Euredocs
European Research and Higher Education Doctoral Studies

SCIENCES PO

with the support of RESUP

First International Euredocs Conference

Sciences Po, Paris, June 24th to June 26th

Salle François Goguel, 56 rue des Saints Pères 75007 Paris

"Transformations experienced by higher education and research institutions in European countries"

Thursday June the 24th (1 pm to 5 pm)

2 pm to 2:45

Magdalini **Kolokitha**
(*Institut of Education, London, Great Britain*)
"Common European Space in Higher Education:
Pedagogical space and Identity formation"

Discussant : Maria João **Pires da Rosa**

Common European Space in Higher Education:

Pedagogical Space and Identity Formation

Magdalini Kolokitha

Institute of Education
University of London

Introduction

My thesis is focused on the on going attempt at the formation of a 'Common European Space in Higher Education', officially known as the Bologna Process. The research is qualitative and representative of the condition of the changes deriving from the Bologna process specifically, of the countries (England and Greece) and of the institutions in which is conducted.

In this paper I am aiming to present a first analysis of the Bologna Process policy effects towards its realisation in two Greek Higher Education Institutions. Policy will be seen as a discourse and its analysis will be divided into two parts. Thus, in the first part of this proposal, I will follow the policy discourse recontextualisation from a European policy level to a state policy level and finally, to an Institutional level. In the second part I will shift the focus of the analysis onto the formation and relocation of institutional identity and the identity of the subjects participating in the practices of these institutions either as academics, administrators or students.

---

[1] This is a **draft paper** based on my first attempt for interview collected data analysis. **Please do not quote,** as further conceptualisation of the analysis and work on the data is required.

In this paper I will first present the main concepts that construct my theoretical framework. Then I will discuss how these concepts can be used as tools of data analysis. Finally, I will present a piece of the data analysis, based on a small part of the sample. Although the overall discussion is mainly concerned with the way the data are analysed; it is specifically oriented on European education policy or Bologna process context.

A. Theoretical tools

My analytical framework for the interview-collected data is based on a combination of theoretical tools extracted the work of Bernstein and Foucault. Explicitly, the main theoretical tools, which will be used for the data analysis, are the Foucauldian notion of 'discourse' and Bernstein's conceptualization of 'pedagogic identities'. I will focus the discussion on the presentation of these two concepts: 'discourse' and 'pedagogic identities'; this will allow me to present the theoretical approach that I adopted regarding these two notions and my perspective on their different utility during the analysis. Then I shall continue the discussion by raising two questions, which, by the end of the paper, I hope to have answered in the context of this research. I will try to explore how 'discourse' and 'pedagogic identities' appear and are promoted in the context of CESHE policy discourse.

The perspective that I adopted theoretically on discourse for the purposes of this research is based on the following features. Firstly, 'discourse is productive'. Discourses produce social practices; they are not the social practice itself. Moreover, discourses are the justification of the type and format of each social practice. Secondly, 'discourse is changeable'. The nature of discourse can be described to be in constant motion and change. Discourses change through the oppositions they create and confront. These

oppositions are mainly based on the way the meaning of the discourse is appreciated. The meaning of the discourse can be spoken or not, can be explicit or implicit, concealed or apparent to the social agents and intermediate social practices and institutions. Finally, a discourse is constantly 're-read' and 're-visited' by different subjects and in different contexts, a process that enforces its change, its recontextualisation.

The subject in the Foucauldian discourse is based on dual role. On the one hand is 'object of discourse' and on the other is 'instrument through which discourse is exercised'. Thus, and although discourses constitute the objects, the objects appear to have a form of an 'anti-power' in the way discourses are exercised. By 'mis-reading', neglecting or opposing to discourses, subjects are able to change them through the creation of alternative discourses. At the level of policy discourse this can be found in the changes of the discourse as it moves from the higher level to the lower level of its realisation, but this will be discussed later.

Narrowing down the discussion to the theme of this research, which is concerned with the on going attempt for the creation of a Common European Space in Higher Education (CESHE), which I will focus on during the analysis as a discourse. I will refer to CESHE as the main policy discourse within the Bologna Process.

The CESHE discourse constitutes both a scientific and political discourse. Its political features appear through the form of signed declarations and official agreements between the EU member states for the future direction of European Higher Education systems and its scientific features become clear when the discussion moves form the structure of the content that will be taught to its quality and its relevance to contemporary labour and social requirements.

In the presented case, the translation of policy discourse by HEI and HEI employees into a scientific discourse is critical as they are the main pedagogical and social agents involved in the understanding of, as well as the production of scientific discourse. Interestingly though, they lack 'anti-power' in the political side/level of the discourse. The political level of the CESHE can also be traced back to global discourses related to economic competition and European discourses related to the qualifications, mobility and employability of the labour force and citizenship. Finally, the CESHE discourse appears top be a discourse with a great complexity, which might interfere with its coherence.

From a Foucaultian perspective this research attempts to deconstruct the Common European Space in HEI. This discourse will be both analytical and descriptive. The main official discourse is constructed by several other specific focused discourses. These discourses can be either for or against of the main values and principles of the official discourse. The question that is raised is, which features of the constituent discourses interrelate in the construction of the main discourse and how the selection of these constituent features is taking place?

Furthermore, all the major discourses i.e. European integration, globalisation, are constructed by smaller discourses that support or oppose them. In the end, all the smaller discourses are located within the space of the main discourse. Their existence and creation is based on the contradictions of the main discourse, which set a space free for different interpretations. In relation to this and as it will be discussed in the following part, subjectivities are constructed by discourses. Their own participation in an oppositional discourse does not promote the rejection of the main discourse but the appearance of a different perspective. Additionally subjectivities cannot escape this context as they are created by the discourse.

However, the specific educational discourse, which produces and is produced by CESHE can only construct identities at the level of institutional or any kind of educational engagement. In a way the discourse appears as powerless in the construction of subject identities outside of the contextual framework that is created and referred. Thus, as my main interest in this research is the discourse itself, the identities that will be presented through the analysis are identities within the contextual framework of the discourse.

At this point I shall try to define the term 'identity' and specifically 'pedagogic identity' and then describe its relation to the discourse; first as a concept underpinning the theoretical framework of this research and secondly in relation to CESHE discourse. In doing so, I will continue the discussion of the notion of subjectivity and consequently of identity. First I would like to distinguish the two terms. I will refer to subjectivity when discussing how the discourse constructs the subject, which here will be the actors who participate in the related procedures of the HEIs. The term identity will be used, when I talk about the educational subjects as participants who express their own interpretation of the attempt to create the CESHE. Additionally, from a Foucauldian perspective subjectivities are created by the discourse "Discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention" (Foucault, 1974, p.49). While in Bernstein the identity of the educational subject, and by identity is meant the social class orientation and type of education, orients how the subject will understand and interpret the discourse. In relation to the Foucauldian approach to the construction of the subject Bernstein writes about identities "There, is clearly, a relation to Foucault's technologies of normalisation, discipline and the discipline and the construction of the subject, but the theory *(theory of codes and pedagogic identities)* gives amore dynamic picture of the struggle to appropriate" (Bernstein, 2000, p.205)

In relation to subjectivity Ball writes, "we are the subjectivities, the voices, the knowledge, the power relations that a discourse constructs and allows" (Ball, 1994, p. 22). From this quotation is understood that the subjectivity cannot be anything over or beyond the discourse in which it participates. Moreover, the discourse of any social practice positions the subjectivities in the context of this practice. That is because "discourses are about what can be said and thought, but also about who can speak, when and with what authority" and they also "embody meaning and social relationships, they constitute both subjectivity and power relations"(Ball, 1990, p.2). Interestingly, subjects do not participate only in one social practice and therefore they are constructed and positioned by many different discourses in many different practices. These discourses can be separated from each other, oppositional, interrelated or overlapping. It is when they overlap or oppose that space for the identity is left to present.

Educational subjects create an interpretation of the official discourse based on their own identity. This interpretation can be either for or against this discourse. The issue that is raised from the above discussion is that any attempt by the educational subjects to resist to the discourse is either an understanding and opposition or a misunderstanding. At any case such resistance cannot escape the essence that lies in the construction of the discourse.

Section A: Analytical Tools

The analytical framework that I will discuss was developed by the process of data coding in relation to the theoretical tools used in this research. The research is based on both, primary and secondary data. As secondary data are considered the official documents of the Bologna process, either the ones that contribute in a way which will promote the process or those that are commentary on the former. Primary data include semi-structured interviews conducted in Greece and England. The theoretical tools I utilised are Ball's 'policy cycle', mainly in the primary data processing, the Foucauldian notion of 'discourse' and the Bersteinian concept of 'pedagogic identities'.

At this point I will be mostly concerned with the description of the analytical framework of the primary data. Specifically, I am referring to 30 semi-structured interviews, held in two Greek higher education institutions during September 2003. The first of two institutions is an 'old University' and the second an A-TEI, which stands for an 'ex-polytechnic'. In each institution I focused on two departments, one oriented towards humanistic studies and one towards science. I tried to find interviewees, who held different positions within each institution and each department. Therefore, the sample from where I draw consists of academics, administrative staff and students.

Data codification

The first thing that I did with the collected data (in audio format) was to listen to them. By doing so I started recognising themes, which were introduced from most (a numerical representation of the sample referring to specific issue scan be seen in Tables 6, 7 and 8) of my interviewees. Although, the themes and situations that were discussed during the

interviews were more or less the same, the approach of the interviewees on them or the significance that was given to each one of them was quite different. The interviewees' responses reflected their position in the institution, as an academic, administrative or student; the department in which they were located, humanities or science; the years they had spent in the institution and the institution itself either old-university or ex-polytechnic.

From the first reading of the data three categories were identified as of great importance for their codification and analysis: a) the themes of discussion that were dominant during the interview, b) the type of the institution and c) what was said by the interviewees in relation to their position in the institution. These three categories are identified in the construction of analytical framework as a) discourses, b) institutional status and c) the voice of the agents. I shall first describe each one of them and then move on to their interrelations, which establish my analytical framework.

a) Discourses

This research interest is on the Bologna Process, which is an ongoing attempt for the creation of a Common European Space in Higher Education (CESHE). The CESHE has not been officially recorded as a European education policy in the sense of a law-penalty condition, but it is a policy in the sense of a voluntary and deliberate agreement within EU member states towards economic and labour development through education. Under this stance and in this research, CESHE is regarded as education policy, and moreover as an education policy discourse. Two features of the CESHE constitute in its obscurity and complexity as a policy discourse. Firstly, CESHE policy-discourse embraces a whole range of the current global orthodoxies concerning higher education such as quality assurance, qualifications, HE management but also regional issues

such as degree recognition between EU countries and mobility. Secondly, although constructed in a regional EU level, its realisation as policy is not only at the state but also at the institutional level.

In relation to the first feature presented above, what appears to happen is that CESHE is the main EU education policy discourse, which is willingly adopted by the EU member states that have signed the Bologna Declaration. The *main discourse,* within the process of realisation, is being reduced to smaller, *secondary discourses*. Secondary discourses appear as education policies at the state level moving down to an institutional. As such can be identified – in Greece – the evaluation policy and the standardisation of degrees of the former TEI now ATEI to the Universities. The outcome of secondary discourses on the everyday reality of an institution can be seen through the *tertiary discourses*. These are discourses concerned with quality assurance, with meeting the standards of a good institution, funding, research and divergences between academics and administrative staff. These are also the discourses that are more commonly recognised, understood and appreciated by most of the participants in an institution.

While moving on to the second feature, I will propose a way of thinking about CESHE as policy-discourse at different levels. That is to say, the main discourse works at the regional EU level, the secondary discourse at the state level and the tertiary at the institutional. Main, secondary and tertiary discourses are highly interrelated and imbricated. Interestingly though, the way that are recontextualised at any level depends on the educational features of the state and status of the institution.

b) Institutional status

When I use the term 'institutional status' in this research I will be referring to the type of an institution. Explicitly, it will refer to whether a specific institution has always been a university or whether it has been upgraded at a certain point from a different higher institution to university. The status of an institution is expressed by the values that the institution and its personnel acknowledge as the guidance for the institutional functioning. The significance of institutional status lays on the way that institutions, according to their values and their inner structure, reflect, appreciate and recontextualise policy discourse and the changes that brings into them.

c) Voice of the agent

The 'voice of the agent' refers to the opinions of the participants in a higher education institution, which in this case are elicited in the interviews. The perspectives of each interviewee as a member of the higher education community, is in way, guided by various factors. These are, as I mentioned earlier, the type of the institution, the department they belong and their position in the institution. Although the pattern described here could easily predict the opinions of most of the interviewees while applied, this is not the case as other features such as political, social and personal values influence their primary opinion. Thus, in this paper, as described in the introductory section, I will make the distinction between identity to subjectivity of the interviewees.

Analytical framework

The three categories presented above as the outcome of the data coding provide the main tools for the data analysis. In an attempt to organise

them in a way that represents their interrelations I ended up with the following table. (see table 1).

Table 1 is organised according specified features in the vertical and horizontal line. Vertically, in the first box is discourse *(this discourse is the discourse of globalisation, economic competition and regionalisation by which CESHE discourse arose)* as a notion but it is subsumed as in each part of the analysis the elements of the discourse change as it refers to specific and differentiated positions and conditions. Accordingly to the conditions, there are three accounts of discourse used as analytical tools. First is the main discourse, which consists of a number of official EU documents addressing the creation of CESHE. Then are the secondary discourses that are conducted through each states education policy regarding the CESHE. There are also the tertiary discourses, which are embedded in the policy realisation process in each institution. Finally, as it is pointed out from their description, discourses – main, secondary and tertiary – appear in different levels – EU, state and institutional – which can be referred as levels of coherence and specification of the discourse.

Table 1

Discourse	Institutional Status (Type of Institution)	Voice of agents (Agent's institutional position)
Main Discourse (EU level)	*Institutional Identity*	*Agent's Identity*
Secondary Discourse (State level)		
Tertiary Discourse (Institutional level)		

Horizontally read, table 1 presents discourse as an analytical tool that would illuminate the processes of policy realisation by recognising its effects on the elements that is applied to, which in this case are the institutions and the agents. However, policy processes and effects are differentiated according to the interplay of the discourse either with the institutional status or the agent's institutional position. In definition, institutional status represents the position of an institution in relation to its position in the HE space, in a local and European context, and in relation to the values it represents. Agent's institutional position is the position that each of the interviewees held on their institution.

The empty boxes in table 1 represent the changeable relationship of the analytical tools when they meet each other. The relationship changes according to the analytical tools' specific features, which describe their position and identity, in relation to the level of their attachment to each account of discourse. In a more straightforward way, the empty boxes present the position of each institution or each agent in relation to each account of discourse, after taking under consideration their own characteristics.

For the exploration of institution's and agent's position I will use an identity cross, created by Bernstein (see table 2), as a model for the description of pedagogic identities. Bernstein introduces five types of pupil identity: a) detachment, b) commitment, c) alienation, d) estrangement and e) deferment. In his model the identity of the pupil is depended on his/her appreciation and understanding of the mode of pedagogic practice (visible or invisible) of the school and the mode of the pedagogic code (restricted or elaborated) that supports it.

Whitty and Power used the Bersteinian typology for the data analysis in one of their research in 1998. They tried to identify pupils' identities taking into consideration their family background in relation to their

appreciation, understanding and acceptance of the pedagogic code of the school that the pupil was located.

Table 2[2]

(Bernstein's identity cross in Whitty, Power et al. 1998)

Detachment	Commitment
Defer	ment
Alienation	Estrangement

In this research in order to create a typology of the agents' identities I will take into consideration their position in the institution that they are based in relation to the type of institution and look at their approach in each account of discourse. At this stage of analysis discourse will be treated as 'code' and the level of acceptance or opposition to it will reveal the type of identity that applies to the agent. The 'code' will also be described, in the Bersteinian way, according to its visibility, a feature that will show its openness to the institution and agent in each of the levels of the policy realisation.

The identity typology can be criticised on three points: a) it is developed from a fixed theoretical framework and will not be easily applied in

relation to a different analytical aspect detached from its structural organisation, b) the typology offers only four option for the identity categorisation and c) the idea of identity categorisation might appear problematic as such.

My argument for the first point would be that the typology although it is detached from the original Bersteinian framework it will not be changed in its original analytical meaning. What will change is that it will be applied to a broad social practice rather than in a strictly educational one. If this is the case; the complexity of interfering features on behalf of the code – policy discourse – and on behalf of the agent – his/her characteristics – will be increased. This would lead to the assumption that it would be difficult to locate two agents with the same characteristics present the same appreciation of the code and finally positioned in the same identity typology. Which leads to the second point of criticism. The four types of identity will allow me to categorise the data collected in a way that would be efficient for their discussion. Nonetheless, the agents' identity should perhaps be seen as an approximation within and between the four types of identity. In addition they will be allocated to the one that they seem to get closest to. Finally, although such fixed process of categorisation could easily be seen as too structural and too much based on grounded theory, I believe that if seen as an analytical device, it will allow and create a space for the interplay between discourses and either institutions or agents.

---

[2] Table 2 needs further theoretical description, which could not be realised in a draft paper as this one.

Section B: Data

The Sample

I now move on to the discussion of the Greek interviews' collected data. The Greek data consist of 30 semi-structured interviews. The interviews were collected in two Greek higher education institutions, a former TEI now ATEI (that would be the equivalent of an ex-polytechnic in England) and an "old" University. The interviews were conducted mainly with people from two departments within each institution (24 in total), one allocated in the sector of humanities and one allocated in sciences, and some were conducted with people that held positions in the main administration (6 in total) of the institution. The sample of the interviewees consists of three categories, a) academics, b) administrators and c) students.

Schematically the sample appears in tables 3, 4 and 5. Table 1 presents the interviewees from the "old" University (AEI) in relation to their department and the position they hold in it. Table 2 presents in the same way the sample from the "ex-polytechnic" (ATEI).

Table 3: Sample from "Old" University - AEI

AEI ELECTR	Academics	Administrator	Students	Total
	Anderson		Kika	
	Grunt		Vivien	
Comput. Eng.	Morrisay	Griffith		
Early Child.	Cusak	Campell	Stefany	
	Michael		Olia	
			Iris	
Main adm.	Jagger	Penn		
	Spacey	Kristofferson		
				16

Table 4: Sample from "ex-polytechnic" - ATEI

ATEI ELECTR	Academics	Administrator	Students	Total
	Vicious	O'Donnell	Pam	
	Hoffman		Noris	
	Kein		Patricia	
Social serv.	Garbo		Cyrus	
	Lopez		Alanis	
			Erica	
Logotherapia				
Main adm	Kravitz	Monroe		
Total				14

The box that needs probably further clarification in the two tables is concerned with the interviewees who are described as academics and members of the main administration. These are academics that hold for some time administrative positions such as the Dean, President or Vice President of the institution. Finally, table 5 presents a numerical view of the sample in relation to the position they hold in their department and their institution.

Table 5: numerical view of the Greek sample

	Old university/ AEI		New university/ TEI		
DEPARTMENT	ELECTRICAL ENGINEERES H/Y	EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	ELECTRICIANS	SOCIAL CARE	
ACADEMICS	3	2	3	2	**10**
ADMINISTRATIVE OF DEPARTMENT	1	1	1		**3**
STUDENTS	2	3	3	3	**11**
MAIN ADMINISTRATION	2		1		**3**
DEAN/PRESIDENT	2		1		**3**
TOTAL	**10**	**6**	**9**	**5**	**30**

Focus – Aims of the Analysis

In section B, I presented the analytical device that I will use for the Greek interviews analysis (see table 1). The analytical device is the outcome of the interaction between the Greek data and the theory aiming to the description of the former. The analysis as presented here is intended to explore two issues in relation to the analytic device: a) its theoretical outcome and b) its empirical outcome. The former is concerned with the level in which this device could be used as a descriptive language of the data and the latter is related to the utility of the device for the understanding of the discursive processes found in two issues: a) the realisation of the Bologna Process as a European education policy and b) the reaction of HEI and HE participants to this realisation.

At this point I will try to discuss the data in a macro level. By this I mean that I will mainly discuss categories and issues of analysis that were developed by the data and how can they be discussed following the analytic device without engaging with the data in a micro level of analysis.

In order to do so, I shall first present the structure of the analysis that will illuminate, which parts of the data will be used and in what way.

Structure of the analysis

It is only through first discussing the data in a macro level that will allow me to move to their micro level analysis. In order to do so, I will discuss the sample categories in relation to the issues in which they focused trying to explore their interaction and appreciation with the different levels of discourse presented in the analytical device. At this stage though, I will briefly engage the collected primary data with secondary data, the official European HE policy documents. However, I will make more explicit connections between primary and secondary data in relation to HEI Greek policies.

Before moving to the presentation of the sample categories and the issues of analysis that derive from them is hall first introduce in what each one of these terms is referring. The sample categories organise the Greek sample according the horizontal concepts of the analytic device, institutional status and agents' positions. The issues that are discussed by the sample are organised in subject areas that are related to the vertical concepts of the analytic device, main, secondary and tertiary discourse.

Sample Categories and Issues of Analysis

Explicitly, the sample categories are divided in two groups: a) institutional status and b) agents' position. The former represents the two types of institution participating in the sample, 'old University' (AEI) or 'new University' (ATEI). The second group which refers to agent's positions includes five main types: a) academics, b) administrators of a department, c) students, d) administrators of the main administration and e) academics within the main administration such as the dean and the president (see

table 5). Each one of these five groups can be divided again, according to the type of institution in which it is found. Therefore, as an example, the administrators of the main administration can be divided to AEI main administrators or ATEI administrators. Finally, the first three categories – academics, administrators of a department and students – following the division in relation to the institution can be divided again in relation to the department they are located. As another example , I will be discussing about humanities students in an AEI and administrators in a science department in an ATEI.

The issues that the interviewees raise are organised in three categories a) policies and politics of the Bologna Process, b) policies and politics of the Greek state and c) institutional changes. Each issues category is related to each one of the levels of discourse presented in the analytical device (see table 1). Hence, the first category that includes issues related to the Bologna Process policies and politics refers to the main discourse; the second category and consequently the issues that refer to state's policies and politics relate to secondary discourses and finally, the third category of institutional changes represents the tertiary discourses.

Section C: Data Analysis

I will focus the discussion on one example related into each one of issues subject areas and see how some of the sample categories reflected on it. In other words I will try to apply the analytic device, regarding the appreciation of each level of discourse by the institutions and agents, in relation to their status or their position. As a start point of the analysis, I will present in a numerical way the sample in relation to the categories and the issues they are referring to.

Table 6

Bologna Policies and Politics – main discourse					
Academics AEI	5	Students AEI	5	Main Adm. AEI	4/4
Electr. Eng	3/3	Electr. Eng	0/2	Elect. eng	1/1
Earl. Child.	1/2	Earl. Child.	1/3	Early. Child.	0/1
Academics TEI	5	Students ATEI	6	Main Adm. ATEI	2/2
Electr.	3/3	Electr.	1/3[3]	Electr.	0/1
Soc. Work.	1/2	Soc. Work	0/3[4]	Soc. Work	0/0

---

[3] The 1/3 percentage indicates that one student had a positive knowledge concerning the main EU/Bologna issues.

[4] The zero number indicates that they did not refer with positive knowledge on the issue. They do know that the European discourses exist and they claimed that no one in their department/institution has ever informed them about it.

Table 7

State policies and politics – secondary discourse					
Academics AEI	5	Students AEI	5	Main Adm. AEI	3/4
Electr. Eng	3/3	Electr. Eng	0/2	Elect. eng	0/1[5]
Earl. Child.	1/2	Earl. Child.	2/3	Early. Child.	0/1
Academics TEI	5	Students ATEI	6	Main Adm. ATEI	2/2
Electr.	3/3	Electr.	3/3	Electr.	1/1
Soc. Work.	2/2	Soc. Work	3/3	Soc. Work	0/0

Table 8

Institutional changes – tertiary discourse					
Academics AEI	5	Students AEI	5	Main Adm. AEI	4/4
Electr. Eng	3/3	Electr. Eng	1/2	Elect. Eng	0/1
Earl. Child.	1/2	Earl. Child.	1/3	Early. Child.	1/1
Academics TEI	5	Students ATEI	6	Main Adm. ATEI	2/2
Electr.	3/3	Electr.	3/3	Electr.	1/1
Soc. Work.	2/2	Soc. Work	3/3	Soc. Work	0/0

At this stage, it must be cleared on the one hand what do the numerical tables 6,7 and 8 actually represents and on the other what are the problems that may occur. Firstly, the proportion of the interviews that are regarded to have referred to issues related to each level of discourse is based on the fact that they actually have a professional opinion and/or

---

[5] Because of her previous experience the discussion focused mainly on EU/Bologna issues

personal experience in with the specific issue. Explicitly, the institutional position of these interviews allows them to have any kind of interaction with the Bologna discourse at any level or they have engaged with it on a level of personal interest. The (0) percent in the cases that appears represents complete absence of interaction with the discourse at any level without implying lack of recognition of the discourse. Moreover, these are interviews that explained that they do know the existence of a European educational discourse but have never been informed about it by the institution they are placed through their experience in it. Their knowledge of the discourse is based on their overall knowledge and interest related to European issues.

Secondly, the numerical tables 6,7 and 8 are mainly descriptive instruments of the data and they support their analysis where needed. The creation of tables was necessary as the sample categories and issues of discussion provide an excessive amount of data, which would be hard to manage without them.

Main Analysis

Due to the limited space in this paper in relation to the amount of data, sample categories and issues of analysis, I will focus the discussion primarily on one issue and examine the perspectives of two sample categories, in both institutions, towards that issue. These are academics within the main administration, such as deans and presidents of the two HEI and students *(the discussion will include the 3 deans and only 4 students due to lack of space and elaborated work on the data)*. I chose those two categories for this paper as they are at the borderlines of an institutional dimension. Deans are at the highest level of the institutional hierarchy and students at the lowest[6]. I will present 3 academics in

---

[6] Even hierarchically this is also the situation in Greece, students hold an influential position towards institutional policies. Greek students are quite keen to staging or/-building

administrative positions 2 in the Old University (AEI) and 1 in the Ex-polytechnic (ATEI), and 4 students, 2 studying in AEI and 2 in the ATEI.

A. European quality assurance context

The issue on which I will focus the discussion, as an example of the data analysis, is the 'quality assurance' discourse. The discourse related to the harmonisation of European higher education institutions was an outcome of the European regional attempt to increase and strengthen its participation in global economic competition. Clearly EU member states value higher education as the means to improve their regional position. The foundations of the 'quality assurance' discourse within the attempt fat the creation of a harmonised European higher education can be traced firstly in Bologna declaration and one of its specified objectives the "promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparative criteria and methodologies" (further details at http://www.vvs.ac/documentatie/bologna/bologna_declaration.htm)

After the Bologna Declaration and in relation to quality assurance, the "Follow up on the Bologna Declaration: a European Quality Assurance" was released as a 'position paper of the steering group of the European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)' March 26th 2001 (further details at http://www.vvs.ac.documentatie/bologna). The ENQA states that, although quality assurance must be one of the primary objectives of the attempt to create a CESHE, it should be developed through national context procedures in each EU member state: "However, the steering group also recognises that the national systems have, as a general rule, developed their procedures and methodologies with a focus on their own national educational arrangements. The steering group is fully aware that the new developments challenge the purely national context for quality assurance" (p. 3)

---

occupations as the means of showing their opposition towards institutional policies, a

Additionally, ENQA suggests that 'accreditation' is part of the quality assurance process explaining "the seminar also concluded that accreditation should not be viewed as an end itself but rather as one of a number of possible components in a European approach on quality assurance"(p.4). Moreover, as part of the accreditation the ENQA proposes the establishment of specific criteria/standards as characteristics which eventually assure quality "the defining characteristic of accreditation is that the process is based on established standards/criteria and that the result of the process is a decision –'yes' or 'no' – as to answer these standards have in fact been met by the institution or programme under accreditation. Whether labelled accreditation or something different, the important thing is that the method used is based on agreed and published standards and makes s formal codified statement about whether or not the evaluated objects meets these standards." (p.4)

Interestingly, although the ENQA group recognises accreditation as part of the European Quality assurance process, and promotes the national organisation of accreditation and quality assurance the group also explains that further action has been taken on the issue: "non-governmental accreditation programs have already been established in Europe and accreditation agencies based in the United States are also active here. But the steering group wishes to emphasise that any more general approach towards accreditation in Europe should be an integrated development from existing quality assurance structures and should not be an additional obligation for institutions of higher education. It is on this basis that the steering group supports the initialisation of a common European framework for quality assurance to look into the possibilities for accreditation" (p.7).

---

condition that partially disturbs institutional organisation and processes.

Finally, the "Communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in charge of Higher Education in Prague on May 19th 2001 (Prague Communiqué) (details at http://www.aic.lv/ace/WP/net_meet/English/It_5_3P.htm) sets as an objective the "Promotion of European cooperation in quality assurance" where "Ministers recognized the vital role that quality assurance systems play in ensuring high quality standards and in facilitating the comparability of qualifications throughout Europe…Ministers called upon the universities and other higher educations institutions, national agencies and the European Network of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), in cooperation with corresponding bodies from countries which are not members of ENQA, to collaborate in establishing a common framework of reference and to disseminate best practice."

The above quotations come from documents, which are part of the production of the CESHE discourse. Within these quotations can be seen the official representation and disposition of the 'quality assurance' discourse on European context and part of the CESHE discourse. Discussing the quality assurance discourse in relation to the analytic device presented earlier (see table 1) it appears as one of the secondary discourses that construct the main CESHE discourse. As such the quality assurance discourse absorbs from the main discourse its European characteristics for the coordination and communication in quality issues. However, the way that quality will be promoted in each of the EU member states lies, as shown from the above quotations, in their own national educational context. Moreover, the ENQA realises the already existing pressure on quality within the European HEIs are facing within their national context and proposes a coordination of already established national evaluative structures in order to avoid the introduction of further obligations to the institutions.

B. Greek quality assurance context

Moving to a state level the quality assurance discourse emerges as a secondary discourse. Specifically, in the Greek context, at state level the quality assurance discourse is officially promoted through the forthcoming law concerning the evaluation Greek HEI. At institutional level the same discourse is unofficially promoted through the established institutional internal and external evaluation. The unofficial promotion of the quality assurance discourse through institutional evaluation is regarded as tertiary discourse as is embedded in and requires institutional changes.

Old-university (AEI)

In more detail, evaluation was existed unofficially in the old-university (AEI) since 1998. It started as a pilot programme organised as a way for the institution to evaluate itself. As the former dean, *Jagger* suggests *it was something that needed to happen. If you wanted to be an institution that would follow the European higher education changes.* Evaluation as a process was not obligatory, as it was an internal experiment focused on how the institution and its participants would react to such procedures. Thus, some departments did not participate in the process, and moreover did not accept to be evaluated. There are no interviews from people in those departments but other interviewees described the attitude of non-participation as stemming from fear of the outcome or as a political position of opposition to EU initiatives in higher education.

The vice dean *Spacey*, who is also responsible for the European issues in the institution, explained that *98% of the departments of the institution are participating in the evaluation.* He described the process of the evaluation, according to which there is an internal and external evaluation. The internal procedures are organised by a body created by the institution and in which the team consisting of the dean, academics and main administrators participate. This body sets the objectives, the means

and the criteria for the evaluation. Interestingly though, Spacey described that *both the criteria of the AEI internal evaluation and the processes are in harmony with the suggested criteria and process of European evaluative bodies*, which was also pointed out by Jagger.

However, on a personal level, Jagger was rather displeased with the overall idea that HEI should follow specific criteria and procedures adopted from a European educational context developed on the idea of global economic competition. Specifically, he explained that the *Bologna (process) is an unavoidable and irreversible situation. As the dean of this institution I had to work towards its full engagement in the Bologna process. If we hadn't made decisions according to the Bologna outlines, this institution would eventually be excluded from the European educational market. On a personal basis though I can't really say that I am happy with the condition in which HEI are engaged right now. The idea and the purposes of a university are changing and not towards a direction that I like.* In comparison, Spacey appeared to adopt a less reluctant point of view at the personal level, but stressed that *the idea of institutional ranking, the way it happens in the UK, is something that I would prefer to be avoided both in the Greek and European context. This situation only creates more problems for average institutions by cutting down their funding from the government and supports the already well off institutions. It is just something that I wouldn't like to see happening.*

Finally, both Jagger and Spacey stated their worries concerning HEI quality. Their main concern was in relation to the upgrading of TEI to ATEI. They both made the same point, which was that *Old-Universities never had a problem with the upgrading of TEI to ATEI as such, and it was about time.* Spacey in a sarcastic way stressed that *we are the only country that had Highest (TEI) and Higher (AEI) education.* Their opposition was that (in the Greek context*) you cannot teach in an AEI*

without a PhD although in the ATEI very few lectures have one. And that is a quality issue.

Moving on to the AEI students, Vivien is an Electrical engineering PhD student and Olia in the final year of her undergraduate in Early Childhood Education. Both of the students were totally unaware of the evaluation procedures in their departments and the institution. It was only when they were specifically asked whether they have filled evaluation forms for a specific module that gave a positive answer. Their point was that this had happened few times, (Olia) *during the lesson some people asked to fill a from expressing my opinion for the module but nobody explained what was it about.* In relation to the Bologna Process none of them were informed about it, so none of them were willing to express any opinion.

New-University (ATEI)

In the New-University (ATEI) the situation in relation to evaluation is quite different. As the Vice President of the institution, Kravitz, explained *we've just started organising the overall institutional evaluation this year, after my constant persistence on the issue, although some departments already run their own internal evaluation.* His point of view was that the *ATEI could be seen as a good higher education institution. We try to adopt the European approach on education and we encourage our people to apply for PhD and upgrade themselves. In a few years we will be at the same level, if we upgrade our people and try to work towards the European standards.* He promoted a very positive view towards the changes in his institution which he saw as *a European institution focused on the transition of labour qualifications.*

Cyrus and Pam are the two ATEI students that whose experiences will be discussed. Cyrus has just finished in the Social Services department and

Pam in the department of electrical engineering. Cyrus stated that *I am not aware of most of the things that you are asking me to talk about. I can only tell you about the upgrading of the institution. I think it is good because our degree from TEI is not respected at all. It is regarded as a lower level degree even though there is no equivalent department as our in any Greek AEI.* Cyrus was mainly concerned with the status of his degree and the possibilities he had to do an MA, as before the upgrading ATEI students were excluded from MA course in Greek universities.

In extreme opposition, Pam was quite aware of the Bologna Process and can be said that she used the system for her own advantage. In 1999 Pam left the then TEI as an Erasmus student. She spent one year in a UK university were she completed four modules and her dissertation. The UK institution awarded her a Bachelor's Degree. With this degree was able to find a job in the UK, do an MA and eventually return to Greece and find a job there. However, the ATEI has not recognised the credits from the UK modules or her working experience and thus, they asked her to do a six-month placement and take exams in order to be awarded with the ATEI degree. As she says, *there was one lecturer in the ATEI that suggested we should leave as Erasmus students to some of us. I spent a lot of time searching for the options I would if I was going to go. I also spoke to people from the university that knew about the Bologna Process. It was a good opportunity so I went along with another girl…I do not regret it. If I had stayed I would have to go anyway in the UK if I wanted an MA…for students like me, in the TEI, it is very good because here we have no other options…*Pam's experience is interesting in many level of the Bologna Process. At this stage I will only point out the obvious lack of credit transfer mechanisms and trust in relation of quality assurance between European HEI.

Conclusions

Summing up the previous discussions, Greece has not yet officially instituted evaluation procedures at a state level in HEI. Although, the institutions operate their own internal evaluations and participate in European evaluative audits working on quality assurance.

Applying the identity cross (see table 2) from the analytical device I would suggest the following description of the interviewees. In the AEI Jagger adopts a position that could be described as detachment. Jagger, because of his position as a former Dean has access and appreciates the CESHE discourse in all levels, even though its recontextualisation. Nonetheless, on a personal level he detaches himself from the discourse. His decisions were driven by his positional responsibilities as Dean but his personal view sees the process as an 'unavoidable' necessity. Spacey could be described as estrangement. He is less critical on the personal level and his overall attitude is to work in the best way towards the ends of the Bologna Process. At this point it can be said that even though Jagger and Spacey resist, on a different level, the principles and values of the main discourse (CESHE) as such, their criticisms do not lead to its rejection nor are these criticisms always translated into actions. However, an oppositional space, a space for change, is created.

On the other hand, Kravitz, which represents here the official voice of the ATEI, is completely committed to the discourse. He never questioned the discourse at any level and in addition he regards himself as the voice of change in the institution. Moving on to the students, Olia, Vivien and Cyrus are alienated from the discourse. They were not aware of the cause of changes in their institutions, and in addition decided that they would not even comment on issues raised with them during the interview due to their lack of information. In contrast, Pam, has a position of deferment.

She doesn't really relate to the discourse even though she states that she is a product of this discourse. She realised the discourse by searching for the right information and then turned the discourse to her advantage. That was a position she took for a period of time and then moved on, leaving the discourse behind her.

Finally, I would like to state again that this is a draft paper, which is a first attempt for data analysis. I chose not to place any references, as I wanted to use this paper to present to you my personal understanding, which is open to your comments and oppositions.

References

Ball, S. J. (1990). Introducing Monsieur Foucault. <u>Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge</u>. S. J. Ball. London, Routledge: 1-8.

Ball, S. J. (1994). <u>Education Reform: A critical and post structural approach</u>. Backingham, Open University Press.

Bernstein, B. (1996). <u>Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique</u>. London, Talor & Francis.

Foucault, M. (1974). <u>The Archaeology of Knowledge</u>. London, Tavistock.

Power, S. W., Geoff. Edwards, Tony. Wigfall, Valerie. (1998). "Schools, Families and Academically Able Students: contrasting modes of involvement in secondary education." <u>British Journal of Sociology of Education</u> **19**(2): 157-176.