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Abstract
The general intention with the follow-up study is to shed light on the contract education program of the FoU (Lic) and on the academic supervision out of the perspectives of the five Licentiate candidates. The focus is on their implicit knowledge, explicated as their habitus towards participating in the academic world as research students and, at the same time, professionally working in the field that is as well the field of their scientific interest as that of political interests and social demands.
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1 Introduction

This follow-up study of the Licentiate (LIC) study program on preschool education at the Linneus-University Växjö/Sweden (2013 – 2017) is a contract study. It is financed by NLU, means for strategical recruitment/quality assurance of scientific competence (medel för strategisk rekrytering/säkring av vetenskaplig kompetens). The duration of the financing of the follow-up study is 2014-02-16 to 2016-02-16. This covers ca. half-time of the evaluated study program. The contract study is part of an agreement of the Linneus University Växjö/Kalmar (LNU) with twelve Southern Swedish communes and IFOUS\(^1,2\), called FoU-program\(^3\). It applies contract education on the graduate level (Licentiate) at the LNU. The follow-up study evaluates the “Lic-forskarskolan med inriktning till Små barns lärande – Forskning och förskolans kvalitetsutveckling i samspel”\(^4\), in English: “Researcher Education on the LIC-Level Directed to the Learning of Little Children – Scientific Research and the Development of Preschool in Interaction”. In this program, five LIC-candidates study half time and work half-time as professionals in the administration of preschools in five different communes in the south of Sweden. The main idea of the agreement is to support the quality development of preschool education by developing and testing models of documentation and evaluation, focusing the fulfilment of the curricular aims of knowledge acquisition, the quality of a preschool and its developmental tasks.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) IFOUS (innovation, research and development in schools and preschools; innovation, forskning och utveckling i skola och förskola) is an independent research institution, aiming at the quality of Swedish schools and preschools also in terms of concurrency and innovation out of a national and international perspective. It has the aims of stimulating, financing and applying the results of research and development in Swedish schools (see: http://www.ifous.se/).

\(^2\) I quote the “Ansökan från NLU om medel för strategisk rekrytering/säkring av vetenskaplig kompetens” in Swedish: „Från LNUs sida har utlofts motfinansiering i förskoleprojektet i form av forskning. Detta kan genomföras genom att Anja Kraus bedriver s k följeforskning. Genom att följa licentianternas kunskapsprocess under utbildningstiden inom ramen för ett aktionsforskningsprojekt kan kunskap kring praktiknära forskning på förskolans område utvecklas. Styrgruppen (med kommunala förskoleföreträdare) har accepterat att detta görs. The follow-up study is no action-research, as the author is not actively involved in the study program as a supervisor. Such an involvement could have been problematic as maybe creating biases or suspicion on the side of the research subjects.

\(^3\) FoU-programmet Små barns lärande – Forskning och förskolans kvalitetsutveckling i samspel projekt/programplan 2015-02-23 (reviderad efter AU-möte 19 feb), see: Linneuniversitetet 2015.

\(^4\) All the translations from to English are from the author.

\(^5\) In original: “Det övergripande syftet med FoU-programmet är att utveckla och prova modeller för dokumentation och utvärdering som genom att visa på små barns förändrade kunnande i förhållande till läroplanens målområden, ger en bild av förskolans kvalitet och dess utvecklingsbehov när det gäller barns lärande.”
In the first two years of the study program three group-discussions with the research students were conducted. These discussions have been transcribed and analyzed by making use of the Documentary Method.

The author started working at the LNU and in Sweden in 8/2013 as a lector, before having been a professor for Educational Sciences (with the focus on school lesson and school development) at the University of Education in Ludwigsburg/Germany. As ethnography can be seen as a task for a professional foreigner, the approach of the author to Swedish university is ethnographic in its first meaning. Since conditions in Sweden are studied, the report refers mainly to Swedish literature on the topic.

A general observation in the preparation of the report was the manifold challenges for the university teachers connected to the LIC-study program and the change of these challenges in the course of time. The study shows that the LIC-candidates actively participated in the follow-up study. They attest their academic tutors a good interest in their work; correspondingly, they express the special importance of a good academic relation to them. However, the researcher students also identify various problems of the study program. The most striking result was their demand for a persisting academic culture as well as a certain fear of dependencies of their academic advisors. The researcher realized a general state of irritation of the students and sometimes a high sensitivity for a possible increase of the situation of crisis. Obviously, the academic culture and the lack of it had much more significance for them than other aspects of the study program, as e.g. the fact that the contract education program was formed by social and political interests that may conflict with the perspectives of each individual student on her\textsuperscript{6} scientific and qualificatory task.

1.1 Purpose
The general intention with the follow-up study is to shed light on the contract Licentiate education program of the FoU and on the academic tutoring, mentoring and supervision (in Swedish: handledning\textsuperscript{7}) at the university (LNU) out of the perspectives of the five

\textsuperscript{6} All the LIC-candidates accepted to the program are female.

\textsuperscript{7} "Handledning" (in the following: academic supervision) is part of/embedded into the Swedish academic culture that traditionally is to a high degree directed to collegial communication, to manifold routines of a feedback to scientific texts. It provides for detailed study programs and and undergoes a comparatively strong governmental control.
Licentiate candidates. The focus lies on their implicit knowledge, explicated as their habitus towards participating in the academic world as research students, at the same time professionally working in the field of their scientific interest. As, according to the contact (FoU), their scientific work is regarded as developmental work in this field as well, diverse political and social demands to their research and academic qualification have to be taken into account.

1.2 Structure of the Report
In the first chapter, out of a historical perspective the concept and organization of the education of researchers in Sweden especially in terms of the academic supervision is described. In the next chapter, the central regulations that settle academic supervision today are listed. The third chapter deals with empirical studies on academic tutorage in theory and practice. In the forth chapter the theoretical backdrop of the empirical follow-up study is unfolded. Here, also the concept of the licentiate study program at the Linnaeus University and the circumstances of its foundation are explicated. In the fifth chapter the empirical study is presented, respectively its theoretical background, bearing methodological considerations, applied methods and the scientific analysis are put in letters. The report finishes with a summary and discussion.

2 Researcher Education – A Historical Outline
Researcher education in Sweden is traced back to early times: Already in the 380th Century b. Chr. Plato founded an educational institution in Athens and his pupil Aristotle on his part established a school which functioned as a research institution and as an educational institution at the same time (cp. Sundin 1994). Many of the questions of researcher education discussed today and the proposals concerning it are already found in the early reports of the “Public Investigations of the Swedish State” (“Statens offentliga utredningar”, abbr.: SOU). The organized education of researchers in form of seminar classes and supervision has been pursued since about 1890 (see SOU 1949: 54). The notion of researcher education has been launched in 1955 (see: SOU 1957: 24). In Sweden, the preparation of the postgraduate thesis (Dr. or Lic.) is thus generally accompanied by a study program, consisting of seminars, colloquia, times for
supervision etc., forming the researcher education at the university. It is directed
towards either a Licenciate or to a Doctor’s degree (SOU 1957: 24).

Originally, the Licentiate in Sweden was equivalent to the U.S. Ph.D.. Since 1969 it was
gradually substituted with the Doctor’s exam. In the 1980ies, the Licentiate was
reinstituted as an intermediate level in research training. Today, it is recognized as a
pre-doctoral degree, equal to a halfway completion of the coursework required for a
doctorate and a dissertation. The Licentiate is formally equivalent to half of a doctoral
dissertation. Generally seen, it is particularly popular with students already involved in
the working life and therefore facing a certain lack of time hindering them from striving
for a Doctor’s degree. Licentiate degree holders are officially eligible for independent
scientific research in universities, and they are here entitled to the right to supervise
Master’s and Licentiate degree theses. If it comes to an advanced degree within
pedagogy and career: In Swedish schools there is e.g. the position of a lector (“lector”),
a scientifically skilled teacher holding a Licentiate or a Doctor’s degree who conducts
smaller scientific studies and does research-based developmental work. Recently, the
status of a lector was also introduced in Swedish preschools. The Swedish work market
likewise involves other professional fields requiring advanced academic qualification,
especially such with a need of systematic quality development. Thus, already in the
SOU-report of 1950 (SOU 1957: 24), the problem of long study times and deficiencies
in the academic supervision at the Swedish universities are diagnosed, and already in
these early times it was maintained that these factors motivated a check-up of research
education. The SOU-report from 1966 (SOU 1966: 67) called attention to the observed
problems of the 1950 report agreeing in the position that academic supervision was
central in the researcher education and needed improvement, carrying out a more
thorough analysis. Here, the importance of a good interpersonal relation of the
supervisor and the postgraduate student and the necessity of its improvement was
considered as of special relevance for the postgraduate student in order to finish his/her
advanced studies in time. Therefore it was stressed that a supervisor should not be
responsible for too many candidates at the same time. It was also suggested that the
supervisor should be assisted of a supervising group of persons with scientific
competence that, as an advising organ, assists him/her in helping to organize a
curriculum for each student, also controlling it and observing that the education

8 http://www.liu.se/liu-nytt/arkiv/nyhetsarkiv/1.255765?l=sv  [last access: 16-10-15]
proceeds without disturbance. A time of four years full-time studies for doctoral students was suggested and a study time of more than four years should be accepted only exceptionally. However, is was also maintained that the need of academic supervision can vary and its duration cannot be fixed. Besides, there should be a certain limited academic teaching by the researcher student, but such a task as well as tasks of administrative character should not be a hindrance in the studies. However, the proposal to regulate the academic supervision by designated groups was criticized and had to be withdrawn, as there was the fear that too much stirring would have a negative effect on the freedom and the initiatives of the researcher students. According to the Andrén report of 1970 the intentions of the 1966 report to improve the academic supervision have not been realized. Whereas, the idea that supervision should not be too extensive that it would cause dependence of the academic advisors in the research itself was maintained also in the report of 1981 (SOU 1981: 21). Here, the analysts took up the idea about groups of supervisors, as then the researcher student would not be as exposed to a single person’s availability and judgement. Again, it was pointed out that it was not possible to describe in detail how the academic supervision should take place. However, the following thirteen points as to what the academic responsibility would include were settled that are also valid today. The supervisor (possibly) 

- supports the recruiting, receiving and informing, admitting and advising of the research students;
- s/he chooses suitable courses for the candidate;
- discusses and finds a suitable limited subject for the thesis;
- works out an individual curriculum for the candidate and sees that the student gets started with the work;
- continuously makes the research student familiar with the research process;
- the supervisor sets on a continuous program for the thesis;
- assists in finding a duty for the candidate as working with a scientific project or some other occupation suitable to his/her research;
- always is an inspiring and suggestive part of discussion with constructive criticism of the sketches or of the more elaborated versions of the thesis;

---

9 It is formulated in the subjunctive.
- encourages the candidate to be independent, aware of scientific paradigms and creative;
- makes it easier for the research students to take part in the courses of research in other institutes, also abroad, and in conferences in their own field of research;
- takes care that the researchers of the institutions are as far as possible at the disposal of the research students.

Further, the supervisor

- examines the thesis in its ultimate form;
- informs the candidate about the results of the assessments;
- suggests a suitable opponent in the faculty to take part in the planning of the defence of the thesis.

Whereas until the 1980ies it was considered not to be possible to strictly decide about the courses of action of the supervisor, since 1993 in terms of this task some important challenges are faced. As since this time many retirements in Swedish universities have been expected and still are, and there have been only a few Licenciate and Doctor theses launched – taking a too long period of time, the qualification of the future researchers was from now on regarded as a prominent political task. Universities successively became more and more subject to the rules of competition and the free market. The research reform in 1993 thus focused on rendering researcher education more effective. In order to provide the next generation with researchers within a reasonable period of time, it has been argued and advised that there is a special need of more academic supervision. The National Audit Office (Riksrevisionverket) in the year 1996 in a check-up of the researcher education in the Social Sciences maintained the idea of a systematic study program and academic supervision that already were the most important parts of the reform in 1969. It was observed that many of the intentions of the reform of 1969 had not been attained. Again, deficits in the supervision were pointed out. The Swedish National Agency for Higher Education10 (Högskoleverket) (1996)

10 The Swedish National Agency for Higher Education was a Government agency in Sweden. It was in charge of inspecting and promoting higher education sector activities, through follow-up and evaluation of higher education, quality assessment, initiatives for updating teaching methods and assessment of right to award academic degrees. Included among the responsibilities of the agency was the Swedish Scholastic Aptitude Test. As of 1 January 2013, Högskoleverket no longer exists; two new government authorities, the Swedish Council for Higher Education (Universitetss- och högskolerådet) and the Swedish Higher Education Authority (Universitetskanslerämbetet) have taken over its responsibilities.
maintained that it is important with regard to the quality of the researcher education that the supervisors themselves have time for active research. The group also stressed the importance of the individual study plan as an agreement on the mutual rights and duties of the supervisor and the postgraduate student. The individual study plan should thus make it possible to elucidate parts of the expectations of the collaboration on both sides; it also may be revised by means of regular controls. Besides that, a collegium should function as a forum for discussions, consisting of all active supervisors of the discipline/institution in question at the university and, when needed, also of external supervisors. In 1996, the Swedish Ministry of Education (Utbildningsdepartementet) stressed the right of supervision as well as a time limit for the admittance to the researcher education (Ds 1996: 35).

In short, as a consequence of the research reform in 1993, the role of the academic supervisor as well as that of the LIC-candidate became more professionalized, with a more distinct commitment than earlier. After the research reform of 1998, the already explicated demands of the academic supervision again have increased (SFS 11 1998: 80).

### 2.1 The Regulation of Academic Supervision at Swedish Universities

To qualify future researchers is generally regarded as one of the main tasks of the universities. However, concerning academic supervision there are customarily few central instructions.

Swedish institutes of advanced studies and universities today are regulated by the Law on Universities (högskolelagen 1992: 1434) and by the Regulations for the Universities (högskoleforordningen 1993: 100). Besides, the universities and institutes have their own local instructions. Detailed information about the Swedish researcher education is given in the handbook of the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education for doctorate candidates (www.doktorandhandboken.nu).

The question of academic supervision is for the most organized locally at the universities on the level of the faculties respective the institute (Lindén 1998), as, according to the Law on Universities (chap.2, 5a § högskolelagen) and the Regulations

---

11 SFS stands for: Sveriges förenade studentkårer, in English: the Swedish National Union of Students.
for the Universities (5 § högskoleförordningen), the faculty committees in the study places are responsible for the questions of researcher education. The Swedish Parliament (Riksdag), however, decides which fields of science should be included in a researcher education, whereas the Swedish Government decides which degrees are promulgated (chap.1, 12 § högskolelagen). The universities are also responsible for the education of the academic supervisors, that is now obligatory when ranging researcher education (3a § högskoleförordningen). At the Linnaeus University an obligatory education for supervisors has been initiated in the year 2010.\textsuperscript{12} There has to be a general study plan for every discipline providing for researcher education (26 § högskoleförordningen). Besides, today the faculty committees of the universities are obliged to provide an individual curriculum for every candidate after having consulted him/her and his/her supervisor (8 § högskoleförordningen). The research reform in 1998 maintained that researcher education includes, as a rule, four years of study and that a financing for it must be settled. In the Swedish regulations for universities (1 § högskoleförordningen) it is thus stated that only so many postgraduate students that can be offered supervision and acceptable conditions of studying and who have their financing settled are admitted to the researcher education. The existing resources, among them the available supervisors, ultimately decide on the possibilities of a researcher education (34 § högskoleförordningen and SOU 1998: 128). The responsibility of the universities for resources is especially obvious with the new demands of admission (SOU 1998: 80).

For every postgraduate student the faculty committee has to appoint at least two supervisors (28 §, högskoleförordningen). The academic supervision generally includes the time schedule for the researcher education and the description of the commitments of the candidate, the supervisor and the faculty committee during the time of the studies (29 § högskoleförordningen). Both has to be updated regularly.

In order to be admitted to the researcher education the applicant needs a basic training at an institute of advanced studies respectively completed a four or five-year academic degree on the advanced level for at least 120 points (högskolepoäng) or corresponding knowledge of some other order in Sweden or abroad (9 kap. 4 § högskoleförordningen). The prerequisite for a Licentiate or Doctor´s exam is thus a Master´s degree or a

\textsuperscript{12} The author of this report went through it.
Magister’s degree after three years of Kandidatexamen (Bachelor’s degree). A Licentiate requires two years of full-time or four years of part-time studies in a program of researcher education. For the Licenciate degree 80 points, for a Doctor’s degree 160 points are needed (8 kap. 2 § högskoleförordningen).

In practice, the study programs differ a lot in the different academic disciplines. Thus, the prerequisites for the collaboration of the candidate and the supervisor at the different universities are far from being the same. There are diverse traditions for the supervision in different faculties and subject areas in terms of the number of the assisting supervisors, their roles and competences. Moreover, the different Swedish counties have different regulations about inter alia the duration of the researcher studies, about the study plans and its contents and about the financing of the studies (SOU 1998: 128). Even subject fields on their part are changing and the borders between them are not given once for all. In Forskning 2000 it is therefore maintained that it is actually not possible to speak of researcher education as one education, but that there are many kinds of it (SOU 1998: 128). There is so far also no uniform practice regarding the commitments of a postgraduate student, the academic supervisor(s) and the faculty committee.

Whereas, in general, there is quite a lot of contract education (mostly launched by industry) regarding the graduate programs at the Swedish universities, contract education on the postgraduate level (LIC) is a recent phenomenon. In our case, the study program is based on a contract of the university (LNU) with the employers of the researcher students (communes) and with an administrative institution (IFOUS).

2.2 Scientific Studies on Academic Supervision
Today there is a growing interest in research on supervision. However, as far as the author of this report knows, are there no empirical investigations taking heed to the view of the LIC-candidates seen as a group, and there is also no scientific evaluations of contract education on the postgraduate level. Studies on academic supervision moreover usually focus on examinations and/or on doctoral studies. Their results are of use regarding Swedish researcher education in general, but they neither refer to LIC study programs nor to contract education on the postgraduate level.
Many empirical studies have shown that a well-functioning relation between the academic supervisor and the student is an important factor for a successful study time (Strömberg & Sölveborn 1983, Lindén & Fitger 1990, Widenberg 1995, Sjödahl 1995, Mohlin & Åsell 1996, Pehrson 1997, Utvärderingsenheten vid Lunds universitet 1999). Also studies in the English-speaking realm give hints to the importance of a functioning tutor relation/supervision. Investigations also show, however, that such a relation is by no means always the case (for Canada e.g. Crawford Seagram, Gould & Pyke, 1998). Molin & Åsell 1996; Utvärderingsenheten vid Lunds universitet 1999; Appel 2000; Frischer & Larsson 2000 and Crawford Seagram et.al. (1998) point to tutor-related reasons why some doctoral (Licentiate) candidates finished their work more quickly than others. Such factors are a good cooperation with their supervisor, regular meetings with him/her and a collaboration with articles etc.

As the short historical overview might have shown, the supervision in the researcher education has, traditionally seen, been the responsibility of the single supervisor/tutor, but since questions of efficiency in the researcher education have been problematized, the academic supervision has been modified as a kind of tool and as an important factor for the passage speed (Lindén 1998). Responsible for this efficiency is the faculty. However, there is also an ongoing discussion about the idea and practice of the supervisor group. The advantages of such a group are that scholars represent different areas and formats of knowledge. In the case of a disharmony between the student and his/her main supervisor, it may be a help for him/her to be able to ask an assisting supervisor; this may also be an advantage in situations of illness or death. For the main supervisor it means that also others have responsibility for the supervision and they contribute something according to their own competence. There are, however, sometimes problems with “too many cooks”, as different interests may conflict with each other, supervisors perhaps do not always agree about how supervision should work or which methods should be used etc. The candidates might involuntarily come under fire from different interests (see Appel 2003).

The researcher education today is seen as a kind of practice in driving, leading to a driving licence for the candidate to do scientific research independently (cp. Appel 2003, s.17). Thus, metaphorically speaking, the formal driving test is the defence of the doctor thesis. The supervisor has the role of a driving instructor and should, so to say,
pilot the candidate as it is the case in a driving school. If the aim of the researcher education is to give the postgraduate student knowledge and skills for the scientific research, the supervision may be seen as a means of assistance to reach this goal. The candidate as well as the supervisor in their common work usually aim at scientific products (e.g. the thesis). Of course, also other parts, institutions and financiers have an interest that their investment of money could give a dividend in form of scientific products. There are supposed to be different stages of supervision (Hessle 1987):

Introduction

- personal theme, research problem, research question, study design
- schedule of the research education (individual study plan)
- become a researcher, resources
- contribution to a research and teaching area

Operative phase

- dealing with the research questions
- become a researcher, resources and the international arena
- contribution to a research and teaching area

End phase 1

- quality assessment of the thesis
- life after the disputation

End phase 2 (examination)

- practical planning of the disputation (opponent, examining committee)
- preparation for the public defence

These stages are characterized by different challenges. In terms of the personal characteristics of the partaking actors some authors have described different types of supervisors and doctorate candidates (Erasmie in Ekholm et.al. 1983; Bargholtz et.al 1994 or Hartman in Walgren 1995). According to Lindén (1998) the academic
supervision may be seen as oriented to the doctoral student, to the product or to the process. In the first case, the focus of the supervisor lies on the individual qualities and skills of the candidate. The aim of a process-oriented supervision is the development of his/her identity, which includes not only the intellect but the whole personality. The research project is not the primary aim. In the product-oriented supervision the production of the doctoral thesis is seen as the result of a research process. In the latter case, the strategies of the supervisor are mostly operative (of the type “do like this”). Also the process-oriented supervision stresses a comprehensive view. The strategies of the supervision may vary according to the stage of development of the doctorate candidate.

Näslund & Engström (1999) see a stronger tradition of the product-oriented perspective within technical nature-scientific and medical faculties and a tradition with the stress on the process in the Social Science and in the Humanities. Franke (2002) divides the supervision in the two categories of research-centered respectively relation-stressed supervision. In the first case, the thesis usually develops from within a greater research project in the field of the research of the supervisor. In a relation-centered supervision the problem of research is often chosen by the student him/herself and the work with the thesis is regarded as an individual project which the supervisor relates to.

The collaboration between the supervisor and the candidates usually lasts many years. The progress of the research and the successive change of the roles between the parts may be affected by many factors. There are only limited models regarding academic supervision and there is so far on the whole, not much systematical knowledge about it (Hessle 1987, etc.). Lindén (1998) describes the relation between the partakers as the core of the supervision in the following aspects:

1. The surrounding society has an influence on the supervision. Laws and regulations settle certain frames for it, even if much is preformed locally at the university and at the institutes of advanced studies. The allowances of financial resources for the researcher education are an important component and different financers give different frames for the freedom of the project. Another material factor is the changing labor market (are there recruiting problems or an abundance of applicants? What kinds of competences are needed/favored?).
2. At the level of university, scientific work is organized with written and unwritten rules. The connection between responsibility and competence, the ways of leading and the possibilities of distributing the work of supervision and other important academic tasks follow moreover unwritten rules.

3. Scientific research itself is mainly influenced and created in the international scientific community. In the end, the thesis is charged by this society (and not only by the supervisor). If it is a combined thesis, it is published in scientific journals which, on their part, have their own criteria and imply assessments in terms of their own prestige.

4. Also factors on the level of the individual are important for the supervision. The research student as well as the supervisor enter into the relation of supervision with a setting of different personal qualities and motives.

For the candidate, the work with the thesis is often the main task during his/her researcher education. However, research students as a group are very heterogeneous and the conditions for writing a thesis are considerably varying between the different candidates. Jense (1985) points out that the supervisor has the responsibility for his/her own qualification as well as for the development of the candidate to an independent researcher. Investigations have shown that many senior researchers are overloaded with their manifold academic tasks (see for instance Armelius, Eriksson & Höög 1995). It is mentioned that the role of the supervisor also means different roles for the individual (Bargholtz et.al. 1994); s/he should act as a fellow being, helping in need, as a trainer laying the bar, but also be the one who decides when the time is right for the thesis to be assessed and published.

Lindén (1998) points out that supervision can also be influenced by gender, social class affiliation, ethnicity, place of settlement, and age.

Hessle (1987) describes five phases for the candidates to pass during the development to legitimate researchers with the Doctor’s exam (Licentiate) as the final point of the education process.

First step: Confusion, loneliness, feeling of incompetence

The start of a researcher education is a transitional and liminal situation (cp. Turner 1969). New experiences are made and mixed feelings may arouse; however, to start it is
a voluntary choice. The special challenge is how to develop an identity as a researcher and to socialize into the academic culture. Hessle (1987) points out three tasks at the side of the university: To take care that the candidate is conscious of what is necessary for the examination, to inform him/her about the resources of the institution to help him/her, and to form an opinion about the competences of the candidate. In this phase, supervision is especially important; already early studies give a hint to the significance of supervision in the initial phase of the studies (Hessle 1987, Anderson & Rubin 1979). Jensen et al. (1991) point out that the supervisor and the researcher student should agree on a frame for the supervision (frequency of meetings, flow of information about proceedings, application of the results).

Second step: Well-learned theoretician, full-fledged researcher

In this phase the work is earnestly proceeding. Hessle (1987) calls it a period of “honey moon”, as the candidate often is motivated and passionate about his/her work. There may, however, be the risk of cooling down and of a rejection of the ideas of others. Jensen et al. (1991) consider that with the proceeding and with more knowledge the candidate may feel a need for discussing and s/he also may question the recommendations of the supervisor. The supervisor as well as the student may be reluctant to a change of their roles. Often the supervisor has to balance between encouragement and limitation.

Third step: To be or not to be a researcher

The work of the student may go on well and s/he may have acquired useful facilities as well as knowledge about scientific research. Now, the question, whether s/he wants to be a researcher, or not, may appear. Hessle (1987) warns that the researcher education probably comes to a full stop at this stage. Here the supervisor has an important role also in discussing the future plans of the student.

Forth step: Self critically examine the own work, independently finish the thesis

The student has reached the last step to the examination and the defence of the thesis is within reach. The supervisor should critically examine the work as well as encourage the student and strengthen his/her self-esteem. According to Andersson & Rubin (1979) a stronger supervision is necessary, at times also a certain pressure. Haldén (1980)
describes the following desirable capacities for scientific work in Social Sciences: To be able to see…

…what one does not know that is to say to realize one’s own limitations and be able to criticize oneself;

…what is possible to do, that is to say, to know about methods and techniques and to see the prevalent priorities;

…what is important to know, that is to say, to relate the problem of research to the needs of social life.

Hessle (1987) points out that the ability to search for knowledge and to find relevant information are developed successively, so that only in the end, even first in the public defence situation, one can really estimate the capabilities of the candidates. Jensen et al. (1991) describe a kind of dissociation of student and supervisor often occurring in this final phase, their roles become unclear. The post-graduate will find a new platform within the university or s/he will go on to further goals outside the university.

Fifth step: Procure results and develop methods, start new projects

There is no self-evident way for the researcher to continue after the disputation. However, many research funders have added a question in their application forms about the plans of the researcher student to mediate his/her knowledge outside the scientific community (see: Research Council for Work and Social Sciences: http://www.fas.forskning.se). A lack of a systematization of the perspectives in this situation has been identified in many papers.

Let’s pay a look on the first and on the second phase of the researcher education, as only those are the topic of this study. There may also be a certain anticipation of the further proceeding already in the reflections on the first phases. Many factors may influence the research process and may delay or render the process impossible.

In spite of the differences between various academic fields and in spite of the fact that the notion of researcher education is changing also depending on the historical or the geographical context it is maintained that there are generally two different basic views of what today is meant with researcher education. These two views are named “apprenticeship model” and “professional model”. The first model is usually associated

---

13 Forskningsrådet för arbetsliv och socialvetenskap (FAS).
with the German university system and lays stress on the personal maturity and
development which according to the model should be aimed at. With careful academic
tutoring for a longer period, maturity and personality development is supposed to be
achieved, when the candidate independently conducts scientific research. There is no
tradition of study programs. Therein it is expected to give an original contribution to the
development of knowledge in the field. The “professional model” is associated to the
American university system regarding researcher education as a training. The thesis is
seen here as a qualified exercise, even if it is also expected to give a certain contribution
to the development of knowledge. Generally seen, these two views have characterized
different types of research in Sweden. In the Humanities, when the research is generally
relatively free and the theses are usually published as monographies, the German model
had a stronger influence. Whereas the American model dominates (natural) scientific
research. These different traditions have on their part determined various kinds of
supervision. Generally seen, we may say, however, that in the last decades the Swedish
policy has favored the American model, because of the sharpened demands of
admission with the stress on training rather than on Bildung. However, recently there
are undertakings towards reconciliation. Quite an influence in this regard has Gert
Biesta’s approach. Biesta (2011) points out qualification, socialization and
subjectification as the most important aims of (also higher) education; his amendments
correspond to the Regulations for the Universities in Sweden.

Qualification concerns the acquisition of knowledge, skills and dispositions that qualify
a person to do something on the backdrop of a sound knowledge for citizenship, cultural
understanding and working life. Accordingly, in the Regulations for the Universities in
Sweden qualification is ciphered out as a broad knowledge and systematic
understanding in a certain research area as well as a highly developed and present expert
knowledge. Scientific qualification includes the ability to identify and formulate
research questions, to be familiar with scientific methods, theories and analyses.14

Through socialization, generally seen, an individual is incorporated into the sociocultural orders. The Regulations for the Universities in Sweden explicate the aims of

---

14 "Qualification" corresponds "kunskap och förståelse" as the the aims of researcher education (lic) in högskoleförordningen 1993:100, p.70f. Here you read "Kunskap och förståelse: För licentiatexamen skall doktoranden visa kunskap och förståelse inom forskningsområdet, inbegripet aktuell specialitetskunskap inom en avgränsad del av detta samt fördjupad kunskap i vetenskaplig metodik i allmänhet och det specifika forskningsområdets metoder i synnerhet."
scientific socialization as being enabled to contribute to the general knowledge development and to form an authority in oral and written presentations, in discussions on research and research results and in identifying research desiderata as well as in contributing to the development of the social and cultural life, also by supporting the academic learning of others.  

The aim of subjectification by education generally refers to the ways in which education contributes to individual freedom, personal voice and uniqueness. The regulations for universities in Sweden cipher this out as showing intellectual independency and scientific probity, the capability of ethical expertises for research, showing deep insights in the possibilities and limits of scientific approaches, the role of scientific approaches in social life and the responsibility connected to its application. The task to socialize a candidate into the norms and values of scientific research contributes to the development of the identity as a scholar relating to a reproduction of the middle class norm (Börjeson & Meyer 1997). However, the socialization into the academic culture is a process which often took place already before the researcher education itself. Besides that, when the education begins, the candidates as well as their supervisors often even have controversy interpretations of the aim of socialization. The same might be true for the aims of qualification and subjectivation. Often, there are different expectations of the collaboration as well as different needs and motivations. The relation of the supervision is meant to last for many years and is a great venture of time, effort and also finances for the partakers. It is no equal relation. On the academic career ladder, the supervisor has a superior position, even if s/he might be younger than the candidate. At the same time s/he often has less experience in non-academic work, whereas her/his profession might have a higher status in society. Education programs for postgraduate students and academic supervision cannot exclude such disadvantages.

---

15 “Sozialisation” corresponds “färdighet och förmåga” as the the aims of researcher education (lic) in högskoleförordningen 1993:100, p.70f. ”Färdighet och förmåga: För licentiatexamen skall doktoranden visa förmåga att kritiskt, självständigt och kreativt och med vetenskaplig noggrannhet identifiera och formulera frågeställningar, att planera och med adekvata metoder genomföra ett begränsat forskningsarbete och andra kvalificerade uppgifter inom givna tidsramar och därigenom bidra till kunskapsutvecklingen samt att utvärdera detta arbete, visa förmåga att i såväl nationella som internationella sammanhang muntligt och skriftligt klart presentera och diskutera forskning och forskningsresultat i dialog med vetenskapsamhället och samhället i övrigt, och visa sådan färdighet som fordras för att självständigt delta i forsknings- och utvecklingsarbete och för att självständigt arbeta i annan kvalificerad verksamhet.”

16 “Subjectification” corresponds “värderingsförmåga och förhållningssätt”, in Högskoleförordningen 1993:100, p.70f. you read: ”För licentiatexamen skall doktoranden visa förmåga att göra forskningsetiska bedömningar i sin egen forskning, visa insikt om vetenskapens möjligheter och begränsningar, dess roll i samhället och människors ansvar för hur den används, och visa förmåga att identifiera sitt behov av ytterligare kunskap och att ta ansvar för sin kunskapsutveckling.”
3 Scientific Quality Assurance of Educational Institutions and the FoU Program

The university (LNU) with the employers of the researcher students (communes) and the IFOUS as an organization directed to quality development in educational institutions form an organizational unit prestructuring and supporting the research of practitioners on their own professional field. Representatives all the three parties of the FoU-agreement form a steer group. In March 2013 five LIC-candidates (from Eskilstuna, Svalöv, Svedala, Jönköping and Huddinge) have been welcomed at the LNU. They are supervised by four senior researchers.

The FoU-project can be seen as part of a worldwide evaluation movement of all kinds of public services. The FoU-program is part of a Sweden-wide political initiative aiming at the implementation of the school law (SFS 2010: 800) on the school’s systematic approach towards scientific studies and established experience, as well as at the implementation of the school’s curriculum (Lpfö 98, s.14-15) providing for the development, the follow-up and the evaluation of quality assurance measures. The agreement is based upon the idea that quality development in schools and preschools is best linked to scientific research. Its thematic focus lies on models of a documentation and evaluation of the work at schools and preschools in terms of the curricular objectives and their improvement. The idea is that preschool teachers develop their competences to observe and document the learning processes of little children in preschools. The knowledge of school leaders and school supervisors shall be developed and the quality improvement of schools shall be conducted in a systematical way.

Another aim of the agreement is to get more knowledge about the interaction of academic research, quality improvement at schools and preschools and the various stakeholders in terms of mutual learning in development and research. The guiding principles for the focus of the FoU-program on the development of local as well as general knowledge are mutuality, durability, systematics and sustainability as well as cooperation. This development is supposed to be structured by research-based frameworks.

As it is true for researcher education, since the last decades, also the quality development of educational institutions, such as that of preschools and universities, is a growing field of
political, social and economic interest. On the one hand, the quality development of educational institutions is more and more decisively directed by large survey studies and binding governmental instruments (on the university level: Bologna reform etc.).

On the other hand there are pedagogical measures mostly dealing with the work on certain educational tasks in a collegium of professionals (instruments for the evaluation of academic teaching etc.).

In both cases there is at best a strong scientific backdrop for the quality development of educational institutions. That is to say, the quality development of educational institutions should comply with the scientific standards and it should be based on scientific research. However, one should not forget that it also should meet the needs of the practitioners in the field.

If it comes to the quality development of educational institutions in cooperation with professional practitioners, or even their under own direction, according to Donald Schön (1983) the central task is to explicate the implicit knowledge of the practitioners. Schön regards a teacher (in the quotation “I”) as a “reflective practitioner”; reflective practice is considered as “[...] a dialogue of thinking and doing through which I [scil. the practitioner] become[s] more skillful.”(1983, p.31) “A practitioner’s reflection can serve as a corrective to over-learning. Through reflection, he can surface and criticize the tacit understandings that have grown up around the repetitive experiences of a specialized practice, and can make new sense of the situations of uncertainty or uniqueness which he may allow himself to experience.” (1983, p.61)

Research of the practitioners in their professional fields is mostly carried out as action research. The FoU-program does not exactly provide for action research, but it follows its principles, and this contract study is in the underlying contract named “action research”. However, as the author is not yet familiar with the supervision of licentiates in Sweden, this report is put up as an ethnographic study.

Action research is driven by the „[…] social-democratic interest in knowledge acquisition and acting“, and the practitioners in the field are regarded as „[…] equal partners in a process of deciding and testing” (Klafki 1982, p.75f.). For the scientific community action research is of special relevance in terms of such empirical issues that are not made accessible by the conventional practices in scientific research (cp. Radtke 1979, p.97f., Hollenbach & Tillmann 2011 et al.). The main challenge for the quality development of
educational institutions is the formulation of concrete, aim-oriented and field-adequate tasks (on the micro-level: learning goals of a school lesson, seminary or lecture, tutoring situation etc., on the medium-level: goals of a study program or on the macro-level, goals of the department, school etc.). The biggest challenge is to establish a link between these aims and the practices in the field.

In the course of the implementation of diverse projects of action research in educational institutions one may meet some problems. The differences between the work areas of communes, preschool and university obviously suggest some misunderstandings. Action research e.g. induces some presumptions regarding the competence profiles of both of the partners. On one hand one mistakenly presupposes that these competence profiles are alike; on the other hand there is the idea that within action research scientific research cannot be pursued in an adequate way (cp. Altrichter & Gstettner 1993, Lüders 1999). In practical regards, action research can be impeded by the pressure of time and action, which is ruling professional practices in school also. The practitioners at communes or preschools are often busy with their handling with the diverse and conflicting interests, considerations, abilities and activity fields within their institution itself (cooperative areas like other teachers, parents, head master, pupils etc.). In this regard, the logics of their professional practices are quite different from those of scientific research. All these problems may also arise in a contract study program on the postgraduate level (LIC) in which the students do research in their professional fields and they should be met. By asking a group of students many practical details anyway shift to the background.

There is the following rough plan for their studies at the LNU: 17

2012: Pre-study, planning, recruitment of the participants, contracting.
2013 (spring): general planning of the research, the LIC study program and quality improvement. Recruitment and acceptance of LIC-candidates. 7th-8th of March: Seminarium 1 with ca. 130 participants
2013 (autumn): Five LIC-candidates start the study program. 17th-18th of October: Seminarium 2 with all the participants
2014 and 2015: Developmental work in the preschools and, parallely and in an interactive way, research. Two developmental seminaries per year are arranged.

17 The study plan in details is attached to this report (see attachment 1).
2016, VT: Development of the project end in the first months of 2016. A developmental seminar and a last summary is held.
2016-2017: LIC-candidates finish their work, no seminars.

4 The Follow-up Study
The follow-up study deals with three perspective orders:

On the one hand, the study is directed to the aims of the LIC study program. In this regard, a third order perspective on the research field (preschool and the practitioners in this field is taken). The prevalent aim of quality development in professional fields to explicate the implicit knowledge of the professional practitioners is here defined as an understanding of the academic world and its relationship to the professional world of preschool and the heterogeneous interests connected to the own scientific work out of the eyes of the LIC-students as the persons concerned (1st order perspective) and regarding the academically trained theoreticians (2nd order perspective). The study is conducted by a researcher who is not responsible for the program (3rd order perspective).

4.1 Methodological Considerations
“Notes not only conserve social processes, but they also de- and recontextualize them in a very complex way. They transfer everyday occurrences into the context of [scientific...] by falling below and exceeding the reality of the knowledge of the participants. A singular occurrence gets reified in a textual way, `data´ emancipate from the control of the participants and establish a stable empirical referent inside the [scientific...] discourse. [...] The decisive effort of a note is thus its decontextualisation [marked out in the original]: the every second measured temporarity as a precise preservation of a course in the biographical and historical processes turns out like a snapshot that sedates steadily moving things in an abrupt way. Notes deprive control of the participants over inquisitively defining what has happened, they snatch a definite edition from the reconstruction efforts – all they said, can now be used `against them´. We emancipated our `data´ from them.” (Hirschauer 2001, p., transl. by the author)

In order to reduce the arbitrariness of interpretation one usually applies methods that are reflected in terms of their logic, the methodology. However, according to Hirschauer (2001) this seems not enough.
One should be aware of a self-dynamics of “decontextualized” data. In this case, there is a special methodological challenge related to the general intention with the follow-up study to shed light on the contract education program of the FoU (LIC) and on the academic supervision out of the perspectives of the five Licentiate candidates. The focus of this follow-up study is on their implicit knowledge. Implicit knowledge is explicated here as their habitus towards participating in the academic world as research students and, at the same time, professionally working in the field. Thus, there is a cultural gap between the evaluator/author sozialized into the German academic culture and the students. This is an advantage in terms of neutrality, but a disadvantage in terms of an inherent temptation to apply culturally shaped and unconscious preconceptions (cp. Budde planned for 2016). It may also cause puzzlement on the side of the students as they do not know whether the academic researcher represents the Swedish academic culture they are facing, or not. All these problems can be forms of “decontextualized” data.

To meet some of these challenges, the transcripts undergo a respondent validation. The interviewees read and comment the transcripts and the selection of quotes from which the analysis is supposed to depart. They also read the report before it is published.

### 4.2 Group Discussion and the Documentary Method

According to Karl Mannheim ([1922-24] 1980) the social world is formed by a structure of sense and relevance, as human beings make sense of their everyday-world. Such sense is defined as the relationship between general rules and norms and their application. Sense is thus a construction generated not only verbally, but also practically, structurally, materially and habitually. It becomes visible in actions, behavior and utterings. The different meaningful types of practices, knowledge and projects structure everyday-acting and being in a symbolical way. The context of action functions thus as the most striking indicator for sense. Referring to Garfinkel (1967), the Documentary Method is thus based on the assumption, that knowledge is expressed in an indexical way. It denotes linguistic expressions as indicators for a significance that is valid for a certain group, as the system of relevance and the communicative rules also unfold in a communicative context. That is to say, each participant has a communicative relation to others (principle of communication) expressed in actions, utterings and behavior in reference to a certain shared or common sense. This sense differs from one social or cultural group to the other.
The researcher may share the sense-making of a community, or s/he may not. Social Research according to the Documentary Method focuses on the orientations which are relevant for acting, metaphorical mis-en-scénes and for the „habitūs“ performed in a social group.

The task of the researcher is thus to elaborate the principles of a generation of (in the first hand everyday) theories, and types of knowledge. To express it more precisely, in order to get the different symbolic orders into sight, Social Sciences take over a „genetic“ habitus. That is a reconstruction and a framed system of common experiences of relevance shared in a group of people and the „generative formula“/“modus operandi“ of their orientations and action knowledge resp. of their „habitūs“ are worked out. In order to work out the constitution of everyday knowledge and theories, the validity of former research results and other prior judgements of the researcher must be put into brackets.

A group discussion is regarded as a probable way to work out how rules are interpreted and how sense is made by the participants, as the action of discussing is supposed to create a so called „conjunctive experiential field“.

Generally, scientific research comes out of the everyday-acting of a researcher (that is doing research). According to the measures of qualitative social research, s/he has to show his/her scientific (self-)understanding, which is a mostly literary communicative understanding referring to former research results. The researcher makes this self-understanding transparent by explicating the theoretical structure of the items or topics of research (principle of „openness“). In this regard, control is important. The aim is a controlled understanding of the other resp. the control of the differences between the language of the researchers and the language of the informants. This control is reached by taking over the 3rd order perspective looking at the theoretical presumptions, the methodology, the quality of data, the own prejudices and their bracketing etc. In short, the awareness of the interpretative frame and the dynamics and effects of interpretation are of importance. The differences between the systems of interpretation and the relevance for the acting persons in the field are worked out by two steps (Bohnsack 2003 and Bohnsack, Pfaff, Weller 2010):

- In a „Formulating Interpretation“: the researcher works out the central (primary) and the secondary topics of the group discussions by paraphrasing the utterings as close a possible
to the words (no interpretation). A formulating interpretation remains within the orientation framework of each examined individual case.

- In a „Reflecting Interpretation“ the course of a discourse is reconstructed by working out the „frames of orientation“ giving sense to the utterings. The frame in which the topic is discussed is reconstructed and explicated by elaborating “focusing metaphors”, that is ideas that are explicated in an expressive-drastic, maybe repeated, maybe flowery way, as well as „horizons of comparison“ and „counter-horizons“.

- Types: The horizons of experience constituting the orientation frame of the acting persons are supposed to be visible in certain types of their utterings.

It was altogether three group discussions, taking place every six months, each with a length of ca. 30 minutes. The topic was: What are your experiences with the status of a “licenciand” and with the LIC-study program. In the second and third discussion also the differences to the previous discussion should be considered. Each of these group discussions has been analyzed according to the approach and methodical procedure of the Documentary Method in order to work out the common „frames of orientation“ of the LIC-students, their „horizons of comparison“ and their „counter-horizons“. The postgraduate students got the results of the analysis of the former discussion forming the ground for the next group discussion, always about the topic: Does the results of the analysis correspond with your experiences? What experiences did you make after the last discussion?

The utterings of the researcher students has been methodically evaluated as it follows: At first, the transcribed group-discussions have been analyzed in terms of the foci of the discussants. In terms of these foci of particular interest are the samples of academic reality or academic strategies and the processing of information as well as the reconstructions of the own professionalism. From these results the “habitus” of the LIC-students towards their contract study program and its aims have been derived. In order to provide an overview over the thematic course of the sayings, the text is subdivided into major and minor subtopics. Then, the formulating interpretation is presented. Here, on one hand, “orientation frames” and “focusing metaphors” that are outlined before so-called “counter-horizons”, i.e. rejected or devalued circumstances, play the central role. On the other hand, the discourse organization and its dramaturgy are described. Both analyses
merge into a total characterization of the case. Hereby, the revealed modes of information processing have been elaborated. In the following, the formulating interpretations will be presented in an order that derives from the reflective interpretation and the types that have been worked out.

4.3 The Analysis

4.3.1 The first group-interview (Sept. 2014)

The first group-interview was conducted shortly before the first presentation of the exposés of the LIC-treatises by the students in front of deputies of the communes (not university).

The transcribed interview are analysed in terms of three topics that I call.

1. the meaning of the group interviews;

2. the academic freedom (academic culture) and/or assignment and effort/output;

3. scientific discussion on methods.

The first topic: the meaning of the group interviews, is divided into three subtopics: Firstly, they ask after the meaning of the group interviews within the study program in a wider context reasoning about the question, whether the LIC-study program in general is meant as a training (par.11 “utbildning”\(^19\)) or as a reflective practice respectively how they have learnt (par.11 “är det hur vi liksom, hur har vi lärt oss?”). They ask as a second subtopic, whether the evaluation is directed to the question of different interests behind the study program (communes, orders, steering group; par.18 “det praktiska att vi kom från olika kommuner och har fått olika bud och styrgrupper och hela det.”) or, as a third subtopic, whether the research process (par.22 “forskningsprocessen”) is of special interest for a formative evaluation (par. 4 “formative bedömningen?”). The students do not find a clear solution or answer to their questions. However, in the following they, above all, continue speaking about their research process(es).

\(^{18}\) The transcriptions of the group discussion you find as an attachment to this report (see attachment 2).

\(^{19}\) As this report is written mainly for a Swedish-speaking group, the utterings of the LIC-students will be reformulated in a „formulating interpretation“ and they will not be translated. In qualitative research, a member check, also known as informant feedback or respondent validation, is a technique used by researchers to help improve the accuracy, credibility, validity, and transferability (also known as applicability, internal validity, or fittingness) of a study.
The second topic: the academic freedom (academic culture) and/or assignment and effort/output, is divided into four subtopics: Firstly, the puzzlement deriving from being confronted with an unfamiliar and unclear academic culture (par.25 "den här [universitets]kulturen”, par.84 "Men det var ju så att hela våren var ju sådär flummig.”). It took a lot of energy for them to realize the own functions and responsibilities. (par.28 "det gick väldigt mycket energi åt det känner jag. Och nu helt plötsligt så åh nu ska jag ju göra någonting. Nu ska jag åstadkomma nånting”). Especially, the expectations of a right performance as LIC-student has been a rather strong experience (par.28 “Att det, ja för mig har det blivit. Ja det låter jätte dumt men något av en chock. Att liksom, nu måste jag.”, par.29 ”presterar?”; par.30 ”ja precis”). However, there is no clear idea of the expectations as the academic skills obviously do not resemble their professional profile as preschool pedagogues, there is also a gap between other postgraduates and them (par.95 ”Alltså nånstans är det ju två världar som möts här också. Här sitter de som har doktorerat, de har gått igenom de här processerna. De vet liksom litegrand utifrån sitt. Och här sitter liksom vi. Och jag menar hur vet man vilka”). This is relevant especially in terms of the tacit knowledge in the academic culture (par.97 ”Finns det nåt som är uttalat och nåt som är outtalat.”) and also regarding not explained expectations (par.101 ”de tog för givet att vi skulle ha med oss text. Men det hade vi, vi fattade ju inte att vi skulle ha det.”, par.94 ”Men hur långt borde man ha kommit?”). However, the solution for them seems to be writing (a text) (par.84 ”Man kom på att nej jag ska nog inte skriva det här, jag ska nog skriva någonting annat.”– Meant is here the exposé of one’s own research project as a task in the course on Scientific Ethics). As a second subtopic, the paradox created by academic freedom (academic culture) versus or along with assignment and effort/output is temporarily solved by the interpretation that studying is a process they undergo and not a result (par.45 ”behövt att vara färdig forskare från början”). The third subtopic deals with the possible, however by the students not taken steps of academic education and the benefits of them (par.43 ”master”, par.69 ”Att de här utbildningarna man har gått däremellan att de också är onödiga på nåt sätt.”– not useful is meant here in a formal as well as in an economic sense). Forthly, academic culture and freedom implies other rules and another form of insight than in everyday life or even school (par.107 ”Alltså det vore så skönt att säga, att men nu har du kommit 15 poäng. Då kan man säga att man gjort en projektplan. Det är 15 poäng, har du gjort en etikansökan 5 poäng till.”). Sometimes within academic culture a question is regarded
of more value for learning than an answer (par.41 "Det är väl det att hjälpen inte är konkreta svar utan hjälpen är frågor."); par.154 "Och det var trettio minuter per person och sen skulle vi läsa (för vi ville läsa) den här ”det finns inga kvalitativa metoder”).

Academic work cannot be measured by the time invested (par.109 "det är en helt annan, jag tänker, jag läste ju massor med tidigare forskning och ser nu att ja ja ja. Dessa veckor av arbete, de kommer ju bara tre meningar där det har förskats.”) Academic work is a kind of reviewing (par.122 "Klart man kan ju revidera den individuella studieplanen.”) and it needs method as well as scientific knowledge (par.130 ”Ja för vi pratade ju också att vi behövde både metod och vetenskap”). Of special importance is the insight is that there is a scientific culture that is driven by individual researchers with an interest for certain questions working with them again and again (par.243 ”Jag känner jag blir ännu mer styrkt i det när vi lyssnade på [lärare 2] i Stockholm nu. För hon pratade ju också om det här om att den första var ju fokus på det syfte hon hade från början då och sen så nästa tog sitt ursprung i den första artikeln och sen likadan med den tredje där tog avstamp i den andra artikeln.”) As a forth subtopic, the LIC-students launch a discussion on methods (focus groups, video-filming, diaries (par.338 ”Nej men jag tänker så här, du kanske hade tagit nån avhandling med fokusgrupper.”…)  

4.3.2 The second group-interview (Feb. 2015)

The transcribed interview can be analysed in term of three topics:

1. Academic performance in front of the steer groups/communes and in an academic environment

2. Academic culture

3. To help each other – being beyond the academic culture

4. Object of knowledge and object of the study

5. Ideologies in scientific research and the own attitude towards such power structures

6. Relationship between theory and methodology
The first topic, that I call: academic performance in front of the steer groups/communes and in an academic environment, is ciphered out in terms of a difference of the own academic progression and the expectations of the steer groups/communes and, thus, there is academic independency (par.13 ”Prestera. Och det är klart, det handlar väl om att prestera nu men, är det inte ändå, alltså på en annan nivå som frågorna, alltså vara inte styrgruppen till lags, men ni förstår vad jag menar. Och sen den akademiska världen men nu handlar det mer om min egen studie och vad är egentligen kunskapsobjektet och studieobjektet och man har ganska mycket tidigare forskning och sen blir det bara svårare men det handlar ju inte så mycket att vara nån till lags, det är ju inte det ordet jag ska använda men ni får välja ett annat ord för det.”; par.14 ”Mycket känns så mättat nu”).

The second topic, that I call: the academic culture, is divided into four subtopics:

Firstly, getting support by supervision (handledning) means mostly to get to know about the own work load (par.18 ”att i och med min senaste handledning att jag har fått mer en uppfattning om vad det är jag ska göra […] Nu ser jag allt det hår enorma jobbet som ligger framför mig.”), but also structuring the own text (par.19 ”Du har hittat en struktur. […] I och med att jag lämnade in en text och jag fick feedback på den så har jag liksom nån sorts mall för nästa del.”). The LIC-students recognize their progress (par.24 ”förut var det bara lösa tankar och nu är det konkret”). The second subtopic is ‘reading is the most important thing’ (par.26 ”liten del som vi har gjort”; par.27 ”skulle behöva läsa mer. Så att det känns ju som att man har vart tvungen att ta en riktning och välja det eller hålla sig till det.”) The own status is characterized as that of a beginner and a learning person, the study program is, out of a not really plausible distance (“you”: ”ni”), regarded as a kind of training. The LIC program is part of a scientific training leading only halfway to the next step, the doctorate (par.37 ”Vi är inte färdiga forskare när vi har licat heller.”; par.37 ”ni går en utbildning. Ni ska göra ett test på det ni alltså … har lärt er.”; par.48 „är faktiskt halvvägs till doktor det vi ska prestera“). As a third subtopic, the students ask after the kind of knowledge founding the improvement of the own scientific work and texts as well as the comments on that of the others in the group (par.54 ”jag brotts med att jag måste avgränsa hur mycket måste jag skriva till den här uppgiften och till planeringsseminariet.”; par.59 ”när vi lyssnade på [lärare 3] text att hon bara liksom hade lagt fram någonting och sen så kommer alla med synpunkter”). As a forth subtopic they point out that the knowledge founding the
improvement of the scientific work and texts is not yet available for them, and this produces fears (par.81 "hur ska jag klara mig utan den input jag får härifrån"; par .84 "Det är inte så att jag räkar stöta på nån forskning utan jag söka"). The licentiate candidates do not work at the same place (par.84 "vi liksom är utspridda"), and there is no academic culture around them (par.86 "man [kan inte] fiska upp nånting utifrån det men är man hemma så"). Even if there is some help, a bibliotheque, for one of them (par.72 "Nu har ju Mälardalen har ju ett bibliotek"), there is no professional help easily available (par.73 "Nej och just bara vara i närheten, alltså man kan bara pipa in till sin handledare eller till någon annan"). The point is that they do not feel as a part of an academic culture (par. 79 "Så det tror jag också är en viktig reflektion i att man inte riktigt är så naturlig i den miljön").

The third topic, that I call: To help each other beyond the academic culture, evolves mostly as a discussion on the topologies of knowledge, is mainly deliberated in terms of a common "frame of orientation" and a common "counter-horizon": The general availability of peer-to-peer-models is of importance as a “frame of orientation” (par.89 "var du på den disputationen där"), in special as there is not so much fear of embarking meeting a peer than face-to-face with a scientific professional (par.96 "Det är ju hundra gånger enklare att fråga er, fattar ni det här, än att man ska [lärare 5] jag fattar ingenting.") There is even the idea of learning and improving collegiality (par.70 "Blir bättre på i vårt kollegiala lärande"). However, as a "counter-horizon" serves the lack of possibilities to meet peer-to-peer-models (par.64 "vi är geografiskt utspridda så det är inte bara"; par.98 "jag tänker nu på de här i Malmö som gick 80 procent eller vad de nu gick. Där det var lite mer intensivt och de var och träffades mycket mer. De träffades mycket oftare. Det blir ju en annan kultur. Än när man ändå fortfarande står liksom men ena benet i sin verksamhet som vi inte delar med varandra på det sättet. Och sen så denna som man delar. Men den är ju liksom ändå bara. men inte fullt ut på nåt sätt.") There is also the general risk of being disrupted in peer-to-peer-situations (par.102 "för inget gjort för att alla stör mig").

The third topic as I put it is “object of knowledge and object of the study”: It is divided into the following subtopics: Firstly, there is no clarity about the what they have realized as the main decision in their own research projects: the distinction of an object of knowledge and the object of the study (par.116-118 "Är alla klara över sina
kunskapsobjekt och studieobjekt?"; "Nej"; "Nej") there is even no transparency whether there always is an object of knowledge and the object of the study (par.142 "Hon kunde förklara, det var det ju några stycken som inte kunde som har kommit och föreläst"). There is a fundamental question (par.148 "Det är ju lite grand så att man får väl brotch och det ser de också att man brotch jättemycket med") and in this regard support is expected (par.158 "Då borde man ju ta det som man känner sig mest osäker på. Då borde man ju rimligtvis få mest."; par.156 "Då borde det ju vara ganska så smart att försöka skriva ner de delar man är mest osäker på. Det som man känner att det här, jag har rätt bra kläm på det här tror jag, det grejar jag nog. Om man nu känner att man måste prioritera menar jag.")

The forth topic, as I put it, is ideologies in scientific research and the own attitude towards such power structures, is presented as a problem evolving mostly as a discussion developing a common "frame of orientation" and a common "counter-horizon": The supervisors are directed by unconscious ideas (par.215."deras undermedvetna kan jag tänka mig också som styr kanske.") and the licenciates are aware of being influenced (par.223 "jag känner nog inte lika formad av handledaren"). As a "frame of orientation" serves the idea of two (or more?) professional researchers who, out of their different perspectives, discuss about a scientific topic (par.175 "jag tänker så här att det vore skön t att veta att det är två människor, för man hör ju när de andra diskuterar."par.179 "de kan bjuda på olika perspektiv"). As a common "counter-horizon" they perceive excessive demands by having to listen to the feedbacks to all the texts, even if there was not a lot of text at this time (par. 204 "Ja och de kommer i diskussion, handledarna, vilket ju var jobbigt då vi var många där men jag menar hade vi varit en med fyra handledare"; par.206 "Men jag menar att man orkar ju inte sitta och lyssna på alla och om alla skulle prata om allas. Det blir ju bara liksom"; par.198 "Ja det har inte funnits så mycket att läsa förut så. Det finns fortfarande inte så mycket").

The sixth topic is the relationship between theory and methodology. The question is how to create a methodology that fits a theoretical approach (par.233 "vad man har för teori ansats och metodologi"). Concepts and terms should fit to the conjunction of theory and methodology (par.238 "Erfarenheter om diskursanalysen, då skriver du konstruerar, alltså och att det liksom är hållar ihop hela."). The question is how diligent this conjunction should be (par.242 "ner på petitess").
Generally, the situation of the LIC-study program is evaluated as a training and not so much as a feature of academic culture (par.67 "Man är inte i en forskarmiljö hela tiden liksom utan det är när vi möts här."); (par.69 "träningsmiljö"); par.72 "Alltså man lär ju sig jättemycket på BBK seminarium och på vilka frågor de ställer."); par.72 "Och då tänker man ja men de där kan jag ställa mig själv. Men man får ju inte, vi övar ju inte upp den färdigheten.")

4.3.3 The third group-interview (Sep. 2015)

The transcribed interview can be analysed in term of nine topics with subtopics:

1. The expectations and the interest of the steer groups in their work are not as present as it was before;
2. There has been a certain uncertainty of the cooperating preschools (in two communes) about the role of the LIC-students;
3. Its time for half-time arrangements: we are not skilled for continuing, there is a certain tension in the air;
4. The academization of preschool teacher education has speeded up since they were students themselves. They experience it as governed by elitism;
5. The demands for research studies are not clear, this is especially true for the scale of formal demands;
6. Scientific progression is thought as a staircase: it should be governed, but there is no plan;
7. Need of inspirations;
8. Difficulties to decide on the importance of information: a survey/recipe book is desired, they have no idea about the research of their academic teachers;
9. Their academic freedom does not fit their qualification level: proposal to invite specialists, scientific knowledge forms are different from their own; they feel helpless and confused.

The general disorientation can be seen as a „counter-horizon“, the need of inspiration as a „frame of orientation“. The „horizon of comparison“ is not identifiable.

The first topic, their interpretation that the expectations and the interest of the steer groups in their work are not as present as it was before, can be devided into three subtopics. The first one is a felt absence of the steer groups (par.33-38 D: "Men det här med styrgruppen där, där tycker inte jag att man känner nån- (.) [nånting längre]”; C: "[( )]");
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In terms of the second topic, an uncertainty of the cooperating preschools (in two communes) about the role of the LIC-students, as a first subtopic no special demands at some of the preschools regarding their scientific work as well as a certain ignorance at one of the preschools can be stated (par.62 A: “Jag känner att det inte finns något större behov sådär. Alltså det är mer från högre (. ) instans men va-. (. ) Och det var som när du var i kommun a. Dom, dom sa ‘ ja men liksom vad, vad ville hon, det blev man inte riktigt klar över’, fast dom fattar ju inte att vi har blivit utkommenderade.”; par.64 A: ”…vi vill komma ut och -., för det var likadant som när jag var i kommun b så ‘ja du ville komma hit idag’. Men fast det har jag ju blivit @tillsagd@ att jag ska”). As a second subtopic there is no clear idea about the functions of their scientific work (par.68 D: ”Men sen det tycker jag når man har pratat med dom förskolelärare som är med, som man har pratat nu med lite ⁰ inför den här empirin som -⁰ då tycker jag att dom uttrycker ju samma förvirring som vi [gör…] ”).

The third topic is, that, by coming half of their way to a Licentiate, they do not feel skilled for continuing and they perceive a certain tension in the air. Even if the evaluative research study could have served as a means for resuming their half-way studies, they, as a first subtopic, miss such an overview (par.84 D: “att nån hade sagt att den där a-, halvtidsavstämningen hade ju [varit bra…] ”). However, they, as a second subtopic, summarize that they do not feel prepared enough to succeed in the next part of their research studies on their own (par.99 - 101 A: ”Om man tänker, om man går tillbaka till själva utbildningen så här så känner jag ju just nu att jag inte har det som krävs för att fortsätta, alltså komma framåt i mitt arbete. Alltså jag tycker inte jag får den hjälpen i (.) handledningen och jag tycker inte att den senaste kursen har hjälpt mig, och jag tänker liksom att jag kanske borde ha haft mer med mig i bagaget själv för att kunna fixa detta.” D: (.) Fast har man inte det så har man ju [inte det på något vis, liksom.] A: [Nä, nå.] Men alltså det känns lite fel att jag har kommit in med dom här förutsättningarna och sen kan jag inte -. Alltså det -, det-, det krävs mer med den hjälpen man får.”). In their analysis they, as a third subtopic, switch
between the trial of formally scaling their competences and a continuous personal irritation (par.109 - 112 A: ”[ För om man nu inte kan få mer hjälp] , om det nu är rätt nivå hjälp som man ska få, då räcker det inte riktigt för mig (.) känns det som nu. Jag vet ju inte, det kanske går att krama ut nånting men C: [ @(.)@ D: ,[@(.)@ ( )] A:[ @(.)@ ], par.113 C: ”[Spänning där (emellan)]” ; par.118 – 120 C: ”…så nänstans måste man ju kunna mötas , [änder…] A: [((Ändå.))] ⁰Precis⁰ C: …där-, där studenterna är nänstans och inte där dom borde [vara]” ; par.441 –443 B: ”[Men är det inte så?] Först blir det kaos och sen blir det ordning, @eller? @ C: Och när blir det ordning? [ @(.)@ B: [Jag vet inte.] Jag vet att …namm… alltid så så förr @(det här med) at huvudet är runt för att @tankarna ska kunna snurra i huvudet@”.)

The forth topic I call: The academization of preschool teacher education has speeded up since they were students themselves and they experience it as governed by elitism. The first subtopic is about the academization of preschool teachers, expressed with irony, surprise and scepticism (par.126–127 D: ”…eller i den bästa av världar och så när förskoleläraren har blivit (i Sverige) (. ) otroligt akademiserad. @liksom@ blivit väldigt [akademisk…]” B: ”[Som vi tror] att dom kommer att bli [ @(2)@ aa ]”; par.132C: ”Nä nä, precis, det gör vi, det gör vi ju inte. Alltså …namm… herregud jag är ju ändå, jag är ju ändå lärare precis som om det är mycket mer akademi i det, det är inte så jag menar men, det är ju ändå en lärarutbildning jag har gått så jag menar -, den-, den känns ju -, jag menar herregud man pratar ju knappot teorier”). The second subtext points out elitism of teacher education. (par.151A: “Nä men här -. Det känns lite som att man sätter utbildningen efter dom bästa studenterna, och sen så får dom -, resten liksom hanka sig fram bäst dom kan!”). Thirdly, greater demands are noticed (par.156 D: ”[Nu har dom väl i och för sig höjt kraven] för att komma in, har dom inte det?”).

As a fifth topic, the LIC-students notice that the demands for teacher education are not clear for them, this is signified as especially true for the scale of formal demands. (par.158 B: ”Har dom gjort det nu? Vad är kraven [nu då?] ”; par.168–169 B: ”…gäller magisterutbildningen också som master då eller? D: Jo, magister, [(alltså vad är det?)…]”; par.188-198 D: ”…vara högre än vad det är på [⁰lärarutbildningen⁰]” B: Vad är det, [vad är det man gör där? …] ” A: ”[Ja för det ( ) -]” B: ”[…]är det en D-uppsats?] ” D: ”[⁰(⁰)]” C: ”[Nä, special(utbildningen) är en C-uppsats]” B: ”Jaha” C: ”(.) Fortfarande en C-uppsats” B: ”Aa [det är så? Mm ]” D: ”[(Aa , mm, för jag vet ju inte)⁰]”; par.204–208 A: ”[ @En högre bokstav@ ] ” C: ”[@En större bokstav@] ”)

According to the sixth topic, scientific progression is thought as a staircase: it should be governed, but there is no plan. (par.206-208 D: ”[Ja men det borde ju gå nån trappa.]
Alltså rimligen, det låter ju logiskt att det borde ett snäpp högre, men jag fick aldrig någon rättsida på det där, hur det var för nån…” A: “[Nä]” D: “[…vad] det var för nät namn eller nummer [eller, (-) eller bokstäv]”). (par.213 B: “[Men sen är det ju en process med dom här olika momenten som man ska ta sig igenom när man gör en uppsats. Det är ju en process] och gå igenom och lära sig, kan jag -, tror jag alltså. Det kan ju vara så att man har varit inne mer i den (-) typen av studier eller vad man ska kalla det för då”). As a first subtopic, the confusion is controversially interpreted as the danger for submissive behaviour in front of the supervisor (par.215-222 C: ”(3) Men det är så jobbigt med alla dom här fria valen, det hon sa det här med att, bli styr d av handledaren. Jag är gärna styr av min [ ( )…]: [Ja, aa]” A: ”[Ja, ja]? Snälla styr mig…” B: ”[Aa]” A: ”[…Jag får ingen styrning alls,] det är bara…” C: ”[…]så att jag menar, jag [får -…]” A: ”[…]” det -, jag förstår inte det. Alltså det kan jag inte, det-, det kan jag verkligen inte (varit jag som hade sagt det men…”). However, there is, as a second subtopic, no idea of the own status quo (par.244 C: ”(.) Men det är ju svårt att veta tycker jag (Pea). Alltså jag tror det är jättetvärt för att vad -, vad har liksom, när jag börjar, nu när man är här liksom, ; eller här då om man tänker att man är färdig där, alltså, (.) var är @man alltså@”; par.250–253 D: ”Och vart borde man vara?” C: ”Ja precis, var borde man vara, och -?” A: ”[Nån annanstans?]” D: ”[För att man hyfsat] ska ligga i fas tills det ska [vara klart]”. This is, as a third subtopic, even true for the time schedule they got. (par.254 B: ”[Vi har ju,] har ju fått en sån förteckning en gång över en sån här terminsplanering vad vi skulle ha gjort varje termin, och då har jag för mig att (.) [nu…]”).

With their seventh topic, that I call need of inspirations, they come to a certain solution of their problems and at the same time they express their desolateness (par.270 C: ”[…] ja precis. Ja,] lite inspiration, lite motivation, lite draghjälp. Jag tycker det är svårt när man sitter hemma på sin kam- och så är man då så långt ifrån, man kan inte liksom heller bara steppa upp på -, på universitetet liksom”; par.275–280 D: ”Insupah [atmosfären @(.)@] ” C: ”[Insupa] atm-, nä men jag -, det tycker jag är en -…” B: ”Aa” C: ”…jag tycker det är jobbigt. Jag tror det hade liksom känts -. Sen vet jag inte om det, om man hade varit längre för det, men att just för att vara -, vara en del av det” D: ”Mm” B: ”Ja men (sen) nu när han pratade om diskurser och frames, då pratade han ju också om skillnaden emellan det, så, så det är ju sanna saker får man ju också. Man får ju lite input [@liksom@…]”; par.288–293 C: ”[…]det har man ju ingen aning, alltså jag menar, man -, man -, man lever ju inte här. Jag vet liksom inte vem som ska [disputera nästa fredag…]” D: ”[Nä, nä]” C: ”[…]Jag kan ju gå in och titta på det, men man gör ju inte” B: ”Nä” D: ”Nä, nä” C: ”Man kan inte snäppa in, ”okej jag ska gå in på den disputationen, det verkar, detta verkar lite kul faktiskt och det verkar intressant och kolla den teorin dår”. Alltså, det känns så -, man känner sig så avskärmad”; par.325 C: ”Man hörde nu
The eighth topic I call difficulties to decide on the importance of information: a survey/recipe book is desired and they have no idea about the research of their academic teachers. (par.304 D: ”Okej jag får informationen så här” men hälften av den informationen jag får som kanske kan vara väldigt värdefull, det får man ju så här i förbifart-, alltså [mer eller mindre...]”; par.314 D: “[(Det är precis)] som den här stora boken om teorierna, den här som jag @saknar [hela tiden@]...”; par.317 C: “[Jag] tycker inte det är klokt, jag menar det finns ju ”Leila bakar”och alla mat- [så då borde det väl finnas teoriprogram liksom]”; par.353 B: ”O-, aa i sånt fall eller så behöver han ju egentligen ha en handledare som kan den teorin man [använder...]”; par.365–368 D: ”[(Mm)]A: , Och jag har ingen aning om vad min handledare kan för teorier...” D: ”Nä det är [ju också lite]” A: ”... [Det är väldigt hemligt]. Det är väldigt hemligt” D: “[(Okej, det är hemligt? Aa men det är spännande)]”; par.388 B: ”Så fattade jag-, och det var ju det jag pratade om på tåget med hon ...namn... som jag aldrig -, eller var jag pratade om det någonstans, eh för dom -, dom -, det var nån som berättade att ...namn... höll på med nätting med lek och lärande så det har jag ju sökt på men jag har inte hittat.”)

By the ninth topic they draw a kind of conclusion. I describe it as follows: Their academic freedom does not fit their qualification level. Proposal to invite specialists, scientific knowledge forms are different from their own; they feel helpless and confused. (par.370 C: ”Det är nog -, ja precis, men det är ju svå-, det är ju så begränsat för jag tänker också det här med att, jag menar, vi som har ...namn..., jag menar alla kan ju inte ha Habermas [teori...]”; par.382–387 C: ”[Men det] är ju så jag kan känna litegrann, men då, då -, det är ju därför man känner att man skulle vilja använda en teori som kanske inte var så använd, men samtidigt så, varför är den inte använd? Jo för att den inte funkar (.) [0kanske0] B: , [Men det -] aa, för, eh, Goffman är väl inte använd mycket i förskolan i så fall?” C: ”Nej”; par.394 C: ”Nä men jag vet inte. Men, men det är ju svårt för -, jag menar han kan ju men jag menar, dom får ju plocka hit nån här, nån -, jag menar det är ju ingen här kan Go- alltså, känns det ju som, utan dom får ju plocka hit honom ju”; par.399 D: ...(.) hur -, ska man (2) ringa upp till den här stackars människan och hoppa på honom och liksom , @jag menar det, [det blir ju (så här)@...]”; par.408 C: ”[Absolut inte.] Alltså det kan man inte begära i [huvudtaget]”; par.411–413 B: ”Nä men då måste väl universitetet ge den, den tiden som dom har (.) till den personen eller?” C: “0Aa jag vet inte.0 Men det är ju det. Det är så mycket sånt som man inte
5 Discussion and Conclusions

The data selected in this empirical study cover only two years of a four year study program. Therefore the study may only represent the first phase for the candidates to become legitimate researchers described by Hessle (1987) as confusion, loneliness, feeling of incompetence. However, there is hardly any development in terms of their state of mind. Out of the German perspective the high expectations of the LIC-students towards their academic supervisors or university are puzzling and contradicting the idea of independent research based on scientific literature. However, on the one side the author of this study had to question her deep rooted presuppositions. On the other side, the LIC-students themselves slightly indicate a similar observation in the second group discussion.

As the group of students was free to unfold own standpoints, there was unfortunately no possibility for the researcher to put direct questions and initiate thematic discussions. This disadvantage could have been compensated by a more dialogic form of data collection (maybe semi-structure interview), however, this was questioned by lack of time. The reviews of the data construction did in this case not provide a good chance for explanation. The strong orientation of the students to consensus, however, legitimize the method choice as the Documentary Method recognizes pronounced tendencies in an outstanding way.

The contract study program as well as this contract study deal with the enterprise of a coproduction of academic knowledge between academic and non-academic actors in Sweden.
The idea of an academic cooperation and coproduction with market forces (her: labor market) is called “post-academic” scientific research (cp. Ziman 1996). The contract study program as well as this contract study are not only part of it, but also signifying it. “Post-academic” research mainly follows the principle of accountability. In our case, it is a “triple helix” (Etzkowitz 1990), university, governmental agencies and businesses (in our case university, communes and preschools), cooperatively forming, creating and also using (economically) valuable knowledge. This development is legitimated e.g. by referring to a symbolic compliance strategy of scientists making their research look as if following commonly set goals while they just work on what they are interested in instead (Hessels et al. 2009). Out of the “post-academic” perspective the solitary researcher is thus seen in terms of crisis and problems – the same is shown in the results of our empirical study. The results mark out the study situation as problematic and as kind of irregular; the academic teachers and the academic culture are signified as too absent, dubious and in an obscure way demanding. The same is said about the instances of the “market” (communes, preschools). This refers not last to the fact that scientific work is organized not only with written, but also with unwritten rules. It might be a problem that supervision and assessment moreover lead to believe in instrumental means. Our data clearly show that especially the aim of academic socialization is impossible to be reached in an instrumental way. This contradicts also the ideology that the development of academic knowledge should in terms of its procedures and results, evidently be of competitive advantage for commercial companies (keyword: “accountability”, see above). Here, Josefine Fischer (2015) speaks of a “colonization of the university by market forces”, our empirical study traces the effects of the in Sweden relatively recently initiated colonization process and the shift in the policies connected to it. The results of the study, therefore, in a wider sense provide an analysis of the introduction of market mechanisms into the governance of university research. Whereas in most policy accounts knowledge is treated as homogeneous, the main result of this study is that the three professional fields involved in the evaluated study program represent different and very separate knowledge cultures. The students in the study program perceive these knowledge cultures as incompatible and in an anomic way demanding. It was already stressed before that the practitioners in the communes and preschools may be occupied by the everyday practices. The same seems to be the case with the professionals at the university. The LIC-students feel all alone in dealing with this problem without an own proposal for solving it. Being professionals at the same time they moreover witness and criticize the colonization of their own professionality by science.
A lot of desiderata for further research appear. To pick out one: In order to see the potentials of these results, we can also use Funtowicz & Ravetz’ (1991) model of “post-normal science” (PNS) in which the ecological economics perspective merges with policy making in the sense of aiming at the development of a methodology appropriate for integrating with complex natural and social systems. According to their approach, systems cannot be tackled by academic researchers alone, but an integration of civic society is required. This presupposes the acknowledgement of the different knowledge formats and further research on the differences (see: Gibbons et al. 1994, Mirowski 2011 et al.). In further research projects it will maybe come out that professional culture in the diverse practice fields is constituted by practices and not by norms and prescriptions only. Maybe very high norms like “making the research student familiar with the research process” are dispensable, as they must lead to high frustration of expectations? Making professional practices subject of research one should acknowledge that an instrumental view of these practices hardly grasps their complexity. Academic practices are reading and reviewing commenting texts etc. In terms of a successful “triple helix” there is a need for working out the knowledge forms underlying professional practices in practical fields (in our case preschool, communes) and the parallels, complements, or contradictions to academic knowledge and practices. (See Kraus 2015 and 2016)

6 References

Andersson, M.; Rubin, S. (1979): Jag har sagt i fyra år nu att jag ska bli klar till våren. Om att doktorera och handleda på Pedagogiska Institutionen, Forskningsrapport från Pedagogiska institutionen, Stockholms universitet


Fischer, J. (2015): Knowledge Compromise(d)? Ways and values of coproduction in academia, doctoral thesis. Department of Business Administration, Lund university


Högskoleverket Doktorandhandboken: http://www.doktorandhandboken.nu


Riksrevisionsverket (RRV) 1996:52 Samhällsvetenskaplig forskarutbildning. Four years – not for years, Stockholm


XLII


