

Impact of the Bologna process two-cycle implementation on teacher education in the Czech Republic¹

Stanislav Bendl, Hana Voňková, Michal Zvírotsky

Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Education, Department of Education

Received 17 July 2013; final version received 2 December 2013; accepted 5 December 2013

Abstract: As a consequence of the Bologna process, five-year master's teacher education programmes have been divided into three-year bachelor's and two-year master's studies in the Czech Republic. The aim of this paper is to describe the development of the two-cycle implementation in teacher education programmes in the Czech Republic and present survey results about the opinions of both the academic staff and students at the Faculty of Education of Charles University in Prague on the implementation. In the first and second parts, we summarize Bologna goals and reaction to the two-cycle implementation in general. In the third part, we analyze the two-cycle system implementation from its introduction into the Czech legal system to a recent successful re-accreditation of a one-cycle programme at one faculty of education and strengthening voices for reintroduction of a one-cycle system for teacher education. In the fourth part, we present the survey results. It has been shown that about nine out of ten staff members had disagreed with the two-cycle implementation at the time of its introduction in 2006, and there has been no significant change of their opinions over time. Moreover, more than sixty percent of the academic staff do not agree with the co-existence of the two systems. On the contrary, students prefer the two-cycle system to the one-cycle system (7:3). Most bachelor's students intend to continue in the follow-up master's study suggesting that the division is more or less formal.

Keywords: Teacher education, Bologna process, two-cycle system, bachelor's study, follow-up master's study, five-year master's study

There has been a lot of discussion about the future design of teacher education in the Czech Republic, much of it related to the Bologna two-cycle

¹ This paper was supported by the institutional research plan *The teaching profession in changing educational demands* (MSM 0021620862) funded by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic. We thank our colleagues Jarmila Mojžíšová (Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Education, Department of Education) and David Voňka for their expert comments and help.

implementation. A thorough evaluation of positive and negative effects of the reform on a transformation of teacher education is needed. The evaluation should also take into account the increasing requirements for teachers which are currently being discussed.

In this paper, we describe the development of the two-cycle system implementation in teacher education programmes in the Czech Republic. This systematic overview has not been published yet. Next, we present survey results about the implementation of the two-cycle system at the Faculty of Education of Charles University in Prague. We asked both its academic staff and students about the two-cycle implementation and its impact on teacher education programmes.

1 Bologna goals

The Bologna process is a result of a series of European conferences and political decisions. It is an agreement among European and some non-European countries (e.g. Armenia and Georgia) which aims to increase accessibility, attractiveness and quality of higher education in Europe. The Bologna process led to the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) which adopts the three cycles of higher education qualification usually awarding bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees.

As of today, the Bologna process has 48 members: 47 countries and the European Commission. In addition, there are consultative members, for example, the Council of Europe (CE), the European University Association (EUA), the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), the European Student Union (ESU) and the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).

The Bologna process is indeed a continuous effort. We can distinguish several milestones in the past: Paris – Sorbonne (1998), Bologna (1999), Prague (2001), Berlin (2003), Bergen (2005), London (2007), Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve (2009), Budapest/Vienna (2010) and Bucharest (2012). Further conferences are planned for the future, specifically for the years 2015, 2018 and 2020.

The main document of the Bologna process is the Bologna Declaration (1999), itself based on several preceding documents. Some authors claim that the Bologna Declaration is so linked with the Sorbonne Declaration (1998) and

the Lisbon Convention (1997) that they should be seen as a whole (e.g. Štech, 2011).

The Bologna declaration states the following objectives as key for the European higher education: 1) adoption of a system of easily understandable and comparable degrees (also through the Diploma Supplement) in order to promote European citizens' employability and the international competitiveness of the European higher-education system; 2) adoption of a system based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate; 3) establishment of a system of credits, such as in the ECTS system, as a means of promoting the students' mobility; 4) promotion of students', teachers', researchers' and administrative staff's mobility; 5) promotion of European co-operation in quality assurance of education and research at higher education institutions with regard to developing comparable criteria and methodologies; 6) promotion of the necessary European dimensions in higher education (for more details see, for example, *The Bologna declaration on the European space for higher education: an explanation*, 2010).

Other objectives were added during regular meetings of Ministers of Education (2001, 2003, 2005, and 2007). These are, for example, promotion of lifelong learning, a curricular reform, qualification framework, a doctoral programme reform, social dimension etc. In comparison with the economic competitiveness objective of the Bologna process, these aims are mainly instrumental (Štech, 2011, p. 27). In the communiqué from the ministerial conference in Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve (2009) ten priority areas were set for the following decade of the Bologna process, among others, student-centred learning and the teaching mission of higher education; education, research and innovations; employability; international openness; multidimensional transparency tools (for making the EHEA institutions diversity more transparent); and higher education institutions funding.

2 Two-cycle system implementation: Opinions in the Czech Republic and other countries

The Bologna process two-cycle system implementation has influenced higher education in Europe substantially. According to *The European Higher Education Area in 2012: Bologna Process implementation report (Report 2012)*, in over half of the member countries more than 90 percent of students study in programmes corresponding with the Bologna two-cycle system

and in another quarter of the member countries about 70–89 percent of students study in programmes corresponding with the Bologna system. However, in some countries the share of students taking part in the two-cycle programmes is low. It is mainly caused by late introduction of legislative changes. In almost all countries there are still one-cycle long programmes for the regulated professions for which the EU directive 2005/36/EC and/or national legislative requires 5–6 years of study: medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, architecture and veterinary medicine and to a lesser extent engineering, law, theology, and teacher education. Although one-cycle long programmes have remained a part of education systems, some Bologna changes have been applied to them, such as the European Credit Transfer System with the issuing of the Diploma Supplement.

Another interesting point of *Report 2012* concerns the share of students continuing their study in the second cycle after finishing the first cycle. There are huge differences among countries. While in most of them 10–24 percent of students continue their study in the second cycle, in some of them (13 countries) it is between 75–100 percent. The high share may suggest that the first cycle may not yet have been introduced in a useful way, e.g. it does not give a qualification for accessing the labour market. Reichert (2010) points out that the bachelor's programme is often perceived as a mass-oriented programme, while the master's programme as a selective or elite one. A master's degree is still considered the main university degree in many systems and follow-up master's studies should guarantee such continuity. The nature of the first three years, i.e. bachelor's studies, has changed substantially. Universities try to make the bachelor's study as complete as possible. It implies, for example, a shift of many courses into bachelor's study, less time for independent work, fewer optional courses and fewer possibilities for student mobility which is in contradiction with the main Bologna goals (Reichert, 2010).

Kehm and Teichler (2006) summarize controversies related to the two-cycle system: 1) Whether and to what extent the bachelor's cycle should be more practical and aimed at immediate employability of the graduates. Would it harm the academic standards? 2) Some three-year bachelor's programmes may not be sufficient for highly qualified jobs. Should universities design an academically-oriented bachelor's programme in these cases and recommend their students to continue in the subsequent master's studies? 3) The two-

cycle system implementation is often considered an attempt to shorten study time in general and decrease over-all qualification levels. 4) It attempts to “squeeze” the preceding five-year master’s curriculum into a new three-year bachelor’s curriculum in order to guarantee labour market relevance (defined by the preceding master’s study).

Reactions to the two-cycle implementation in the Czech Republic are both positive and negative. Sokol (2011) summarizes the advantages of well-implemented bachelor’s studies: 1) postponing adulthood and decisions about the final choice of profession, they may also motivate students with a less stimulating background; 2) thorough search for and selection of talented students with academic career ambitions; 3) preserving the difficulty of follow-up studies (master’s and doctoral) to prevent those who do not need it or do not have the capability to study them from enrolling; 4) providing students with “unspecific” skills and knowledge which is not aimed at a specific profession, but still possibly used in various activities; 5) reduction of public cost on useless long studies for those who will not need it; 6) strengthening of international student mobility which is important for smaller countries such as the Czech Republic (Sokol, 2011, pp. 18–19).

There are also many negative assessments of the two-cycle system. These are mainly based on bad experience of the implementation at universities and its application in programmes, where a bachelor’s degree makes no sense. Stehlík (2011) gives an example of bachelor’s graduates in Egyptology and Sinology at the Faculty of Arts at Charles University in Prague who try to find a job right after getting their degrees. It seems to be hard to imagine since the study is inherently academic and needs a long-term preparation. Moreover, the Faculty is then criticized that most of their graduates in these and similar fields of studies continue in the follow-up master’s study. Stehlík (2011) also stresses that the two-cycle implementation has had a serious impact on teacher education. It might threaten the whole education system since it opens a discussion about teachers with a bachelor’s degree only (according to current Czech law, teachers must get a master’s degree). Moreover, Janík (2012, p. 224) states that it is much more complicated to link knowledge in subjects and didactics in the two-cycle system although this integration is seen as a crucial element in teacher education. According to Hník (2012, p. 232) the introduction of the two-cycle system in teacher education is often perceived as destructive.

Štech (2011) and Šťastná (2011) point out that there is no analysis of impacts of the two-cycle implementation in the Czech Republic. Šťastná (2011) states that only basic descriptive statistics are known such as that 80 percent of bachelor's graduates continue in the follow-up master's study. Deep analyses of employability of graduates and the quality of the two-cycle studies were not, however, done.

3 Teacher education: Development of resistance to the two-cycle system in the Czech Republic

There has been a long-term discussion about two-cycle system implementation in teacher education. Here, we distinguish five phases of two-cycle system implementation in lower secondary teacher education programmes in the Czech Republic: 1) Introduction of the two-cycle system in the Czech law and accreditation of the first two-cycle teacher education programme; 2) Two-cycle teacher education as a national experiment; 3) Unsuccessful attempts to re-accredit the five-year master's programme; 4) Shift – successful re-accreditation of the five-year master's programme; 5) Discussions about the existence of the two-cycle system and/or the five-year master's programme.

In the first phase, *Introduction of the two-cycle system in the Czech law and accreditation of the first two-cycle teacher education programme*, the process of the two-cycle implementation started at all universities in the Czech Republic. Besides the Bologna declaration (1999), the two-cycle system has been introduced in Czech Act no. 147/2001 (Zákon č. 147/2001) – an amendment of the Universities Act. According to the Act, the five-year master's programme is an exception, while the two-cycle system should become common practice. Par. 46/2 of the Act states that:

A master's programme follows a bachelor's programme; a standard length of the programme is at least one year and maximum three years. In case of study programmes with specific characteristics, it may be allowed to accredit a master's programme which does not follow a bachelor's programme; in this case the standard length of study is at least four years and maximum six years.

The first wave of two-cycle implementation took place between 2000 and 2003, but since the introduction of the Act, the universities have been “fighting” against the two-cycle system. For teacher education, only the primary school

teachers' study was allowed to keep its five-year master programme. The main reason was that this study consists of 12–19 subjects which are hard to split into two parts. The reasons why not to divide the study were also brought up at a seminar organized by the Faculty of Education at Masaryk University in Brno in cooperation with the Council of Higher Education Institutions, the Ministry of Education and the Accreditation Commission: for example, large number of interconnected subjects, an unclear definition of bachelor's graduate profile and an inherently limited possibility to switch to/from other fields. The Accreditation Commission recognized that this study can hardly be divided into two cycles. Training programmes for lower and upper secondary school teachers were divided into two cycles although the Faculties of Education Deans Association was against the division. The first faculty of education which accredited the two-cycle teacher education was the Faculty of Education of Masaryk University in Brno. It was a surprising step since the faculty declared its preference for the one-cycle system in its Long-run Strategy for 2000–2005. However, in 2002 the faculty updated its Long-run Strategy and made a commitment to prepare an accreditation of two-cycle lower and upper-secondary teacher programmes. In 2003 the accreditation was accepted. Based on the information from the participants of meetings that resulted in this change, we can say that the faculty was "forced" to make this step by the leaders of the university. In 2004, a two-cycle teacher programme was also opened at the Faculty of Education at the University of West Bohemia in Pilsen. The conceptions of two-cycle teacher education programmes were different at the two faculties. The bachelor's study in Brno specialized in the fields that correspond to currently taught subjects at high schools (like mathematics etc.) and the graduates could be employed as teaching assistants for these particular subjects. The bachelor's study in Pilsen was aiming at knowledge in a broader field (like science) with the intention that the graduates would specialize in specific subjects during their master's. Note that even before the introduction of the two-cycle teacher education programmes, bachelor programmes providing teaching qualification had existed in the Czech Republic. The Universities Act 1990 enabled the introduction of bachelor's studies at universities. In the 1990s the lack of elementary school teachers of western foreign languages like English was partially solved by opening bachelor's teacher programmes (so-called *fast track*).

The second phase, *Two-cycle teacher education as a national experiment*, can be seen as very surprising for the faculties. In 2005 The Accreditation Commission published a working document called *Conception of lower and upper secondary schools teacher education* on the Ministry of Education website (*Koncepce pregraduální přípravy učitelů základních a středních škol*, 2005). The document states that two-cycle teacher education is a national experiment. In Czech, the word “experiment” puts in doubt whether the implementation can be taken seriously and whether it was actually necessary to divide the study. If it was not, why were faculties “forced” to do it? In 2005, the implementation had been (almost) finished at several faculties. The word “experiment” was clarified in a personal statement by J. Mareš (the editor of the document) on January 27, 2012 where he said that (a) the impact of the two-cycle implementation had not been studied and evaluated systematically and (b) there are many models of how to divide study programmes and we did not know which one was the most appropriate one.

In the third phase, *Unsuccessful attempts to accredit the five-year master's programme*, the Accreditation Commission had been slowly changing its attitude to two-cycle teacher education programmes and discussion about five-year master programmes was reopened. There were two attempts to re-accredit a five-year master's programme: at the Faculty of Education of the University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice in 2007 and the Faculty of Education at the University of Hradec Králové in 2011. Both attempts were unsuccessful. It is interesting to compare explanations of the rejections given by the Accreditation Commission. In 2007, the Faculty of Education in České Budějovice intended to accredit the five-year system parallel to the two-cycle system and then compare and evaluate advantages and disadvantages of both systems. The Commission sees the proposed five-year master's programme as an anti-systemic solution of teacher education in the Czech Republic. The Commission also argues that the five-year programme would hamper students' mobility at both the university and the Czech Republic and that it would not allow for adequate mobility in the EU (*Zápis č. 05-07*, 2007).

In 2011, the Commission says that the proposed five-year master's is not qualitatively different from the existing two-cycle system. It recommends presenting an analysis of mobility of students and employability of graduates of both two-cycle and five-year master's systems (*Zápis č. 05-11*, 2011). The Commission also recommends conducting a project which would evaluate the impact of the two-cycle system on the teacher education. According to the

Commission, it should also be considered whether to enable an accreditation of five-year master's programme parallel to the two-cycle system, or alternatively in which fields such an accreditation would help to enhance the quality of teacher education and improve the situation at faculties of education (*Zápis č. 05–11*, 2011, p. 52). In light of the rejection to run both systems together at the University of South Bohemia, a recommendation to evaluate and compare the two systems at the University of Hradec Králové seems to be an interesting development.

The fourth phase, *Shift – successful re-accreditation of the five-year master's programme*, can be seen as a breaking phase. After the two unsuccessful attempts to re-accredit the five-year master's study there was a successful one in 2013. The Accreditation Commission approved the application of the five-year master programme accreditation at the University of Hradec Králové (*Zápis č. 02–13*, 2013). It notes that the proposed five-year study differs from the existing two-cycle study in many aspects such as an increased number of courses in education and psychology and their logical order, more teaching practice and better distribution of all parts of teaching preparation courses within the five years. However, the Commission expects that the Faculty will work further on the “new” model. It is particularly expected that there will be a better connection between theoretical and practical parts of teaching preparation, subject (e.g. mathematics, languages) and subject didactics and strengthening students' reflections of their teaching preparation.

As expected, the accreditation at Hradec Králové has sparked even more discussions about the models of teacher education. The fifth phase *Discussions about the existence of the two-cycle system and/or the five-year master's programme* is currently running. There are some ideas about what the teacher education should be like, including an option to run both types of studies in parallel at one faculty.

The Faculty of Education of Charles University in Prague has also joined all the discussions about models of teacher education. In the following section we present the key results of a survey of academic staff's and students' opinions of the implementation.

4 Implementation of the two-cycle system at the Faculty of Education of Charles University in Prague: Survey results

The Faculty of Education at Charles University in Prague introduced the two-cycle system in the academic year 2006/2007. In 2011 we decided to conduct a questionnaire survey of the opinions of both the academic staff and students on the two-cycle implementation and its impact on teacher education programmes. Specifically, the aim was to find out the academic staff's opinions on the accreditation of the two-cycle system and get their comments on problems emerging after the implementation at different departments. Moreover, we also aimed at describing experiences of both the academic staff and students with the two-cycle system in 2011 when the first two-cycle master's graduates left the faculty. This year was important for another reason: there was a second unsuccessful attempt to re-accredit one-cycle teacher education study (see previous section, phase 3).

4.1 Sample

There are 19 departments offering teacher education programmes in total at the faculty. Only the Department of Primary Education has not implemented the two-cycle study system and still offers a five-year master's programme. The other 18 departments have implemented the two-cycle study and were asked to participate in our survey and share their opinions on the two-cycle study system. In total, 51 academic staff members from 16 departments and 1 member of the Institute of Research and Development of Education (a research institute at the faculty which also gives lectures in the two-cycle study system) answered our survey questionnaire. We have asked the head of every department to select preferably members that have been active in the implementation process.

Most of the academic staff members participating in our survey reported that they had been working at the faculty for more than ten years (67.3%, $n = 35$). Most of them also worked on the two-cycle system accreditation (78.8%, $n = 41$).

The other group of our respondents were students of the current two-cycle system. In total, 126 students participated in our survey, 30 bachelor's students and 96 master's students. The bachelor's students were in their second or third years of study. Master's students were mostly in their first

year of study (94.8%, $n = 91$). Students were asked to fill in our questionnaire mainly after taking an exam in a major course like general didactics.

4.2 Results

There were three key questions for the academic staff: 1) whether and why they had agreed or disagreed to the introduction of the two-cycle system at the time of its introduction; 2) which type of study they would prefer at this point if they had a choice between keeping the two-cycle system and reintroducing the previous five-year master's study in their field; and 3) whether they would agree to running two-cycle study and five-year master's study concurrently in their field. Table 1 summarizes their answers. (Note that basic analysis of the first two questions is given in Bendl, Voňková, & Zvírotsky, 2013).

Table 1

Academic staff members' opinions on the two-cycle implementations

Preference of the two-cycle system in 2006	abs. freq.	rel. freq. (%)
Yes	6	11.5
No	45	86.5
Not available	1	1.9
Neither of them	-	-
Total	52	100
Preference of the two-cycle system in 2011	abs. freq.	rel. freq. (%)
Yes	5	9.5
No	45	86.5
Not available	-	-
Neither of them	2	3.8
Total	52	100
Running both two-cycle and five-year master's studies concurrently	abs. freq.	rel. freq. (%)
Yes	20	38.5
No	32	61.5
Not available	-	-
Total	52	100

Opinions of the academic staff are clear: 86.5% ($n = 45$) had disagreed and only 11.5% ($n = 6$) had agreed with the two-cycle system implementation in

2006. One person (1.9%) did not answer the question. Moreover, there was no significant change over time. Only three out of the six staff members who agreed with the introduction of the two-cycle study would like to keep it. Two out of the six would prefer to go back to the five-year master's and one recommends conducting a detailed analysis of advantages and disadvantages of the systems. Only two out of forty-five staff members who disagreed with the two-cycle implementation would prefer to keep it. We also asked the academic staff to give reasons why they had agreed or disagreed with the implementation.

Reasons for the prevalent negative answer are categorized into the following three groups:

- (1) The biggest group of these staff members (75.6%, $n = 34$) argue that the two-cycle system is not "suitable for teacher education" and that training in educational science, psychology and subject didactics is not linked with training in subjects from the beginning of the study. A specific answer representing this category is: "It is not possible to train students systematically in didactics. Bachelor's study is not sufficient for a student to become a teacher; students have to continue in master's study anyway – the division of the study is therefore useless". Another specific answer: "I consider teacher education as a whole, all parts are linked to each other and they can hardly be split. The bachelor's degree does not provide a teaching qualification."
- (2) Seven staff members (15.6%) mention a general danger for the teaching profession, intentional lowering of requirements for teacher's qualification and a danger of shortening teacher studies. A typical answer for this category is: "...the fear that bachelor's study will be declared sufficient for teachers in the future, a danger of cutting down on the studies and reducing teachers' expertise."
- (3) Three staff members (6.7%) mention other reasons. One respondent complains that there is no research-supported reason for the introduction of the two-cycle system. One staff member is afraid that the value of the university diploma will decrease. One staff member mentions higher administration load and less time for preparation for courses.

One staff member did not give any reason for his/her disagreement.

Reasons given by the six staff members who had agreed with the implementation are that students can get an academic degree after only three years rather than five ($n = 1$), students have the possibility to change their field or not to continue their study after finishing their bachelor's study ($n = 1$), higher student mobility ($n = 1$) and that our system of higher education is now synchronized with other countries ($n = 1$). Two staff members did not give their reasons for agreement.

An interesting question is whether both types of studies could be run concurrently at the faculty nowadays. More than sixty percent of the academic staff (61.5%, $n = 32$) do not agree with the co-existence of the two systems. They give mainly the following reasons: organization problems, time constraints and chaos ($n = 18$). One respondent states: "It is a conceptual decision and it should be clearly given which of the two types of studies is better for teacher education." Those who would prefer the co-existence of both systems (38.5%, $n = 20$) give the following reasons:

- 1) The types of applicants for teacher education do matter ($n = 6$). Five-year master's programme could be aimed at those who plan to become teachers from the very beginning while two-cycle study would be better for those who are not decided at the beginning of their university study or want to focus on science more. Moreover, the follow-up master's study could be available for applicants with bachelor's degree from other faculties.
- 2) Evaluation of which forms of study are more appropriate should be provided ($n = 3$). Specifically, it should be clear which one is effective (more suitable for teacher education) and which is more interesting for students.
- 3) Co-existence is better than existence of the two-cycle system only ($n = 2$). Introduction of five-year master's study could help increase the low academic level of the current two-cycle study.
- 4) There could be two streams – teaching and non-teaching ones ($n = 1$). Furthermore, depending on field, the educational science and psychology study programmes could remain structured into two cycles while teacher education studies (such as teacher education in mathematics and languages) should be divided into two cycles ($n = 1$).

It is interesting to compare the opinions of the academic staff with the opinions of students at the faculty. We asked students which type of study

they would prefer if they had a choice between the two-cycle and five-year master's study. The other complementary question for bachelor's students was whether they were going to continue in the follow-up master study. Table 2 summarizes students' answers to both questions.

Table 2
Students' opinions on the two-cycle implementation

Preference of the two-cycle system	abs. freq.	rel. freq. (%)
Yes	85	67.5
No	38	30.2
Not available	3	2.4
Total	126	100
Intention to continue in the follow-up master's study	abs. freq.	rel. freq. (%)
Yes	27	90
No	3	10
Total	30	100

The opinion of the students in our sample is also clear and quite the opposite to the opinion of the academic staff: the ratio of those preferring the two-cycle system to those who prefer the five-year master's programme is greater about 7:3 (67.5%, $n = 85$ for the two-cycle; 30.2%, $n = 38$ for the five-year master's programme; 2.2 %, $n = 3$ did not give any answer). The main reasons for the prevalent choice of the two-cycle system are getting a bachelor's degree after three years of study (68.2%, $n = 58$), the possibility of changing the field or the school after getting the bachelor's degree (21.2%, $n = 18$) and the possibility to stop studying after the bachelor's degree if there is a reason to do so (5.9%, $n = 5$). The students who would prefer the five-year master's study gave mainly the following reasons: *compactness* of study, more time for both subject courses and teaching practice (34.2%, $n = 13$), more obligations in the two-cycle system such as one more admission procedure and writing a bachelor's thesis (34.2%, $n = 13$) and a bachelor's degree is not sufficient for those who want to teach in the future (13.2%, $n = 5$). For more details on the students' choices, see Bendl and Voňková (2011).

Finally, the answers of bachelor's students to the complementary question whether they are going to continue in the follow-up master study show another very clear opinion of students. Most of them (90%, $n = 27$) are going to continue in the follow-up master's study. About three quarters of

these students (74.1%, n = 20) want to continue at the same faculty, i.e. Faculty of Education of Charles University in Prague and about a quarter of the students (25.9%, n = 7) are going to change the faculty for another one (five students would like to continue at a faculty of arts, one student is going to study at New York University in the US and one student intends to study at the Institute of Chemical Technology Prague). The main reasons for the change follow from a specializations of faculties of education and other faculties (students do not want to become teachers or want to specialize in their field), or dissatisfaction with study conditions and study programmes. There are only three students in our sample (10%) who are going to finish their study right after getting their bachelor's degree and find a job such as educator or language instructor. We can conclude that most students want to continue in the follow-up master study at the faculty suggesting that the division into two stages is more or less formal.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we distinguish five phases of the two-cycle system implementation in lower secondary teacher education programmes in the Czech Republic: 1) Introduction of the two-cycle system in the Czech law – according to an amendment to the Universities Act 147/2001 the five-year master's programme is an exception, while the two-cycle system should become a common practice. 2) Two-cycle teacher education as a national experiment – according to the working document *Conception of lower and upper secondary schools teacher education* of the Accreditation Commission published in 2005, the two-cycle implementation in teacher education is called a national experiment which puts in doubt whether the implementation can be taken seriously. 3) Unsuccessful attempts to re-accredit five-year master's programmes – two faculties of education of the University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice and the University of Hradec Králové tried to re-accredit the five-year master's programmes in 2007 and 2011 respectively. 4) A shift – successful re-accreditation of the five-year master's programme – a breaking phase since the University of Hradec Králové managed to re-accredit the five-year master's programme. 5) Discussions about the existence of the two-cycle system and/or the five-year master's programmes.

The Faculty of Education of Charles University in Prague has taken part in all the discussions about the two-cycle implementation. Our survey can be seen

as a part of the discussion. It brings empirical evidence about the opinions of the academic staff and students on the two-cycle system implementation. We asked academic staff about their opinions of the two-cycle implementation at the time of its introduction at the faculty in 2006 and also at the time of the survey conducted in 2011, i.e. five years later when the first master's graduates left the faculty. Opinions of the academic staff are clear: about nine out of ten had disagreed with the two-cycle implementation and there was no significant change over time. The reasons for the prevalent negative answers are mainly that the two-cycle system is not "suitable for teacher education" and that training in educational science, psychology and subject didactics is not linked with training in subjects from the beginning of the study. The academic staff also mentioned general dangers for the teaching profession (intentional lowering of requirements for teacher's qualification and the danger of shortening teacher studies) together with the fact that there is no research supporting the introduction of the two-cycle system. The minority of the academic staff who agreed with the implementation (one out of ten) gives the following reasons: students get an academic degree after three years only instead of five years, students have the possibility to change their field or not to continue their study after finishing their bachelor's study, higher student mobility and that our system of higher education is now synchronized with other countries.

More than sixty percent of the academic staff do not agree with possible co-existence of the two systems due to organizational problems, time constraints and chaos. Those who would prefer the co-existence mainly state that types of applicants for teacher education do matter and that evaluation of which forms of study is more appropriate should be provided.

The opinion of the students in our sample is also clear and contrary to the opinion of the academic staff: the ratio of those preferring the two-cycle system to those who prefer the five-year master's programme is about 7:3. The main reasons for the prevalent choice of the two-cycle system are getting a bachelor's degree after three years of study and the possibility of changing the field or the school after getting the bachelor's degree. The students who would prefer the five-year master's study mainly gave reasons similar to the academic staff's, i.e. *compactness* of study and more time for both subject courses and teaching practice. They also state that there are more obligations in the two-cycle system such as one more admission procedure and writing a bachelor's thesis. It is remarkable that more obligations and

higher workload due to the two-cycle implementation were only pinpointed by students, not the academic staff although their workload has increased immensely. Another very clear opinion is given by bachelor's students. Most of them (nine out of ten) are going to continue in the follow-up master's study which suggests that the division into two stages is more or less formal.

There are still many interesting questions which need to be answered during a serious discussion about the final model of teacher education. For example, we are conducting a survey where we ask bachelor's and master's graduates about how well-prepared they feel for teaching. It is also important to know the headmasters' opinions on the length and the model of teacher education. Current discussions about the two-cycle implementation in teacher education are not based on empirical evidence and detailed analysis of implications of collected data too often. We recommend conducting surveys similar to ours at other faculties of education as well as analysing experience of the new system. Moreover, given that the University in Hradec Králové managed to re-accredit the one-cycle study in 2013 and both one-cycle and two-cycle systems run concurrently nowadays, the advantages and disadvantages of the systems may be compared in real settings. After a thorough analysis of empirical evidence a general recommendation can be given.

References

- Bendl, S., & Voňková, H. (2011). Hodnocení strukturovaného studia učitelství studenty Univerzity Karlovy v Praze – Pedagogické fakulty. In O. Kaščák & B. Pupala (Eds.), *Škola – statický element v sociální dynamice* (pp. 200–206). Bratislava: Iura Edition.
- Bendl, S., Voňková, H., & Zvířotský, M. (2013). The Bologna process and teacher training in the Czech Republic: Opinions of academic staff and students about the two-cycle system implementation at the Faculty of Education of Charles University in Prague. *The New Educational Review*, 11(2), 301–312.
- Bologna Declaration* (1999). Retrieved from http://arhiv.mvzt.gov.si/fileadmin/mvzt.gov.si/pageuploads/doc/dokumenty_visokoskolstvo/Bolonjski_proces/bolonjska_deklaracija.pdf
- Hník, O. (2012). Jaký model vzdělávání učitelů potřebuje současná škola (z pohledu didaktika literatury). In J. Kohnová, et al., *Profesní rozvoj učitelů a cíle školního vzdělávání* (pp. 229–234). Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Pedagogická fakulta.
- Janík, T. (2012). Učitel a didaktické znalosti obsahu: podmínky utváření a možnosti rozvoje. In J. Kohnová, et al., *Profesní rozvoj učitelů a cíle školního vzdělávání* (pp. 213–227). Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Pedagogická fakulta.
- Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2006). Which direction for bachelor and master programmes? A stocktaking of the Bologna process. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 12(4), 269–282.

- Koncepce pregraduální přípravy učitelů základních a středních škol* (2005). Materiál Grémia MŠMT ČR. Retrieved from <http://aplikace.msmt.cz/AK/koncepce1.htm>
- Reichert, S. (2010). The intended and unintended effects of the Bologna reforms. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 22(1), 99–118.
- Sokol, J. (2011). Boloňská reforma po deseti letech. *Aula*, 19(1), 17–19.
- Stehlík, M. (2011). Boloňský proces – prospěl, nebo uškodil českým vysokým školám? Strukturované studium po deseti letech. *Aula*, 19(1), 19–20.
- Šťastná, V. (2011). Boloňský proces – prospěl, nebo uškodil českým vysokým školám? Strukturované studium po deseti letech. *Aula*, 19(1), 20–24.
- Štech, S. (2011). Boloňský proces: nutný proces adaptace, nebo trojský kůň neoliberalních změn vysokoškolského vzdělávání. *Aula*, 19(1), 25–30.
- The Bologna Declaration on the European Space for Higher Education: An Explanation* (2010). Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/bologna/bologna.pdf>
- The European Higher Education Area in 2012: Bologna Process Implementation Report* (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/%281%29/Bologna%20Process%20Implementation%20Report.pdf>
- Zákon č. 147 ze dne 4. dubna 2001, který se mění zákon č. 111/1999 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění zákona č. 210/2000 Sb., a zákon č. 451/1991 Sb.
- Zápis č. 05–07 ze zasedání Akreditační komise 20.–21. listopadu 2007, Brandýs nad Labem. Retrieved from http://www.akreditacnikomise.cz/attachments/034_zapis_ak_05_2007.pdf
- Zápis č. 05–11 ze zasedání Akreditační komise 21.–23. listopadu 2011, Litomyšl. Retrieved from http://www.akreditacnikomise.cz/attachments/article/321/zapis_ak_05_2011.pdf
- Zápis č. 01–13 ze zasedání Akreditační komise 4.–6. února 2013. Retrieved from http://www.akreditacnikomise.cz/attachments/article/448/zapis_ak_01_2013.pdf
- Zápis č. 02–13 ze zasedání Akreditační komise 15.–17. dubna 2013, Hejnice. Retrieved from http://www.akreditacnikomise.cz/attachments/article/464/zapis_ak_02_2013.pdf

Authors

- Stanislav Bendl, Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Education, Department of Education, M. D. Rettigové 4, 116 39 Praha 1, e-mail: stanislav.bendl@pedf.cuni.cz
- Hana Voňková, Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Education, Department of Education, M. D. Rettigové 4, 116 39 Praha 1, e-mail: hana.vonkova@pedf.cuni.cz
- Michal Zvírotský, Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Education, Department of Education, M. D. Rettigové 4, 116 39 Praha 1, e-mail: michal.zvirotsky@pedf.cuni.cz

Dopad strukturace studií dle Boloňského procesu na vzdělávání učitelů v České republice

Abstrakt: V důsledku implementace Boloňského procesu byla v České republice rozdělena pětiletá magisterská studia učitelství na tříleté bakalářské a dvouleté navazující magisterské studium. Cílem tohoto článku je popsat vývoj strukturace studia učitelství v České republice a uvést výsledky výzkumného šetření názorů akademických pracovníků a studentů Pedagogické fakulty Univerzity Karlovy v Praze na tuto strukturaci. V první a druhé části jsou shrnuty cíle Boloňského procesu a ohlasy na strukturaci studií v obecné rovině. Ve třetí části je analyzována strukturace studií od jejího zavedení do právního řádu České republiky až po současnou úspěšnou akreditaci neděleného studia na jedné z pedagogických fakult a postupnou tendenci k opětovnému zavádění nedělených studií učitelství. Ve čtvrté části příspěvku jsou uvedeny výsledky výzkumného šetření. Ukázalo se, že přibližně devět z deseti akademických pracovníků v roce 2006 nesouhlasilo se zavedením strukturovaného studia na fakultě a že v průběhu času nedošlo k významné změně jejich názorů. Navíc více než šedesát procent akademických pracovníků nesouhlasí s paralelní existencí obou typů studií. Oproti akademickým pracovníkům preferují studenti strukturovaná studia (7:3). Většina studentů bakalářského studia hodlá pokračovat v navazujícím magisterském studiu, což poukazuje na to, že dělení do dvou cyklů je více méně formální záležitostí.

Klíčová slova: vzdělávání učitelů, Boloňský proces, strukturované studium, bakalářské studium, magisterské studium