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This PhD dissertation is a contribution to the formation of a new inter-disciplinary research area. Research in lifelong learning is in a certain sense a historically necessary continuation of pedagogical research. As an area of research, however, lifelong learning has a broader scope. The research perspective comprises learning through the whole course of life in formal education, everyday life, work life, family life, civil society, etc. Thus research in lifelong learning calls for an interdisciplinary approach to learning as a subjective activity in a social context.

The Graduate School in Lifelong Learning will contribute to the development of these areas of research by training skilled researchers who realize the specific academic potential of this interdisciplinary and problem-oriented approach.

A PhD dissertation marks the end of an academic apprenticeship. It proves that the author has been “conducting an independent research project under supervision” as stated in the “Ministerial Order on the PhD Course of Study and on the PhD Degree”. It is the culmination of the process that is published here. PhD dissertations are however also part of the development and forming of a new area of research. This preface will briefly present the Graduate School and the research environment in which the PhD dissertation is written.

Jan Thorhauge Frederiksen has in his dissertation “Between Practice and Profession” made an original contribution to research in the area of professionalization and the training of social educators, with a specific focus on how these processes are taking place within the Specially Structured Program for Social Educator Training (SSPSE).

The purpose of the study is to describe the students’ transition from the domain of practice to the educational domain, how the students relate to their biographies, and examine how these strategies and the educational domain adapt and relate to each other.

These purposes are motivated by the hitherto absence of studies of social educator training examining the students as students in their own right, rather than potential professionals, and by the all but absolute shortage of studies detailing
the theoretical aspects of the training, without assessing it in terms of its practical applicability, suitability, or necessity.

The empirical design consists in four distinct methodological modes: geometric data analysis of the student population in question, classroom observations of two classes, group interviews with students and individual biographical interviews.

This empirical construction, theoretically inspired by the educational sociology especially Pierre Bourdieu, Basil Bernstein and Daniel Bertaux, allows for a unique interconnection between the empirical modes, inspecting the statistical relations between individuals, while still retaining the specific data on each individual, and also allowing for the relation between the qualitatively produced data and the statistical examinations.

The study finds that the characteristics of the students’ biographies are structurally ordered. The three constructed dimensions in the students trajectories – trajectory direction, indirect trajectory type and trajectory complexity – are combined with a classification of the students trajectories in five classes: The Straight Ones, The Outsiders, The Nurses, The Social/Health Assistants and The Complex Insiders.

The structural dimensions also describe the acquisition of forms of capital related to social educator training: Educational capital, cultural capital of care, and social educator capital. It is found that the form of capital the students bring into the classroom are perceived and evaluated differently by the teachers.

As a conclusion this study suggests that the nature of the training caters differently for the different groups of students within the SSPSE, and that there is a need to understand what sorts of students are currently recruited, and how this may challenge and change the training, and in time the profession itself.
The Graduate School in Lifelong Learning was established in 1999 with support from the Danish Research Academy (now Danish Research Training Council). The Graduate School is a continuation of the research-training programme in education dating back to the early nineties. Since the PhD-programme at the Department of Educational Studies was established some 55 students have achieved the PhD degree. Presently some fifty students are enrolled. The Graduate School has an annual enrolment of approximately 10 new doctoral students. It is an inter-national research training programme. Academic every day life comprises frequent visits by international guest professors and visits by foreign PhD students. Both students and supervisors are engaged in international research networks. Furthermore agreements are established on cooperation with leading research groups across the world.

The Graduate School draws upon theoretical and methodological inspiration from traditions within the art and humanities as well as the social sciences. Graduate School training addresses issues traditionally ignored by discipline-oriented research and professional knowledge. It particularly focuses on learning as the subjective mediation of objective, societal and cultural processes. Research in Lifelong Learning encompasses a variety of subjects and is equally broad in the perspectives it takes. The topics of the PhD dissertations are often quite far from what is usually associated with pedagogy, but help to co-establish an emerging critical and historically located important area of research. This often demands theoretical and methodological innovation. At the same time the programme aims to establish connections between existing traditions in pedagogical research and associated disciplines. Methodologically the graduate school concentrates on qualitative methods and interpretive methodology. Within a wide scope each project may choose and adapt quite different methods to the specific research problem.
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CHAPTER 1
The Fulcrum Between Practice and Profession

This thesis is about social educator training. Social educators is a profession unique to, and utterly entwined in the modern Scandinavian welfare state; it is also one that impinges on the lives of most citizens, and perhaps for that reason, one that has been the object of much political debate. The debate has often been on one of three topics: how to recruit students for social educator training, whether the sector is sufficiently funded or manned, and whether the wages and working conditions are acceptable. These discussions often, at one point or another, turn to the topic of the professional skills, knowledge, and thus the social educator training, as it was. The implicit consideration here being whether social educators are getting what they are worth, or worth what they are getting, and to what extent the funding ensures or undermines the professional work. Such debates are intrinsically related to the differing emphasis placed upon economy, quality of work, training, and professional monopoly by the various agents with vested interests in the profession - the union, several ministries, politicians at national and municipal levels, and so on.

Until 2006, I was employed full-time at a National Institute of Social Education, which is where social educators are trained. My interest for the profession and the training stems from this, as does a particular point of curiosity: what

---

1 If the reader is unfamiliar with the precise meaning of social educator the short explanation is that the profession that unifies pre-school teachers, people working with physically and psychically disabled individuals, and people with social problems - what in other countries might be called care assistants, care workers or educators. In 2003, there were just under 100,000 trained social educators in Denmark. For more detailed descriptions and introductions to the profession, see the official site of the training: http://www.eng.uvm.dk/Uddannelse/Higher%20Education/Bachelor%20in%20Social%20Education.aspx and the Ministerial fact sheet on the degree (Undervisningsministeriet, 2008): http://www.bupl.dk/iwfile/AGM-3VQ4G/8file/080101_fact_sheet_social_education.pdf

2 While I continue to refer to the social educators as a profession, this label is by no means equivocally accepted as suitable in the case of the social educators. A complete discussion of the conditions under which the social educators can be said to be a profession, what such a label may entail, and whether the discussion thereof is at all pertinent can be found in chapter, section 3.9
exactly is it that the theoretical part training does, and what do the students make of it?

1.1 A Glaring Omission

Almost all research on social educators, and social education for that matter, in Denmark, takes leave from the above matrix of interests and agendas. All of them are highly pertinent and important - but they have also contributed to a state of research, where there is all but no research on social educator training, that does not take leave from a fairly limited set of interest vectors within the field of welfare work (Brodersen 2009) - in effect an economic vector, a professional vector, and occasionally special interest group piping in as well. There is thus a large contingent of studies detailing the efficacy or appropriateness of the training, and a similar contingent detailing the perspective of trained social educators on their training, and of the clients, clients’ parents, and employers of social educators, and even on the teachers conducting social educator training.

What is more or less absent is the social educator students. We know very little on whom they are, why they chose to apply for social educator training, and in particular what it is like to be a social educator student.

One reason for this is the correlation between the structure of social educator training, and the debates on social education. Social educator training is planned as alternance training, which is to say that it alternates between regular classroom tuition and work practice. The training entails three periods of work practice - one period of three months and two of half a year. Such planning stresses that the training leads to a specific sort of practical work. Unlike, say, a university bachelor’s degree in social education, which is aimed at no particular vocation, the vocational destination of the social educator training is a given, and the work practices serve as a sort of draft for this. Thus, the training is by necessity perceived as a prelude to the social educator profession, depriving us of the opportunity to examine what the training in itself entails (cf. Andersen & Weber 2009).

A tiny example can illustrate this point: The largest series of research projects and publications done on social educator training, the Social Educators’ Qualifications series (Hjort 1999, Andersen et. al. 1996, Johansen & Weber 1993 and others) examines a complete reform of social educator training, financed by the various unions of the social educator sub-professions. This series consists of

---

3 This state of affairs within research on social education is mapped out and discussed in chapter 3.
ten publications of which five are concerned with the work practice periods; two are concerned with the training, and the last three with the total project, the unions, and the board of the National Institutes of Social Education. Of the two studies concerned with the training, one analyses a series of interviews with social educators about the now complete training and the other examines 39 group interviews with employees at different National Institutes of Social education and six interviews with students. In short, this project, posits that what occurs within the training at the national institutes of social educators training is of limited relevance to the training, and the students’ perspective on that part of the training is even less relevant. This selection is no coincidence and is most reasonably argued in the project. But nonetheless, it still leaves us without any substantial research on what takes place within the training. For that reason, this thesis endeavours to primarily look at what the training is, who the students are, and how the two connect.

1.2 Academization

One point commonly raised in the debates above, in particular by the unions on the professionals’ behalf, is the need for academization - or, conversely the applicability of academic or scholarly knowledge to the daily work of social educators (cf. Hjort 2005). The aspects of the training in which Academization is presumed to take place is the classroom tuition, and it becomes a central point of criticism that this theoretical side of the training remains unconnected or insulated from the practical work of the profession (Pilegaard Jensen 2008). The occasionally also takes the form of questioning whether the students are being presented with a theoretical syllabus beyond what they are able to handle - the underlying assumption being that social educator students lack school skills(Rebsdorff 2009). Altogether it has become a highly contended issue whether social educator training has been academized to the point where students can no longer relate theory to practice.

However, while academization on a practical level refers to increased demands for writing papers, reading theoretical literature, and demonstrating cog-

---

4 I am here deliberate referring to theory in the most vague manner imaginable. These discussion does not in general address the issue of what the label theory can meaningfully be applied to. Brok (2010) is one rare exception in this respect.

5 In fact a major research project takes leave from exactly that proposition. Called Bridging the Gap, the project aims to clarify why there is a gap between theory and practice within sundry forms of professional training, and how this gap may be bridged. See Brok (2010) and the project website: [http://www.dpu.dk/site.aspx?p=13948](http://www.dpu.dk/site.aspx?p=13948)
niscance of the scholarly use of both, on a more structural level\textsuperscript{66}, it refers to the National Institutes of Social Education fusing with numerous other sites of medium cycle programmes\textsuperscript{77}, and the subsuming of all these previously insular educations into a continuous and homogenous educational system, wherein all institutions and forms of training connect seamlessly even beyond national borders, e.g. by most of the medium cycle programmes attaining status as bachelor-programmes (Rubenson 2004).

This development also introduces entirely new educational circuitry as it were, establishing connections and possibilities for further education, where there were previously none. This elongation of the educational pathways also introduces new points of access to the educational system, however. One such point of access is the Specially Structured Programme for Social Educator training. This programme was established in 1993, and caters to students who have worked as unskilled labour within social education for five years or more, and provides them with an opportunity to train as social educators under special conditions. The ordinary form of social educator training entwines work practice and classroom tuition within the course of 3½ years of training, the students alternating between educational setting and social educational work and back again several times during the training, completing 2½ semesters of work practice and 4½ semesters of formal education at the National Institutes of Social education (NISE from here on).

The Specially Structured Programme for Social Educator training (SSPSE from here on) admits only students with extensive (five years minimum) experience from unskilled social educational work. The students are only required to complete ½ a semester of work practice, but are required to complete the full theoretical part of the training, corresponding to 4½ semesters of formal education\textsuperscript{88}. And finally, the SSPSE allows the students to obtain a different, higher, study grant - instead of the State Education Grant and Loan Scheme, the students are entitled to the State Educational Support for Adults. This is convenient and attractive to students for whom the ordinary 3½ years of full-time study is impossible, due to economical or employment obligations.

\textsuperscript{6} An entire research programme in this level of academizations is currently under way at The Danish University School of Education - \url{http://www.dpu.dk/site.aspx?p=13127}

\textsuperscript{7} Traditionally, tertiary education in Denmark is partitioned by the length of the training: short cycle (about one or two years), medium cycle (three years or long cycle programmes) (five years or more university degrees in particular). Medium cycle programmes includes numerous forms of professional training, such as nurse, bachelors in relaxation and psychomotor therapy, occupational therapists, school teachers, social workers, physiotherapists and much more.

\textsuperscript{8} In practice this part of the SSPSE training is often spread over a longer period of time, providing a slower theoretical pace in the training, allowing the students to remain employed during their training.
1.3 Two Programmes

The SSPSE students are a different group of students. The ordinary social educational programme incorporates a two-step transitional course for the future social educator: from uninitiated layperson, to student of the theoretical sphere of social education, and acolyte within the practical sphere, and finally to fully initiated professional.

The SSPSE traces a different path of entrance for the future social educator: from uninitiated layperson, to unskilled labourer within the domain of social educational work, to student within the theoretical sphere, and finally to fully initiated professional.

This latter path of access, compared to the ordinary one, is both longer: entailing five years of training before application complex: requiring a greater set of prerequisites from the applicants, and demanding: delaying studying in the students’ life course to well into the students’ working career, often coinciding with the establishment of family and thus making study a costly and demanding option.

This begs the question of what makes the students of the SSPSE apply, how they manage, and to what extent the training adapts to encompass them. But it also, and perhaps more pressingly, raises the question of what relation exist between social educational practice, and social educator training, and in the end, what part training and education plays in professionalisation. The outline of the two main paths of access to social educator training above, underscores a fact that characterises the inner logic of professional alternance training: that practice and some sort of apprenticeship must be part of the training, and consequently, that some aspects of practice cannot be dislodged from practice itself.

1.4 Why Study the SSPSE Students

It is the students of the Specially Structured Programme for Social Educator Training (the SSPSE from here on), whom I will be studying in this thesis. This provides a unique opportunity to combining two different perspectives on social educator training: First, the implicit assumptions of alternance training, and secondly the sorts of students recruited.9

The implicit assumptions of alternance training is that theory and practice should be brought to connect by way of the individuals. Theory - or whatever

9 To my knowledge, only two studies have ever been conducted of the SSPSE: Ahrenkiel(1998) and Svejgaard (2006). Both studies are the subject of a thorough discussion in chapter 3.
one chooses to call that which students are provided in the NISE part of the training (Brinkkjær & Nørholm 2000) - arrives in the practical setting of social educational work, by being carried in the students’ heads, so to speak. And conversely, practical experiences - or practical knowledge, or whatever one chooses to call what being in work practice does to the students (Andersen & Weber 2009) - are available for reflexive, theoretical scrutiny, as the students’ return to the NISE, incorporating such experiences. This perception of the students as repositories of practice and theory, bringing one into the other and advancing their understanding and command of each as the training proceeds is effectively inverted in the SSPSE - as individuals, they are extremely familiar with the practical work, and as students they are not alternating between the two. I do not propose to examine the influence this might have on what sort of social educators the students of the SSPSE in the end turn out to be, but rather to use the SSPSE students practical experience as an opportunity to focus on how the students connect to the aspects of the training, which are being described as theoretical rather than practical - by which I mean the class tuition taking place at the NISE. In short, the SSPSE students bring the theoretical side of the training to the fore, as it is that part of the programme which is, in fact, specially structured.

The second point is the students enrolled at the SSPSE. One study (Svejgaard 2006) notes that they are less used to school, and that they are students for whom education is an option only because of the special conditions under which the SSPSE can be undertaken, when comparing them to the ordinary social educator training students. The students are older and of a very differentiated educational and employment-wise background. Such background must affect the training somehow, not merely by way of demanding an adjustment of the theoretical level of abstraction. And no matter their specific scholarly aptitude, experience and skills, the diversity of the SSPSE students not only raises the questions of effect on the training, but also of whether the SSPSE students are pursuing other strategies and goals than the ordinary students. In other words different access point to the educational system may not only result in new kinds of students, but also in education being a means to new kinds of ends.

1.5 The Purpose of this Study
This study thus aims to explore social educator training as implemented and deployed in the SSPSE in order to examine what characterises the students who have chose this circuitous pathway to the training, examine social educator
training from the inside, and examine the interaction of the training and the students.

As noted above, I am myself an NISE teacher, and I of course arrive at these issue with a number of preconceived notions on what we may find. One such notion I shall present here, as it indirectly dictates the design of this study: The difficulties encountered by the SSPSE students does not relate to theory and practice, the definition of either none withstanding, but instead the pedagogy employed in the NISE. And the difficulties are not simply related to the students’ educational skills, but to their social origin and biography, in a complex, structured mesh. This preconception mirrors the theoretical gaze I bring to bear on the issue: that of Pierre Bourdieu, and to a lesser extent those of Basil Bernstein and Daniel Bertaux.

The purpose of the study falls in the following three objectives, all contributing new perspective to the bodies of research on social educator training, on professional training, and on welfare professions:

| Describing the students’ transition from the domain of practice to the educational domain: What social biographies do the students bring with them? |
| In practice, the general term experience does not fuse easily with the theoretical apparatus I bring to bear on the topic. The concept of experience in most incarnations, entails a hermeneutical approach, and granting subjective perspectives primacy. Yet, in the Bourdiean optics, experience is rather the notion of what traces the agents bear of past positions occupied in social space, not incorporated as dispositions and forgotten as socially arbitrary condition of the past’ positions. For that reason, I will be examining the students as bearers of a social biography, rather than as possessed of specific experiences. This effectively means discarding the subjective dimension of experience of the social educator students. Such studies have already been carried out to a great extent(Schmidt 2007, Møller Pedersen 2005) |

| Describing how the students relate to or draw upon their biography in the educational domain: How does the biography become relevant for the student? |
In practice, this entails constructing a relation between the students’ biographies and their educational strategies, as they are retold, and employed within the classroom. This relation - a homology(cf. Chapter 2) - is a specific relation between what sort of capital the students possess, as they enter the SSPSE, and what sorts of practice they deploy.

Examining how these strategies and the educational domain adapt and relate to each other: What practice is in demand in the NISE, and to what extent is this the practice being supplied by the students?

In practice, this entails examining whether the above described forms of capital correspond to respectively different strategies, and different forms of perception and appraisal of the strategic student practices within the NISE classrooms. The above statements are both lengthy and overly cumbersome, and having made the theoretical foundation clear above, I will rephrase the purpose as the following three research questions:

**Research questions**

What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?
How are these biographies related to educational strategies?
How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

1.6 Three Ostensible Study Goals

Throughout my work with this study I have had numerous opportunities to present my research. On these occasions, I have come across three recurring preconceptions of what I ought to be doing, or what it seems like I am doing, and for that reason I have chosen to address them here, and state what I am not trying to do, and why not. If this seems a little harsh, then it is perhaps a consolation that I shall return to these three reader positions, and address what this study does, in the end contribute to the preoccupations of these positions.

The first study, which I am thus not doing, is a didactic assessment of the adequacy or appropriateness of the training. This could be done in numerous
ways, for instance addressing the amount of control in the training: Are the students being oppressed in some way? Or it could be from more or less the opposite pole of interest in the training: Are the students being hampered or aided in completing the training, and how can the rate of completion be improved upon? Or finally, such a didactic study could attempt to assess whether the students are learning what they are supposed to, and if not, how this situation could be ameliorated?

It is perhaps already apparent that this kind of study inherently encapsulates the interests of particular groups of stakeholders in the training. I stated above that the research in social educator training lacks the perspectives of the students, and that is thus the perspective I am adopting in this study. I do not believe that it is possible to vet this study entirely of any vested interests, but I do not believe that starting out explicitly from assessing whether the training meets these interests makes no difference to the conclusions.

For much the same reasons, I am not conducting a practice suitability study, attempting to assess which students will make good social educators and which will not, and what sort of dropouts are acceptable or even desirable? This sort of study also embeds the interests of specific stakeholders in social education, most of whom are in my opinion already well catered for in the research hitherto conducted, as will be discussed in chapter 3.

The theoretical thrust of Bourdieuan sociology entails attempting to objectify the position of the researcher in relation to the object of research - which should not be taken to mean that the interest inherent in said position are then neutralized. This objectification rather points out that the object constructed is how the object appears from the specific position of a researcher, and subsequently positions this in opposition to the perception by the agents of the field themselves, in an attempt to break with both perceptions by contrasting them with each other. I put this in some details since it addresses the final, third study, which I am not doing. The all-exhaustive study that provides a completely accurate representation of all sorts of NISE, all students, all subjects taught and so on. The demand for such a study ignores that any demand of accurate representation is in fact insatiable if imposed rigidly, and thus objectivistic. It is necessary to explicate one’s criteria of relevance of representation: how does one choose which contexts are ensured representation? In this study, the context and the criteria by which the representation is decided upon is to be found in two chapters (chapters 4 and 8)
1.7 The Structure of this Thesis

The study is conducted as a heavily empirical study, drawing on four different methodological modes of producing empirical data, I initially draw upon a set of registry data for an analysis of the NISE, and a geometric data analysis (Rouanet & Le Roux 2004, 2010) of the SSPSE student population. I then conducted small scale fieldwork at two NISE, and also conducted group interviews and individual biographical interviews with a small number of students. The precise deployment of each methodological mode, and the relations between the modes and the research questions is the subject of the entire next chapter, and for that reason I will refrain from forestalling those points here. At least two aspects of this design enter into previous uncharted waters:

First, almost no fieldwork has been done in the classroom setting of social educator training, and none at all at the SSPSE. Nor have much been done in other welfare professional settings. And second, to my knowledge the mixed methodology here applied has not been attempted in precisely this way before. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the informants are present and connected through empirical layers and the different methodological modes can thus be connected in an original way.

However, this convoluted and rather massive empirical design also requires several equally lengthy and intricate discussions on methodology. I have chosen not to go through the methodology discussions and the theoretical foundations for each before embarking upon the empirical analyses. Instead I will be interspersing the empirical chapters with several small sections on methodology.

Directly following this first chapter I do, however present the design at some length, and discuss the traditions and implications of conducting research that combines methods. This chapter - Chapter 2 - also contains a short introduction to the theoretical framework of Bourdieu, emphasizing the notion of homologies.

The subsequent chapter attempts a construction of social educator training by examining a plethora of research on social education, social educator training, and the social educator profession. Chapter three attempts to demonstrate that the NISE - and thus the SSPSE students are subjected to the structural effects of two separate subfields, of domains: that of social educator training, and that of social education.

Following this, in chapter 4 I conduct an examination of the relations between the National Institutes of Social Education, by way of examining the recruitment in later years to the NISE. This is done in order to locate and assess the two sites of field work, and relate them as agent of the social space.
The next three chapters are dedicated to conducting a geometrical data analysis of the SSPSE student population of 2003-4. Chapter 5 presents the history, methodology and Scandinavian traditions of geometrical data analysis. Chapter 6 details the first step in the geometrical data analysis, which is a specific multiple correspondence analysis of the SSPSE population, and Chapter 7 details the second step, which is a Euclidean classification of the individuals in the SSPSE population.

Chapter 8 returns to the theme of fieldwork sites, applying the findings of the geometric data analysis to the two sites of fieldwork, the populations of students followed there, and the individuals selected for interviews.

Chapter 9 present the biographical interviews, and the underlying theory and methodology used here, detailing the interviews and the theoretical framework of Daniel Bertaux.

Chapter 10 combines the biographies with the empirical data from the group interviews for the construction of a set of educational strategies.

Chapter 11 details the process of obtaining access to the field work sites, and makes an extended examination of my position as researcher, as it can be objectified from the field work.

Chapter 12 presents the analysis of the fieldwork, and the Bourdieu-Bernsteinian theoretical apparatus employed here.

Finally, Chapter 13 present the conclusion, summing up and combining the findings of the entire study. Throughout the study, the complexity of the methodology and combinations of methods have necessitated that I continually assess the relevance of the methodology and the limitations it imposes on the work. This is also the subject of a short discussion in chapter 13.

1.8 Notes on Translations

The entire thesis is in English. While the social educator training topic is perhaps most immediately relevant to Danish research communities, the overall theme of professional training is relevant in many other contexts, and the use of geometric data analysis, in particular in the mixed methods design is relevant well beyond Danish borders. It is for those reasons that I chose to write in English. But of course doing so comes with a number of added difficulties. The entire analysis has been conducted on untranslated materials, and only once specific bits of transcripts and field notes were chosen for direct inclusion, did I translate them. The actual translation has both a precise and consistent
layer, and a more freely interpretative one. The consistent layer is related to all references to specific institutions, subjects, and so on. Here I have chosen to use officially sanctioned translations - either provided by the institutions themselves, or provided by dictionaries. I have used four different dictionaries for this purpose, in decreased order of specificity:

The ministerial webpage socialeducator.dk - now unfortunately defunct - provided an introduction to social educator training, including translations of all relevant Acts and Executive orders. It has been replaced by some of the sites referenced earlier in this chapter.

The Danish Agency for International Education (formerly CIRIUS) provides an online dictionary of educational terms.

The Dictionary of Institutions details the official translation of almost all public entities in Denmark, as well as numerous Unions and so on.

And finally, I have used both ordinary online dictionaries and standard Danish-English dictionaries as well. In many cases none of these were of any help, and I have instead had to go to a number of different sources in order to find a reasonable translation. Often, the problem arises from the fact that there is no equivalent institution or entity in any native English countries, and thus a translation in fact may come to shroud important cultural differences. In these cases, I have made a footnote explaining the important points or, in at least one occasion - chosen to avoid the term altogether. All terms that I have found and selected an official translation for, are listed in the dictionaries found in appendix 1. In passing, please note that the dictionaries and a summary of the thesis entire, are the only appendices supplied in print. All others - excepting transcriptions and other confidential data - are available online.

The more interpretative layer of translation is in particular related to transcripts of verbal interaction. Here, I have tried to recreate what is said in colloquial English, rather than by direct translations. Some informants stutter, use a lot of interjections, interrupt each other or themselves, all of which makes for some very challenging texts. I have tried to translate them, so that I retain these not explicitly information-bearing aspects of the enunciations. This is a highly difficult endeavour, and possibly a controversial one as well, as it involves a measure of interpretation. However, were I to instead try to retain only what was clearly meaningful, or to rephrase everything in to Standard Danish (or for

10 That occasion is the notoriously challenging Danish term [faglig] or [faglighed]. These words on some occasions describe the aspects of social educator knowledge and skills that are presumed to be professionally (or vocationally) specific - but as such they also serve as a sort of implicit judgement on what beings within the profession and what does not. When examining various Danish definitions of the word, these very quickly segue into either assumptions of professional monopoly, or defending arguments for such monopoly, and for that reason, I think the word hampers any clear analysis. As it was very rarely used by my informants, I have lost very little in avoiding it.
that matter translate in accordance with the *King's English, Modern English Usage* etc.) I would be interpretation to the same extent, but in addition enforcing an arbitrary standard of correct phrasing. I chose instead to collect all samples from one person and translate them in one go, thus trying to maintain some consistency in how each *voice* was translated. And, I have included a large subset of these translations - put along the original Danish transcripts, allowing for some inspection of my reinterpretations. These are found in appendix 23.

1.9 List of Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used throughout the thesis, in order to avoid unnecessary lengthy text.

SSPSE: The Specially Structured Programme for Social Educator Training [Medituddannelsen]
NISE: The National Institutes of Social Education [Pædagogseminarium]
A&A: Arts and Activity-subjects [Kultur- og aktivitetsfag]
JSEM: The site of my fieldwork in Jutland
KSEM: The site of my fieldwork in Copenhagen
GDA: Geometric Data Analysis
MCA: Multiple Correspondence Analysis
AHC: Ascending Hierarchical Classification.
CHAPTER 2

On Methodology and Homology

This research project employs a number of discrete methods, in an attempt to examine the field of research from several angles. In this chapter I will discuss first the actual design, and then go on to the methodological intentions, assumptions and implications of the design. All of these hinge on the concept of structural homology, an aspect of Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology. For that reason, the initial presentation of the project design is succeeded by a presentation and discussion of both the concept of homology, and the theoretical framework that embeds it.

The use of multiple forms of empirical data, and forms of data production is also put into the context of various models for combining separate methodological modes, the reasons for doing so, and the ways in which they can or should connect. As is perhaps already apparent, the design involves numerous different layers, both analytical, empirical and theoretical. As much by necessity as by choice, the very deployment of such a design has become a sub-theme of my research, and this chapter also serves the purpose of setting up such a discussion: while such a design enables reconstructing the object of research according specific theoretical assumptions, it also imposes constraints on the data production, and limitations as to what conclusions can in fact be supported.

A final part is dedicated to discussing the relations between the methodological modes, the field, my theoretical and subjective position as researcher, and the possible bias that is embedded in these relations. I will not, however, in this chapter go into the actual methodic practice - these aspects will be discussed in the chapter dedicated to the empirical analysis.

---

11 By methodology, I understand the assumptions - philosophical, epistemological, ontological or axiologic - that underpin any particular scientific method, whereas by method and methodic I understand the actual practice of the researcher.

12 Although by no means a research question in itself, I will throughout the thesis refer to this theme, and explore the points of what constraints the design imposes on my data production, what limits it imposes on my analysis and interpretation, and finally, at what points the design inhibits rather than specifies my work.
2.1 Design Overview

Graph 2.1 below is an attempt at a graphical overview of my research design. There are four separate methodological modes involved - and by modes I mean to emphasize that they are not phases, or stages, but *discrete* and *disparate* methods.

The modes are:
1. Geometric Data Analysis (GDA) of the entire Danish SSPSE population
2. Biographical interviews with a selected subgroup of the observed students.
3. Group interview with a selected subgroup of the observed students
4. Classroom observations at two Danish NISE

There are at least three levels of connections between these four modes: *empirical connections*: All students I met in my classroom observations are entered into the population of the geometric data analysis. I analytically select two subsets of students, with whom I conduct both group interviews and biographical interviews. Thus, specific individuals link all four empirical products. This level of connections is crucial, as it allows for several analytical operations which are not commonplace.

Secondly, *analytical* connections are constructed as I analyse the empirical data, and select individuals for interviews etc. Recurring themes found in different methodological modes form analytical connections as well.

The third level of connections between these modes are the ones embedded in my choice of this design, specifically the theoretical foundations of the design. As an example the use of Geometric Data analysis is heavily (although not exclusively) linked with the empirical work of Pierre Bourdieu, the work of whom is a central influence in my theoretical position. These connections I will term theoretical connections, as they indicate what limitations and demands of coherence my theoretical stance imposes on my empirical work. Of course, even if my reasons for employing multiple correspondence analysis e.g. are in themselves sound, they are still not completely extricable from the subjective associations and preferences that *also* guide my researching.

Presently I shall describe the four modes briefly, and outline some of the general questions related to the modes, and subsequently an outline of the levels of connections between the modes. The specific choices made when employing the methodological modes are discussed separately, in respectively chapters 5 through 7 (Geometric Data Analysis), Chapter 9 (Biographical Interviews), Chapter 10 (Group interviews) and Chapter 12 (Classroom observations).
2.1.1 Mode 1: Geometric Data Analysis

The object of my research - students enrolled in the Specially Structured Programme of Social Educator training (SSPSE) - was in 2004 the object of a small evaluation study (Svejgaard 2004a,b,c, 2006), financed by The Danish Rectors Conference of the NISE. As a part of this study, the admission data on all students enrolled in the SSPSE in the fall term 2003-4 were collected and examined statistically. In designing this present project, I have been granted access to this data set. My analysis of these data will be conducted using a number of multivariate statistical techniques, namely those of geometric data-analysis. The product of this analysis is a relational description of the students enrolled in the SSPSE. This description describes the differences of importance in the group examined, and point out various pathways of education and employment, that lead to the SSPSE - all within the information contained in the variables found in the data set, and without dislodging the information from the individuals bearing it, and thus enables me to study differences structuring the population of SSPSE students, while still enabling me to examine each difference as it pertains to each student I interview and observe.

13 The results of this particular part of the study is discussed in chapter 6-7.
Two methodological discussions impinge on this mode: first: why use a quantitative analytical tool at all, in an otherwise qualitative setting? And second, why GDA, and not one of the many other techniques of multivariate statistics available? The first of these is addressed presently, whereas the latter is postponed to the specific discussion of the GDA methodology in chapter 5.

The debates on the relative merits and virtues of respectively quantitative and qualitative methods is, in my opinion not a particularly fruitful way of approaching the differences in the actual underlying methodologies. Denzin and Lincoln present in their introduction to the massive Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research an incisive protest against the domination of quantitative methods and the failure of such methods to grasp dynamic subjective societal phenomena (cf. Denzin & Lincoln 2005:3ff.). Consequently, researchers should abandon all the presuppositions of classical science, a point I shall return to below. A more moderate position is adopted by Alvesson & Sköldberg, in the introduction to their book on qualitative methods. Here the link between quantitative methods and the virtues of classical science blurs: on the one hand, there exist qualitative research that relates the quality of research entirely to methodic rigour (cf. Nielsen & Nielsen 2005), and on the other hand the demise of reliability and validity in quantitative research easily extends to qualitative research as well (Cf. Alvesson & Sköldberg 1994:8f.) Research in general is thus threatened by a crisis of stability, and not just quantitative methods, as it were. As MCA in a number of ways is an attempt to meet the difficulties (and absurdities) of analytical statistics, and confront the dynamic and complex nature of social reality, I am in accordance with this latter position, and thus does not see by necessity any methodological contradictions in the employment of both quantitative and qualitative methods.

This methodological mode relates to the first research question:

- What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?

Statistical descriptive analysis of students enrollment data cannot say anything reasonable about the meaning of biographies; this aspect of the question is examined in the biographical mode. I have thus elected to operationalize the concept of educational biography as respectively a trajectory and a biographical narrative - the trajectory being the part of the student’s life course prior to admission at the SSPSE, which allows for that admission. The biographical narrative, being
the subjective appropriation of the life course, is discussed in the next section. I should stress that this distinction cannot be maintained as either an ontological or epistemological distinction - it is merely an operational distinction, related to the specific sort of data used in this and the following methodological mode, and the operations that I apply to each. Thus, when, say, Higher Preparatory Exam is discussed in different ways when encountered in biographies and trajectories, the statements address the same epistemological object. Higher Preparatory Exam is only reconstructed, when the construct retains each discrete methodological construction of it.

2.1.2 Mode 2: Biographical Interviews

A small selection of students will be the objects of a biographical study. The selection will be representative of the differences found in the geometric data analysis of the SSPSE student population, but also of the differences noted during initial classroom observations (qv. Section 2.1.3 below). Like geometric data analysis, this method hails from a field of numerous, complex and contested positions. My interest in the biographies are twofold: first a specific sociological interest: what pathways lead to the SSPSE, so to speak - and by that metaphor, I of course mean to hint at an underlying assumption: that there are, in fact, a limited set of pathways, indicating similarities between a number of subsets of students. The metaphorical pathways roughly corresponds to the trajectories constructed by the GDA discussed above.

My other interest in biographies can be said to microsociological: the subjective structures of meaning that connects the biography to the educational domain, the students find themselves in now. In line with the metaphorical pathway, the question here is how prospective students select pathways, and this corresponds to the concept of a biographical narrative - an empirical product aimed at constructing both the social strategies of the student, and the meaning ascribed to the SSPSE. Such structures of meaning I therefore take to encompass both the decision to enroll (and thereby the meaning ascribed to the domain, the institution, and the profession), and the work of transformation necessary, in order to become a legitimate (in the opinion of one self and other’s) occupant of the student position. The transition from unskilled agent in the domain of social education to social educator student involves a substantial subjective shift, a transformation of the experience.

I am specifically aiming at relating the biographical narratives to the space of SSPSE student trajectories, and thus exploring homologous relations between the two.
This methodological mode relates to the first and second research questions:
• What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?
• How are these biographies related to educational strategies?

2.1.3 Mode 3: Group Interviews

While the emphasis in the above discussion of observations does not attempt to reconstruct the SSPSE students’ practice from their perspective, this very perspective is nonetheless important. As will be shown in the subsequent chapter 3, most research on social educator training has as its sole concern the end product of the training, which is to say, whether the students turn out as capable social educators in the end. This means that the perception of social educator training as education in lieu of training, and the students as students in lieu of social-educators-to-be is commonly either disregarded (as the view of the uninitiated), disowned (by fully fledged social educators who are no longer students themselves) or circumscribed by either teachers’ or researchers’ construction of the training’s end purpose. The third methodological mode, group interviews, is meant to precisely provide access to these perspectives, and also serve as “anchorage” of the interpretations of in particular the classroom observations. This methodological mode relates to the second and third research questions:
• How are these biographies related to educational strategies?
• How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

Interviews with groups\textsuperscript{15} provide the researcher with access to actual social interaction as data, and thus to the social interpretations and cultural understandings of a group(Halkier 2010, Barbour 2007). Group interviews retain the complex, discontinuous and multivalent aspects of social dynamics, at the cost of abandoning continuous narratives and intimacy. Such interactive aspects of social educator students culture is an important part of understand the resolution of the relation between students’ and the educational demands of the training - and as the biographical mode retains the narratives, nothing is lost by conducting group interviews (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis 2005)

In the literature on focus groups, it is a well-established fact, that focus groups is not a methodology with any particular epistemological or political allegiance, originating in military intelligence research, as well as the marxist pedagogy of Paolo Freire and the classical fieldwork of Lazarsfeld.(op.cit p.898f.) While

\textsuperscript{15} I have chosen to use the term group interviews instead of focus groups thus emphasizing group rather than focus. The concept of focus is present in any interview, and the term of focus tends to be associated with a very concrete form of structured questioning (sorting pictures, commenting on specific texts or magazines, etc., Halkier 2010), betraying the terms’ origin within market analysis.
the specifics of setting up these interviews, and selecting the participants will be discussed in chapter 8 and 10, a few commonly recognised aspects of interviews with groups are related to the interconnection of the methodological modes: the size of the groups, and the relationship between interviewer and interviewees.

Several sources (Halkier loc.cit., Barbour loc.cit) argue that groups should be somewhat large, for at least two reasons: Firstly, in order for the group to encompass real world problems and asymmetry, it must contain a sufficient number of participants that ensures a real-world heterogeneity of attitudes. Secondly, large group numbers may mitigate the dominance of the interviewer, inhibiting researcher authority (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis loc.cit.) by providing “security in numbers” (Barbour 2007:21). However, in the opposing scales sits the consideration of whether the researcher will be reliably able to discern the individual agents participating in the interview, and the amount of on-stage time available to each interviewee within the interview. In this particular design, the ability to discern which agent says what at any one time in the interview is paramount, as it is the identity of the agent, that connects the group interview to the rest of the methodological modes. For that reason I elected to construct fairly small groups for interviewing.

2.1.4 Mode 4: Observations

This fourth methodological mode is mainly concerned with examining educational settings and educational demands imposed within that setting. I passively observed about a month of social educator training in two separate NISE - one in Copenhagen, and one in Jutland.

This methodological mode relates to the third research question:

• How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

The commonly raised methodological issues (Kristiansen & Krogstrup 1999) in relation to observations are those of duration, participation and validation. Duration, as a question of how long the researcher should insert him- or herself in the field; participation, as the question of what role should the researcher choose in relation to the agents observed; and validation, as the question of how to assert the validity of the findings of the observations. All of these questions will be briefly addressed in the following, as they all pertain to the combination of methods.

16 The specific extent of the observations is detailed in chapter 11.
While possibly redundant, I would like to start by stressing that this study is not as such concerned with the appropriateness nor the didactics of the training in so far as it relates to the profession of social educators. What takes place in the classrooms of social educator training I perceive as a manner of shaping specific agents in a particular way, having its own social and historical logic, rather than a work of preparation for specific professional tasks. It is in part for that reason, that I find it important to conduct classroom observation. For that reason, educational demands cannot be constructed without direct access to the practices that transmit such demands, as opposed to the legislative/regulatory documents that stipulate one set of demands from within an bureaucratic logic, or the teacher’s didactic reflections, which represent another set of demands from within the teacher’s practical logic; this is a direct corollary of the Bourdieuan notion of fields: the sense agents make of their practice within a specific field makes up only one part of social efficacy of practice (Bourdieu 1994a:123ff.). These assumptions in themselves argue for a limited participation (or participating observer, in the terminology of Kristiansen & Krogstrup (1999:99ff.)) on my part, as I, simply put, strive towards seeing structures that are not part of the participants own perception of practice. Such a position has been criticized for the researchers inability to access local contextual meaning, due to the fleeting and sporadic relationship between researcher and agents (op.cit. p.8f., p. 100). In my opinion, such critique stems from a superficial understanding of said relationship, completely disregarding the numerous symbolic relations connecting observer and observed (Bourdieu 1999, 2003).

I use the terms classroom observations, fieldwork and classroom studies interchangeably. While one could engage in discussions as to what demands a set of observations must meet in order to qualify as fieldwork or whether classroom is in fact the proper delimitation of the setting which I am observing, I am unsure of the purpose of such distinctions. While there are inarguable advantages to the advanced duration of many studies in institutional settings, such considerations must be weighed against what other forms of data the study aims at producing, and in my case the multi-methodic design takes precedence over the possible advantages of prolonging the fieldwork. My purpose in doing observations of classroom activities, is to discern symbolic practices of inculcation in the work of schooling (Bourdieu 1990) taking place within the SSPSE. Such practices I take to be recurring patterns, invisible divisions and partitions of the subjects, naturalisation of values, assumptions and ethics, but these practices

---

17 The opposite point of view - that classroom research must emphasize local contexts and local knowledge - can be found in e.g. Sharrock & Anderson (1994). Or, in a more generalised ethnographical stance, in Spradley (1980)
are a constant, continuous activity reproducing the structures that produce it, and for that reason incomprehensible without appreciating those very structures (Bourdieu 2003). The demands of education in this light are omnipresent, rather than uniquely occurring events, and for that reason I cannot derive a critical amount of observations, nor any absolute demands of representativity that in itself validates the classroom observations.

Hammersley (1994b) discusses extensively the issue of validation, with particular emphasis on the question of whether being an agent of the field of study validates or invalidates the research. Mirroring the arguments above against the necessity of observer participation, Hammersley argues that the extent to which being a field member can validate class room research hinges on the extent to which one relies on the transparency of the practical perception, understanding and relation to the field. This argument can be extended to cover the various forms of face validity (Guba & Lincoln 2005) or respondent validation (Kristiansen & Krogstrup, loc.cit, p. 212); such validation sets up the agents’ perception of the field as the be-all and end-all of class room research. The ambition of this study is precisely to transcend that border, and this leaves only room for the types of validation related to researcher communities.

2.1.5 Modes and Research Questions

Above the four methodological modes were introduced along with outlines of the specific purpose of each, in the overall design.

The three research questions posed in the previous chapter were:

1. What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?
2. How are these biographies related to educational strategies?
3. How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

In the previous sections, I have put forward specific relations between these three questions, and different aspects of the design, and specifically to different subsets of the four methodological modes. In the illustration below, these couplings are demonstrated - although such an illustration (and coupling as well) simplifies the relations. I cannot reconstruct the trajectory of one of my informants statistically, and then presume to not recall the outcome of that reconstruction when observing or interviewing that student. Nor would I want to, as the findings of each analytical mode should of course be used to qualify my analyses of other modes. Still, the process of analysis - and in fact the structure of this thesis as well, will proceed in a fashion ordered by the three
research questions. Thus the relations between research questions and modes is an important underlying structure.

In section 2.1 above I discussed three levels of connections between the four methodological modes - the empirical, analytical and theoretical connections. I will conclude this discussion by explicating these connections.

The geometric data analysis connects analytically to all three other methods as a framework of selection. Selecting fieldwork sites, constructing groups for interviews and selecting students for biographical interviews all draws upon the findings of the geometrical analysis of the student\textsuperscript{18} population, and the hierarchy of social distinctions constructed in this analysis. Similarly, the geometric data analysis is firmly grounded in a Bourdieuan understanding of social space as relational and agents’ actions as both structured and reproducing structures - thus by theoretical connections requiring both an overall framework of structural relations, and a qualitative appreciation of the performance of such distinctive relations.

The classroom observations connect analytically to both group and biographical interviews through observations of different ways of relating to the educational

\textsuperscript{18} Specifically, the theoretical connections are throughout the design, guided by the assumption that the empirical layers can connect by way of homological relations between student positions, and student dispositions towards the training. This is discussed in extenso in section 2.2 shortly.
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context, which serve as another way of selecting interview participants. The theoretical connections remain the underlying attention to relations of difference, and distinctive practices. Finally, the biographies analytically and theoretically connect to the group interviews by connecting past, present and expectations: the narrative reconstruction of the students’ past yields an individual perception of the SSPSE training, and the group interviews yield a cross-section of the relations between the perceptions of different students. This leaves the empirical connections, which I have attempted to depict in graph 2.3, each circle representing an individual, each layer representing a methodological mode, and each connecting tube representing recurring individuals - those individuals whom are present at different empirical levels, as it were.

2.2 The Concept of Homology

A keystone of the empirical design of this study is the concept of a homological relation between structural social conditions within a particular social subspace, and how agents perceive, and relate to that subspace. That such a
relationship should exist is a guiding principle of many studies taking their cue from the work of Pierre Bourdieu, and occasion a number of specific methodological decisions. For that reason, I will in the following attempt to outline the concept, its intricate position in the theoretical work of Pierre Bourdieu, and how, in the end, the concept precipitates a number of methodological and empirical decisions. This discussion will also introduce the theoretical framework of Bourdieu, albeit in a very compressed form. This is not meant to serve as an adequate introduction to the entire work of Bourdieu, nor even as a thorough recapitulation of the central concepts of his work19.

2.2.1 Homologies in Social Space

The word homology originates in mathematics, and describes the procedure of relating various subparts of geometrical objects to each other, and two geometrical objects are said to be homological, if they share certain geometric properties. Bourdieu appropriated the concept for his sociological analysis in order to illustrate precisely this sort of relationships, and throughout his work, he repeatedly draws on a mathematical images and abstractions, in striving for terminological rigor. A central concept is that sociological quantification and modelling must be multidimensional (cf. Lebaron 2009), that is to say, neither reduced to linear scales or coefficients. And geometry being the basic mathematical discipline employed describe multidimensional spaces, geometrical modelling of data has been central to Bourdieu’s thinking.

To my knowledge, it is in “Anatomie du goût” (Bourdieu & De Saint-Martin 1976), the concept of homology appears for the first time. Here, it serves to emphasize the shortcoming of traditional sociological analyses of social mobility, by way of a now commonly cited conception of social space. While Bourdieu here concedes that social classes can be described as separated by the amount of capital they possess, he introduces the notion that capital comes in different forms - specifically, in the study at hand, economic capital and cultural capital. This introduces the dimension of the structural composition of the capital possessed by any one social agent, creating a social space of two dimensions, rather than the hitherto accepted one-dimensional scale of classes (op. cit. p. 17). Consequently, social mobility becomes an equally multidimensional affair, being no longer a question of ascent or descent, the agents also having the option of transversal social mobility, by converting one form of capital to another. What was previously considered to be one homogenous social class,

19 For such an introduction, one should preferably turn to either one of Bourdieu’s own empirical works such as “Homo Academicus” (Bourdieu 1988), or a more comprehensive introduction, such as Prieur & Sestoft(2006)
now becomes a multitude of *class fractions*; for instance the upper class\(^{20}\) being split into academic, commercial and liberal professional fractions, among others. Cultural capital makes up the most of the capital possessed by the academics, whereas economic capital makes up the most of the capital possessed by the commercial and industrial managers (op.cit.p.15). This tripartite division reoccurs in other classes, accordingly partitioning the middle class between academic primary school teachers, and small time merchants\(^{21}\). The inner relationships between these fractions of respectively the middle and the upper class are similar - homologous. Bourdieu underscores here that one can only discern the differences between the two sets of fractions if one takes into account *both* dimensions of (this) so-

\(^{20}\) Foregoing for the moment the problems inherent in making use of a concept as unqualified and vague as that of an upper, middle or lower class.

\(^{21}\) Bourdieu surmises that a similar difference exists at the lower classes, but the data available for the study at hand did not allow this to be further examined (Bourdieu & De Saint-Martin 1976:15 n.16)
cial space: If one examines only the structural composition of their capital, the professors can barely be told apart from the primary school teachers - and looking only at the volume of capital leaves us with the rough social classes, lumping professors and industry managers together. Bourdieu thus demonstrates that incorporating two dimensions in the conception of social space reveal several similar structures related (here) to the horizontal dimension, but separated by the vertical dimension. The separation of classes (along the vertical dimension of capital volume) into fractions (along the horizontal dimension of capital composition) creates a depiction of homologous sets of class fractions.

While the partition along the vertical axis corresponds roughly to the notion of social class, a similar partition along the horizontal axis provides an equally important socially active ordering, that of social fields. In the leftmost side of the graph, both professors and teachers are located, within an educational/academic field. Ascension inside this field is largely reliant upon cultural capital, in particular in objectified form, as educational credentials. In the opposite right side of the space, where economic capital predominates, the means of ascension are closely linked to acquisition of economic capital. Thus the means of social ascension or “mobility”, as it were, are dependent upon what region of social space - field, one is studying. The relations between class-fractions within each field are organised by their own principle of dominance, in accordance with the forms of capital prevalent within each field, and these vertical relations of dominance within the field are what constitutes the relative autonomy of fields; a specific group of agents, closely positioned in a sub-part of social space, possessed of a specific logic of practice and valorization of capital. This multidimensional conception of mobility gives rise to the notion of transversal mobility - social mobility that cannot be seen by relating it to classes, but which must be understood as related to fields.

The relations of dominance in social space are also organised in (here) two dimensions: the (vertical) dominance of classes with more capital over those that have less, and the (horizontal) domination of economic capital over cultural. This is the first aspect of social space, wherein Bourdieu employs the principle of homology, to understand social distinction: the similarity of relations between class fractions in similar position of dominance along either axis. At a later point in Bourdieu's oeuvre, this principle is formulated thus:

"...the practices or goods associated with the different classes in the different areas of practice are organized in accordance with structures of opposition which are homologous to one another, because they are all homologous to the to the structure of objective opposition between class conditions.” (Bourdieu 1984:175)
Yet, as each field is structured differently, by different forms of capital, the actions of each agent is also precipitated by the specific forms of perception and appraisal within the fields. Thus Bourdieu abandoned the notion of interest as a means of understanding agent’s actions, instead employing the term illusio, to describe the fact that actions are lead by a wish to “play the game of the field”, to strive for what is seen as valuable within that field, in the ways known to be legitimate, within that field. This revised notion of interest perceives interest as all-permeating features of our life, but always shaped in accordance with some field.

### 2.2.2 Capital

So far I have made use of the notion of *Capital* without specifying what this concept entails. In one famous paper Bourdieu explains the notion as follows:

“Capital is accumulated labour (in its materialized form or its “incorporated,” embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e., exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labour.” (Bourdieu 1986:241)

Capital is the notion by which social differences endure in social space. Capital persists, incorporated and objectified, and delimits the possible practices for the agent. While both the term and the notion of a medium of interchange originates with economy, Bourdieu generalises the terms beyond the realm of monetary exchanges. Besides economical capital, Bourdieu proposes two other central forms of capital: cultural capital, and social capital. Social capital refers to the agents membership of dominant social groups, and thus the network of relation the agents is able to make use. In the present study, I will make no use of this concepts. Cultural capital, on the contrary, is a central notion in my research. Cultural capital may be either embodied, objectified or institutionalised. Embodied cultural capital takes the form of dispositions, acquired as manner of speech, behaviour, and thought. Cultural capital may also be objectified, in the form of cultural products, the selection and acquisition of which is guided by the embodied cultural capital, such acquisition necessitating both an economic and a symbolic(i.e. cultural) work of acquisition. Finally cultural capital may be institutionalised, whereby embodied cultural capital acquired through education is sanctioned as e.g. academic qualifications. This institutionalization on the one hand guarantees the specific cultural capital, endowing it with a durability beyond what embodied and objectified cultural capital possesses, and on

---

22 This notion of interest is the subject of an extended discussion in Bourdieu(1994c)
the other hand entrenches a gap between what may be infinitesimal differences (e.g. between those who obtain a specific grade point average, and those who do not) - a gap that becomes a socially important distinction.

Cultural capital cannot easily be transferred, unlike economic capital which parents may simply bequeath on their children. The transfer of cultural capital requires a labour of symbolic inculcation, which I shall return to in section 2.2.4 on habitus below.

Different forms of capital may be converted into each other, but how and whether this is possible depends upon the field in which such conversion is attempted. The SSPSE training this study is concerned with, is an example of one such attempt at converting heterogenous sets of capital into an institutionalised form of cultural capital, an issue I shall explore extensively in chapters 5 to 10.

A final refinement concerns the possibility of capital to function as symbolic capital. In so far as any form of capital is recognised - within a particular field - as an indicator of a dominant position, it is functioning as symbolic capital. Such dominance is as aspect of the specific relations between that field’s agents, their habitus being a “socially constituted cognitive capacity” (op.cit. p.253) by which they recognise such symbolic vestments of dominance, incognizant of the misrecognition of such arbitrary dominance as legitimate

2.2.3 Homologies Between Spaces

The citation on homologies and class stems from “Distinction”, a study which completely revolves around another aspect of social homologous relations. The study is subtitled “A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste” - and it is the very proposition that taste should be socially structured, which hinges upon the concept of homology. Bourdieu throughout this work considers the relations between lifestyles as homologous to the relations between social positions. One extensive examination is concerned with food. Here Bourdieu constructs a space of food preferences, organised by the opposition between delicate/lean/refined/light versus salty/fatty/heavy/cheap/nourishing on one axis, and an opposition between healthy and exotic food ver-

---

23 In fact there is one other notion of capital, that I shall be using - the notion of informational capital. I shall return to this in chapter 10.

24 Strictly speaking, the point of homologies between the space of lifestyles and the space of social position is already made in Anatomie du Goût (Bourdieu 1976), and Distinction (Bourdieu 1984) is mostly an elaboration of that previous work. However, the point is explored much more in the latter work, which has come to stand as epitomising the analytical stance of Bourdieu, and for that reason, I have chosen to draw upon its more extensive concipation of homology.

25 In this case the two spaces are constituted by separate sociological interpretations/categorizations of empirical data. The data on social origin, and the data on lifestyles are treated differently in the analysis, because they are considered to be different species empirically.
sus rich, strong food and alcohol (op.cit.p.186). These two dimensions of food preferences are homologous to the dimensions of the space of social positions, respectively small versus great volume of capital, and predominantly cultural capital versus predominantly economic capital:

“Thus, the spaces defined by preferences in food, clothing or cosmetics are organized according to the same fundamental structure, that of the social space determined by volume and composition of capital” (op.cit.p.208)

and the relationship is not restricted to a similarity of structures, but also one of agents individual preferences, as the similar structure contribute to structuring the social space, by way of:

“[...]Coincidences of homologous structures and sequences, which bring about the concordance between a socially classified person, and the socially classified things or persons which ‘suit’ him [...]” (op.cit.p.241)

In short, the space of lifestyles is homologous to the space of social positions, and more generally, that the spaces of agents’ dispositions is homologous to the space of agents’ positions. This homology has been the subject of multiple re-examinations in different contexts (Rosenlund 2000, Savage et. al. 2003, Coulangeon & Lemel 2009)

At this point, the objection that Bourdieu’s analyses border on determinism is often raised. I believe that Bourdieu employs the concept of homology precise in order to avoid the pitfall of determinism, by underscoring that the similarities are not to be understood as causal, determinate relationships, but rather as concomitant evidence that an underlying social organizing principle is at work:

“The social sense is guided by the system of mutually reinforcing and infinitely redundant signs of which each body is the bearer - clothing, pronunciation, bearing, posture, manners - and which, unconsciously registered, are the basis of ‘antipathies’ or ‘sympathies’; the seemingly most immediate ‘elective affinities’ are always partly based on the unconscious deciphering of expressive features, each of which only takes on its meaning and value within the system of its class variations[...]” (Bourdieu 1984:241)

This social sense is what Bourdieu theoretical examines as the concept of habitus.

2.2.4 Habitus

The concept of habitus has been the subject of numerous exegeses, at least two in Denmark alone (Callewaert 1994, Munk 1999), and for that reason alone, attempting a short defining explanation of the concept is somewhat pointless.
Nonetheless as one can argue that it is precisely the notion of habitus by which Bourdieu transcends the structure-agency-problem of sociology, it does require some specific attention. Callewaert (loc.cit) explores numerous works of Bourdieu in order to establish a coherent and comprehensive conceptualization of habitus. I have chosen to proceed from one such specification of habitus, and compare it to the discussions made in Bourdieus general theory of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990).

In an examination of the scientific field (Bourdieu 1976), the scientific habitus is specified as follows:"

“...systèmes de schèmes générateurs de perception, d’appréciation et d’action qui sont le produit d’une forme spécifique d’action pédagogique et qui rendent possible le choix des objets, la solution des problèmes et l’évaluation des solutions” (op.cit.p.96)

This definition expounds on the most important aspect of habitus - that it is both structured and structuring. Structured in that the agents’ habitus originates in a specific social locus, and consists in an incorporation of the objective conditions prevailing at that locus, by way of pedagogic action(cf. below); structuring in that habitus provides the preconditions for the agent perceiving, appreciating and acting - which is in fact the aspects of habitus that I concluded the previous section discussing.

The production of habitus, by way of specific pedagogical action, explains how acts (of artists or of scholars) that appear effortless, as unschooled displays of bildung are in fact the enduring product of systematic work.(cf. Callewaert 1994:125) That systematic work is examined by Bourdieu & Passeron(1990) in their theory of symbolic violence, by the concepts of pedagogical action and pedagogical work27. The habitus is a product of pedagogical actions, spanning both upbringing (as what would in other theoretical frameworks be considered socialization), formal education, and non-formalized learning in all sort of social settings. While pedagogical action designates actions objectively aimed at inculcating specific meaning - culturally arbitrary, yet selected in accordance with the relation of dominance(op.cit.§1.1 and §1.2). Pedagogical work describes the fact that such action must take place repeatedly over an extended period of time, in order to produce

“a durable training, ie. a habitus the product of internalization of the principles of a cultural arbitrary capable of perpetuating itself [...and] of perpetuating in practices the principles of the internalized arbitrary.”(op.cit.§3)

26 [Systems of schemata generating perception, appreciation and action, [the systems being] the product of a specific form of pedagogic action, enabling the choice of objects, of solutions for problem, and the evaluation of [such] solutions.] My translation.

27 Action pédagogique and travail pédagogique, respectively.
Thus the habitus produced by the agent's immersion in specific pedagogical relations enables the agent to reproduce the cultural arbitrary as social practices. Thereby the agent's history of social displacements is encapsulated in his/her habitus, incorporated as the social practices adapted to the social conditions prevalent at the position the agent occupied, and expressed as practices shaped by the modes of perception, appreciation and action - by the habitus of the agent, as it were. And the primary pedagogical work, which is to say the first pedagogical work the agent is exposes to, is the strongest, and any subsequent pedagogical work has a greater efficacy the more closely it resembles the cultural arbitrary of the primary pedagogical work. (op.cit. §3.3, §3.3.1)

It is important to recall that not all forms of meaning are made the object of pedagogical work. This is - in part - the topic of another large-scale empirical study by Bourdieu, “The State Nobility” (Bourdieu 1996). One relevant analytical point from this study, is that the field of institutions of higher education is organized by a double structural homology(op.cit.p.136): first a homology between the prestigious grand écoles opposed to the less prestigious educational institutions, and the upper bourgeoisie opposed to the petty bourgeoisie. And second, the homology between the intellectual schools opposed to the establishment schools “...and the opposition within the field of power between the intellectual or artistic pole and the pole of economic or political power.”(ibid.). The field of higher educational institutions thus spanned by an axis of prestige, and an axis opposing cultural and economic-political clout recalls the construction of social space in general as discussed initially in this section, illustrating the fact that the educational system reproduces the social space. The cultural arbitrary dominating the educational system is that which corresponds the most with the objective interest of the social dominant group(Bourdieu & Passeron 1990: §1.3, §2.1), and each educational institution encapsulates the objective interests of the social group, class or fraction most closely associated with that institution, by way of homologous positions. And thus, habitus is at the centre of the concept of social homologies, being the principle from which homologies are derived (Callewaert 1997:85).

28 Another point could be made here, namely whether the structure of all fields are homologous to the structure of the social space as analysed initially in this section. Precisely put, are all field structured by respectively structural composition of capital, and volume of capital? This claim is forcefully argued by Munk(Munk 1999:45f.), but it would seem to me that in doing so, one claims an invariance of social space and fields that allows for very little change and dynamics.

29 Strictly speaking, I am skipping the step of what pedagogical agencies are endowed with the power to perform pedagogical actions - which Bourdieu and Passeron analyses by the concept of pedagogical authority(Bourdieu & Passeron 1990: §2ff.)
Finally, the differences between fields relate to the habitus fostered within each field, and encompasses both fundamental assumptions about the relative value of different forms of capital, and the schemata of perception and action within the field. These common features of the field are also termed nomos and illusio by Bourdieu - the nomos being the fundamental principles of perception of value, and illusio being the agents’ investments in the stakes of the field as prescribed by its nomos. For example, the nomos of the academic field emphasizes intellectual virtues rather than economic. The relative academic merit of any academic endeavour is perceived according to intellectual criteria, rather than economic. And thus the agent wishing to participate in the academic field must stake his investments accordingly. The concept of illusio is the act of investing oneself in accordance with the nomos of the field - playing the academic game by the academic rules, so to speak. But the ability to correctly perceive and strategically adapt to the nomos, and consequently whether the agent subscribes to or abandons the game (illusio) is related to whether the agents’ habitus is at variance or in accordance with the field.

2.2.5 Homologies of Position

Returning now to the specific exploration of homologies, I will discuss a third aspect of homologies, that of homologous positions in different fields. In his study of French academia, Bourdieu analyses what constitutes academic power and capital, thus maps out the French academic field. What concerns us here is one specific aspect of his analysis, that of exploring how the structure of the academic field relates to the stance adopted in relation to the students rebellion (for lack of a better term) in Paris, May 1968. Bourdieu here turns his attention to the alliances between certain social groups:

“...the subordinate intellectuals and artist tend to produce forms of perception, appreciation and expression liable to impress themselves on other subordinate groups through homology of position.” (Bourdieu 1988:179)

In other words, the solidarity between the subordinate academics, and the working class relates to the dominated position of both within their separate fields. Thus, homologous positions are an important part of understanding how different social groups relate to each other, particularly when it comes to the struggles within each field.

The events of May 1968 in Paris relate to a crisis of reproduction within the academic field, but is in fact just a more dramatic instance of what takes place in any field - a struggle of fractions belonging to the field about symbolic dominance - power relations. In the case of the academic field, various forms of
capital are related to different positions within the field (op.cit. p. 80), the number of citations (by citation index) is shown to be related to faculty, indicating that different valorizations of citations, is related to position in the academic field. The valorizations subscribed to by the dominant groups are expressed as *doxa*, and consequently the dominated groups attempts at influencing the field in favour of their own forms of capital are termed *heterodoxical*. Taking part in such struggles, concerned with what constitutes doxa within the field, is what comprises *illusio*.

### 2.2.6 Homology and Field

The above explorative detour through the various studies and theoretical concepts of Bourdieu can be summed up as follows. I have listed four species of homologies

- Homologous relations between the fractions making up different classes, but belonging to the same social field(s)
- Homologous relations between groups belonging to different fields, but in similar position as dominant/dominated
- Homologies between different fields, with incongruent nomos, yet similar structuring principles
- Homologies between empirical spaces

The homologies *all* hinge upon the structuring effect of habitus (and thus, are all aspects of the same properties of social space), yet the relative autonomy of each field, the distinct objective interest of each class, the struggles in each field of the different groups within it, and the different habitus of each agent all contributes different and distinct dynamics to the reproduction of social space.

### 2.2.7 Design Implications

The homologies described above make up this study’s point of departure, in terms of empirical design. The concept of experience and social biography equates the genealogy of the social educator students’ habitus, and that habitus is the keystone, upon which the social interaction within the domains of social education pivots. The empirical design of this study thus tries to examine how the habitus of the students differs, by way of their social trajectories, and individual biographies, and how these differences are exposed in classroom interaction. The Bourdieuan notion of capital is, as noted previously, a way of describing how differences in individual social biographies come to be accu-
mulated as socially pertinent distinctions. In short, the social practice of SSPSE students manifests the different pathways taken by students, in that such different pathways equates different compositions of capital and different social sedimentation in habitus. These differences shape the student space, yet they are not perceived as neither social history nor social work.

I base my empirical work on the assumption of homologies by way of the habitus of the students, as I assume that

- Similar trajectories (as revealed in the geometric data analysis) implies similar habitus, and similar capital composition
- Habitus connects the students classroom strategies, and general educational strategies
- Biographical narratives allow for examining both the students’ capital possession and current habitus, and the educational strategies employed by this student.
- Group interviews with students possessing different trajectories put into confrontation specific differing educational strategies, allowing glimpses of the doxic struggles of the domains

Thus, the theoretical connections discussed in section 2.1 are the assumption of the existence of homologies between students pathway leading to the SSPSE, and their student practices. In the preface to “The Weight of the World” (Bourdieu 1999) Bourdieu states that one cannot understand the agent’s point of view, i.e. the position in social space, unless one understands as well the social conditions under which this point of view came to be. The student as object of analysis is thus reconstructed by my design as an empirical double objectivation: respectively an objectivation of the position occupied by the student in the social space, and the historical trajectory embedded in the students social biography, and an objectivation of the practices of the student.

2.3 Combining Methods

In complicated research designs, one must be wary of numerous pitfalls. One of the more subtle ones is what Ian Parker calls methodolatry: when research questions lose precedence over the design and method of the study,
making the method the actual object of study - and both the research questions and research object superfluous. As my design involves a perhaps not unique, but certainly neither textbook standard method combination, it will be necessary to examine the interaction and integration of these methodological modes - but the object is not to make the methodology central as such. The danger of succumbing to methodolatry is especially present in the case of Multiple Correspondence Analysis and of Biographical interviews, both of which are specific and contested positions of methodology, in a much wider field of, respectively Multivariate Statistics and Life-history Analysis. My choice of these specific position relate to my theoretical position, my construction of the research object, and, in the end, my subjective interest in posing these research questions. In order to avoid placing neither overt nor implicit excessive emphasis on methodology, I will - as noted initially - only concern myself with the relations between methods in this chapter, and postpone most discussions related to the specific deployment of each method to subsequent chapter. The following sections will then specifically deal with the problems and consequences of combining different methods. As described previously, the methodology employed in this study span most of the methodological field, encompass a number of radically different positions on the research subject, produce quite disparate sets of empirical data, and each have their own disparate theoretical comprehension of the field of study. I therefore find it necessary to examine the interconnections and integration of the methodologies and empirical products. In this section I will discuss at some length some of the positions and traditions of combining methods, and subsequently inspect how my study is related to such positions. Combining methods is often discussed under three different headings, each situated in a different cultural and historical context of science: triangulation, bricolage, and mixed methods. I will attempt to show how the issues at stake turn out to related to more fundamental epistemological assumptions, rather than characteristics of each specific tradition of combining methods, and in the end, I will propose to consider combined methodologies from an altogether different perspective.

2.3.1 Triangulation

Triangulation comes from in primarily positivist or post-positivist conceptualisation of science. It literally means attempting to study (or even measure) the same phenomena from several disparate methodological positions, and the resulting different measurements may then validate each other (Guba & Lincoln 2005). Thus the fundamental assumption is that different methods are basically
different ways of observing the same, and the *choice* of combining of methods is made with the intent to validate the outcome of the research. This position proceeds from an assumption that interviewing, observing, or whatever other method one might employ, essentially describes the object studied objectively, and leaves it unharmed: there is no interference between the measured, the measurer and the measurement, and the produce of different methods is commensurable, that is, assorted methodological tools do not produce different *species* of data. This methodological position is closely related to a positivist epistemology: That which is, is scientifically knowable as facts, and therefore objectively knowledge and scientific knowledge are synonyms.

A slightly different conception of the word has recently been advanced by Wendy Hollway and Tony Jefferson, who use it in connection with analysis, rather than combined methodology: when several researchers examine the same empirical data, they may, by comparison “...*pick up on possible false notes in the analysis...*” (Hollway & Jefferson 2000:131f.) Again, this means that triangulation is a measure against invalid research, specifically interpretations, but since the comparison no longer takes place between methods, but rather between researchers subjectivities, the implications are quite different. Two researchers examining the same material, and coming to different interpretations have not examined the accuracy of their interpretations as such, but rather themselves as instruments of interpretation, and where discrepancies appear, they must attempt to understand the origin of these. One should perhaps be a bit wary of the idea of false notes, as employed by Hollway & Jefferson, since this indicates a notion of truth (or at least not-false) in relation to interpretations - and such a notion has profound implications. However the underlying assumption is a realist one: it is the interpreter and the interpretation, which is constructed and malleable, not the actual narrative read or heard.

---

32 I am indebted to Ann Phoenix for making me aware of this usage.
33 I have, throughout my work with this project participated in numerous group settings, than can be put under the heading of analytical triangulation. However, such work is difficult to documents, and in the end, the interpretations made are mine. Thus, the Hollway & Jefferson concept of triangulation has been a useful tool in my work, but will not be discussed further, neither in relation to combined methodology, nor in analysis.
34 In any case, creating or recounting a narrative is a construction - but this construction, when considered as material for interpretation, is *not* considered malleable to interpreter intentions by Hollway & Jefferson.
2.3.2 Bricolage, pt. 1

A second position is the rather more complex notion of *bricolage*. The idea originally appears in *The Savage Thought* (Lévi-Strauss 1962) and is presented by Lévi-Strauss as the following metaphor on the researcher as *bricoleur*:

“The ‘bricoleur’ is adept at performing a large number of diverse tasks; but, unlike the engineer, he does not subordinate each of them to the availability of raw materials and tools conceived and procured for the purpose of the project. His universe of instruments is closed and the rules of his game are always to make do with ‘whatever is at hand’, that is to say with a set of tools and materials which is always finite and is also heterogeneous because what it contains bears no relation to the current project, or indeed to any particular project, but is the contingent result of all the occasions there have been to renew or enrich the stock or to maintain it with the remains of previous constructions or destructions.” (Op.cit:28)

Lévi-Strauss is concerned with the anthropologist’s problem of what manner of materials may be available at the site of research, which may obviously be both unordered available, disorganized, and difficult to fit in with strict methodological procedures. The point is, that this concept of bricolage stems from a specific appreciation of the object being studied by a particular discipline: anthropology. The contrasting point - the engineer - illustrates this. The position, Lévi-Strauss is engaging with the metaphor of Bricolage, is the assumption that research may be designed and planned at the desk; in order to do anthropology, one must rather work from the ground up, and gather up whatever one finds “according to the principle ‘this might be useful at some point’” (ibid.)

The position involved in triangulation was characterised by the uniformity of data, at the final level, which is not completely unlike the assumption of data presented by Lévi-Strauss’ *bricoleur*: all manner of data may serve as a piece of the jigsaw, which, when completed, will depict the culture being studied. Lévi-Strauss’ book is often considered to be laying a great deal of the foundations for (French) structuralism, and the notion of bricolage ties in to this: all objects found will in some way reflect the greater, underlying, dynamic structure of classifications employed by the culture studied. This idea is kin to triangulation and the idea of separate complementary methods together pinning down a phenomenon. Still, even though structuralism thus relates triangulation and bricolage, it seems fair to characterise bricolage as mostly opposed to triangulation, as it proceeds from assumptions related to the nature of *cultural life* as empirical phenomena, rather than from assumptions about knowledge and science.
2.3.3 Bricolage, pt. 2

The Levi-Straussian notion of bricolage has spawned a quite different tradition of bricolage in some American sociology and educational science. Unlike Levi-Strauss, this is not a method, but a methodological stance, most eloquently adopted and presented by Joe Kincheloe in a lecture positing bricolage as a scientific necessity in postmodernity (Kincheloe 2001). Kincheloe argues that science: “...must operate in the ruins of the temple, in a postapocalyptic social, cultural, psychological, and educational science where certainty and stability have long departed for parts unknown” (op.cit:681). This casts the researcher in the role of bricoleur, bricolaging disciplines, methods of inquiry, data of any kind, theoretical and philosophical notions. The new form of rigor in science is thus to be the rigorous adherence to interdisciplinarity, multiple avenues of inquiry etc., and the model of this form of examinations is the genealogies of Foucault (op.cit. 683)

It seems somewhat contradictory that this approach, being necessitated by an increased awareness of the dynamic and subjective nature of methodology, then can go on to state that

“Using the x-ray vision of contemporary social-theoretically informed strategies of discourse analysis, poststructural psychoanalysis, and ideology critique, the ethnographer gains the ability to see beyond the literalness of the observed. In this manoeuvre, the ethnographer-as-bricoleur moves to a deeper level of data analysis as he or she sees “what’s not there” in physical presence, what is not discernible by the ethnographic eye” (op. cit.:686)

thus ascribing the methodology of bricolage with attributes similar to those positivism ascribed to traditional scientific methods. Kincheloe’s conception of bricolage is - in this as in many other points - inspired by the work of Norman Denzin and Yvonne Lincoln, according to whom qualitative research has a particular interactive and dynamic relation to human activity:

“Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations [...] At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. [...] It is understood, however, that each practice makes the world visible in a different way. Hence there is frequently a commitment to using more than one interpretive practice in any study.” (Denzin & Lincoln 2005:3f.)
Kinzeloe’s methodology of bricolage provides such interpretative material practices, and the savoir-faire of how to combine them. Denzin and Lincoln then goes on to describe the qualitative researcher with a number of metaphors, ranging from jazz, to a lengthy extract of the montages used by Eisenstein in “Panzerkreuzer Potemkin” (Denzin & Lincoln(2005a) p.8f). The gist of these is the assumption that by employing a multitude of interpretative practices, a picture with many facets will emerge, retaining more than just a central position or conclusion, of the field studied. Perhaps equally enlightening is the following paragraph, which position qualitative research in opposition to the Scientifically Based Research(SBR) movement35 :”Under such a framework qualitative research becomes suspect. Qualitative research does not require well-defined variables or causal models. [...] Qualitative researchers do not generate “hard evidence”.”(op.cit. p.9)

It is apparent that Denzin & Lincoln find it crucial, qualitative revolution or not, to impress upon their reader the differences between qualitative research, and other kinds of research, amongst whom SBR is only an example. The war-like metaphors of Kinzeloe (ruins, aftermath, apocalypse) and Denzin & Lincolns dramatic positioning of the unique qualities of qualitative research implies, that this methodology cannot be understood separated from understanding the opposed position. That opposing position being one that does require well-defined variables, causal models, and hard evidence. In the work of Denzin & Lincoln, both mixed methods and triangulation seem likely recipients of the critique, even though quantitative methodology must bear the brunt of it. However, it is not the methodologies as such that are the target of the critique, but rather the scientific preoccupations they reveal: Concluding a passage comparing methodologies, the authors sate the current purpose of qualitative methods:

“We want a social science that is committed up front to issues of social justice, equity, nonviolence, peace, and universal human rights. We do not want a social science that says it can address these issues if it wants to.
For us, that is no longer an option.”(op.cit.:13f)

This is a clear statement of what science should be, and do, and one that goes somewhat further into the terrain of normativity, than the previously examined combinatorial methodologies do, and clearly states what ought to preoccupy researchers. Thus, this is a very clear statement of what separates Denzin & Lincolns position from that of SBR and quantitative methodology.

Even so, this is hardly a contender for a durable demarcation between quantitative and qualitative methodologies. After all, social justice and equity are

35 Which is very similar to the Danish movements of Best Practice/Evidence-Based Practice, Research, etc. in medicine and social work. See for instance The Danish Clearing House for Educational Research: http://www.dpu.dk/site.aspx?p=9882
issues that may prove difficult to even raise without quantitative methods to
demonstrate the extent of many aspects of both injustice and inequalities. It
may be more reasonable to conclude that the opponent of Denzin, Lincoln
and Kincheloe is the tradition of purely descriptive neutral science, rather than the
methodology of that position.
This second iteration of bricolage is thus an attempt to at the same time oppose
specific hierarchies of methodologies, raise particular political issues, and aban-
don objectivist ideals of science. Thus the recent bricolage position seems to
reiterate arguments previously made for qualitative research supplanting quan-
titative research in American social research. Concurrently, a similar translation
of the arguments in favour of quantitative research has occurred under the
heading of Mixed Methods, as discussed in the following section.

2.3.4 Mixed Methods

Mixed methods is an recent attempt to develop a paradigmatic stance on all
the previously discussed issues of combining methods. There has recent been
a great publishing activity with this heading, most notably a journal (Journal
of Mixed Methods Research, published by Sage from 2007), a reference hand-
book (Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research by
Tashakkori and Teddlie ) and a flurry of other publications. This development
represents an attempt to bridge the gap that is often perceived to be between
qualitative and quantitative methods and methodologies.
The actual definition of Mixed Methods is itself a contested issue, to the extent
that actual research has been carried out, trying to examine the breadth of the
definitions (Burke Johnson et.al. 2007). The definition this study reaches is this:
“Mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or
team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative
research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints,
data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of
breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration.”(op.cit. 122)
Whereas a concurrent textbook (Creswell and Clark 2006) employs the follow-
ing definition, which attempts to contain both method and methodology:
“Mixed methods research is a research design with philosophical assump-
tions as well as methods of inquiry. [...] it involves philosophical assump-
tions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and
the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many of the
phases in the research process. As a method, it focuses collecting, analyz-
ing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study
or series of studies. Its central premise is that the use of a quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone." (op.cit. 5)

Along the way, both of these definitions attempts to subsume all previous historical instances of combining methods under their heading. This seems to me to be an attempt to legitimize a current position by retroactively providing it with a long history and tradition. As my previous discussion of bricolage and triangulation points out, these positions are sited in specific disciplinary, methodical or historical conditions. The epistemological differences between the various positions discussed above would be de-emphasised or entirely cancelled out by such an endeavour.

Which of these definitions - if any - one should canonize is a matter of deciding whether methodology should, or must, be considered embedded in method or not. Leaving aside for now the question of whether qualitative/quantitative is truly a central distinction of methodologies, I would argue that the latter definition (by Creswell and Clark) presumes that the very combination of qualitative and quantitative methodology in itself involves methodological assumptions not involved in using either methodology alone. This is not entirely self-evident, and bears further examination. According to Creswell and Clark the arguments in favour of mixing methods are as follows (op.cit 9f.):

1. Mixing methods allow the strengths of quantitative and qualitative methods to offset each others respective weaknesses.
2. Using all manner of data and methods allows for much stronger evidence in research, than qualitative or quantitative approaches can provide alone.
3. Mixed methods can answer questions than are out of reach of either qualitative or quantitative approaches alone.
4. Mixed methods encourage collaboration across the adversarial gaps engendered by the opposition between qualitative and quantitative approaches.
5. Mixed methods encourage the use of multiple “world views” or paradigms.
6. Mixed approaches the world in a practical manner, using whatever form of data or approach is deemed sensible by the nature of the object of research.

Looking at this list, an immediate observation is that the opposition between qualitative and quantitative methods is taken for granted. And even more im-
portant, this opposition is extended to encompass both the nature and purpose of research (bullet 2) and the nature of reality (bullet 3). The list may be summarized by saying that this approach understands reality to be a mixture of quantitative and qualitative *phenomena*, and research therefore has to embrace both these dimensions, each by adequate methods, in order to grasp, comprehend and depict reality successfully. Creswell & Clark next provides a taxonomy of mixed method designs, based on the sequence of qualitative and quantitative methods, and the manner in which findings from one method is applied in the other.

This understanding of both methods and methodology is skipping perhaps the most important step in methodological deliberation, *the construction of the object of research*. In the terms I set up in presenting my own design previously, Creswell & Clark allows only for empirical connections between methods. Since “world views” and research questions are related to methods, and methods are chosen in accordance with the nature of the researched object, theoretical and analytical connections simply mirror connections in the nature of said object: such connections belong under the heading research findings, rather than design. Yet in their very use of the word nature, lies hidden any number of theoretical and analytical assumptions. Hodkinson and Macleod (2007) approach precisely the problem of preconstructing the object of researching a discussion of conceptualization, claiming that researchers’ differing concepts of “Learning” tend to bias them towards certain methodological choices. Three concepts of “learning” - acquisition, participation, or construction - appear to have affinities with certain methods, respectively quantitative studies, ethnographical fields studies, and individual life stories/interviews. In other words, the choice of methods depends on the theory of learning employed.

Nonetheless, the inarguable opposition and incommensurability of quantitative and qualitative methods persists and seems to pervade the position of Mixed Methods, inversely reflecting the intent to bridge the quantitative-qualitative gap, by insisting that the gap is in fact real. The constructions of mixed methods precipitate assumptions about the nature of research objects and the nature of methods, and these epistemological positions I suspect to be inherited from the American discussions of quantitative and qualitative social science.

### 2.3.5 Cross-Over Methodology

The positions discussion on how methodologies can be combined can now be seen to possess exceedingly different underlying epistemological agendas.
The original concept of triangulation attempted at completing a picture by performing different methodological measurements, as it were, of the object of research - the different measurements thus validating each other. Similarly, the Mixed Method position attempts to reveal more of a phenomena, by deploying methods matching diverse aspects of the nature of the object of research. These positions share assumptions of an underlying identifiable nature of the object of research.

The bricolage positions abandon such assumptions trying instead to adapt to the dynamical production of meaning in cultural products and social practice.

The underlying epistemological projects are quite different, and are, as proposed above, reminiscent of earlier quantitative-qualitative debates. One might ask, if not both mixed methods and the bricolage positions share the assumptions that

1. methods are possessed of original intentions, and
2. methods have “a natural home” (Denzin & Lincoln 2005:9) - a particular habitat of research purposes, which corresponds to the original intentions of the method.

Yet I would propose that such associations between methods, intentions and areas of research relate closer to researcher proclivities than to any essential nature of the methods. That is not to say that some methods may not be more suitable for one purpose than another36, only that one cannot derive intent and purpose from neither methodology nor object alone.

This indicates that the actual issue of disagreement neither lies in methodology nor in manners of codifying data, but rather in the purpose of social science. If one replaces the notions of qualitative and quantitative methods with the corresponding operations of data manipulation - respectively categorisation (noting difference) and registration (noting presence), it becomes apparent that both are necessary in order to perform any analytical operations in any research. If one were take seriously the challenge of how to combine methodologies adept at registering presence with those adept at categorising differences, one would attempt to apply a categorising gaze to the products of a registrating method and vice versa. Such an approach I would term cross-over methodology, as it would attempt to fuse the different emphases of methods at the empirical level.

The paramount demands such research faces, is making underlying assumptions clear, and their impact on the design, analysis, and scope of the research. I have previously (section 2.1) attempted at making precisely the analytical connections within my research design explicit, and the underlying theoretical assumption guiding the design is the assumption of homological relations 36

Indeed, I previously made precisely that argument for quantitative methodologies in relation to social injustice and equity.
discussed in section 2.2. In the terms proposed above, this study is more generally based on the assumption that no one method can succinctly both register and categorize the aspects of the SSPSE students’ positions and dispositions, as sought by the research question. But this is not a feature of the methods themselves, but rather a feature of the underlying theory of homologies. For that reason, any limits in the scope and its apprehension of the field should be related to that theoretical stance, rather than the methods. I will thus conclude this chapter with a discussion on how these aspects limit the scope of the possible conclusions of this study.

2.4 The Scope and the Limits of this Study

Concluding this chapter on methodology, I will discuss how the methodological decisions presented above limits the scope of this study. I have chosen the specific aspects commented upon in the following using two rough criteria: Firstly, those limitations which are very specific when compared to the terms I use - these include the concept of point of view, and the concept of experience. Secondly, those which are, based on my suspicions alone, likely to differ from the expectations teachers, students and professionals within the domain of social education are likely to possess. The points made below to some extent repeat points made in chapter 1 on the ostensible studies, but here in reference to the methodological discussions above.

2.4.1 Experience and Subjectivity

The students enrolled at the SSPSE differ from the students enrolled in the ordinary social educator training most importantly by having five years or more of practical work social educational experience. Such experience could be described as being familiar with numerous practical everyday aspects of the work, and as well as being familiar with the codes and values permeating the field. These experiences may also consist in having experienced and learned how to cope with the social conditions and emotional pressures commonly explored in studies discussing the work of social educators. Yet neither concept of experience plays any part in this study. The concepts of capital and habitus implies a specific socially contextual understanding of how the time spent in social educational work can be understood: as historical sedimentation of symbolic meaning and social practice, that - while surely endowing the possessor with
the ability to function socially in the field - is primarily socially active being mis-recognised as the nature of the field rather than specific arbitrary social conditions. Thus, this study will not attempt at delving into what knowledge or skills transfers from social educational practice and into the educational setting, nor if and how such skills are transformed or advanced during the training.

2.4.2 The Points of View of the Students and Teachers

The point of view of students is a highly contended point in evaluations of social educator training (Svejgaard 2006), and in the very small number of studies made within the training (cf. Chapter 3 for detailed discussion on these). The issues raised are commonly whether the training serves the purpose it is in fact meant to serve, that of qualifying students for social educational work, and whether the level of academic challenges in the training is sufficient, or too lenient. While I will be analysing such statements and discussions in this study, I will no be doing so with reference to any actual demands teachers or students might impose on the training. Rather, I will be considering the dispersion of such points of view as student dispositions, and relate them mainly to the analysis of homologies. Thus the questions I pose to such opinions will be rather that of what sort of students holds which opinions, rather than whether the student is assessing the training sensibly or not. Going into the actual assessments made by my informants - teachers as well as students - means entering into the ongoing struggles that define social educator training, rather than analysing what social framework such struggles are being shaped by.

2.4.3 Being A Good Student/Teacher/Social Educator

This is more or less an extension of the point made in the previous section: neither the design, nor the research questions are in fact concerned with what may legitimately be the most pressing questions for the agents occupying the field I am studying. My study is likely to be read by social educator teachers, students and graduates, yet neither of these will find that I am in fact proposing to answer whether the SSPSE currently provides adequate training for the job as social educator, nor what quality the training current contains, nor whether students are learning what they will find they need the most when graduating. While such concerns are both sensible and important to working in the fields, they are also be necessity shaped by the very relations I wish to discern as homologous. The very notion of good, or adequate training relies on specific assumptions about the purpose of the training, and allying myself with such
assumptions explicitly restricts my ability to analyse the social conditions under which such assumptions arise. That is however not to say that I do not hold an opinion of the purpose of the training, and the needs of profession and students. These however, belong under the heading of researcher subjectivity, and is specifically addressed in each of the methodological sections.

2.4.3 Planning Social Educator Training

One final point concerns the geometric data analysis of the SSPSE student population. While this substudy is concerned with the characteristics of that population, the result of the analysis is not compared to the current curricular or didactic planning of the SSPSE. While there is undoubtedly a potential for rethinking the SSPSE and adapt it to the population as I examine it, I have not made any attempts at doing so, nor in preparing the findings for such interpretations. The analytical ambition of exploring homologies between the social distinctive differences of the population of students, and the classroom practices does not permit a concurrent analysis of which students the training currently inhibits or supports.

The above reservations none withstanding, my findings may well inspire students and teachers alike to new ideas about the training and I believe that such inspiration is a welcome byproduct of this study. It has simply not been my goal and it is a goal at cross purposes with my analytical ambition, at that.
This chapter concerns itself with social education, social educator training and the social educator profession. In order to discuss the relative position of social educator training within the educational system, the internal dynamics of the training, and the social context the students find themselves situated in, I will be examining a number of studies done on social educators and social education in this chapter. My primary concern will be to elucidate the social educator training, and the relationship between this, the organisation of the training, and the professionals themselves, in order to provide a general context for the analysis in the following chapters.

In the terms used by Muel-Dreyfus in a methodological lecture (Muel-Dreyfus 1986) I will in this chapter attempt to explore the structural features of social educator training, stemming from the history of the institution. In most Bourdieuan studies this undertaking constitutes a separate historical-empirical endeavour in itself, I have chosen - due to time and space constraints - to synthesize the results of numerous Danish studies. While this on the one hand reduces my empirical workload, it also involves combining the findings of numerous researchers whose epistemological positions by no means jibe with each other. The upside is that to my knowledge many of these studies have never been compared before.

The chapter initially presents the many groups of informants, sites and frames of reference of these studies. It then goes on to discuss the findings of these studies, proceeding from the unskilled care and nursery assistants, to the history of the profession and the training including an extended discussion of classroom, and finally studies on the professional status of social educators and professional debut.
A fundamental point of definition, which often takes up much attention in studies of professions inspired by Bourdieu is the relationship between social educators and social space. Commonly this relation would be explored in terms of whether social education is a field or not. I do not hold with this approach. The questions I try to answer with this study, (and, indeed, this chapter) are empirical questions. Attempting to determine whether a profession, or a form of training, satisfies a theoretical definition is not, in my opinion, a fruitful way of approaching ones empirical object. As will become apparent from the discussions in this chapter, social educator training is positioned between education and a complex field of welfare professionals - the latter field skirting numerous other professions and areas of expertise (see Brodersen 2009 for an thorough discussion of this field). Exploring whether social education possesses any relative autonomy outside of either of these fields, or its own logic requires extensive empirical examinations, and the outcome does not appear to justify such an endeavour. I have chosen to skip the entire discussion of the field-wise nature of social education, and instead refer to social educator training as a part of social space bordering of two sub-regions of different fields: A region of the field of education, which I will term the domain of social educator training, and a region of this more elusive field of welfare, which I will term the domain of social education. The word domain is intended to underscore the fact that I am talking about two limited parts of social space; although I abandon trying to locate the precise lines of demarcation, the part of the field of education which is concerned with social education is limited. In my opinion, it is equally certain that the field of education and the field of welfare are incongruent. Thus, the NISE are sited in two domains of social space - with all that this implies in Bourdieuan optics - which are pertinent to the agents of my research, and the social practices of the agents must be examined in relation to both domains.

3.1 Subjects, Sites and Frames of Reference.
Social education is perhaps one of the most trans-illuminated professions in Denmark. At the time of writing, more than 100 ph.d. projects alone concerning social education are under way. An even larger number of state subsidized development projects are taking place, and of course a number of research programs at various departments at most Danish universities concern themselves with various aspects of social education as well37. The by far largest swathe of

37 The numbers of these projects are literally too large to be assessed properly. A list of ongoing research published in 2007 ran to 32 pages - listing only project headings, dates and researchers responsible.
this immense field I will outright ignore: the research concerned with developing tools, methods or better directions for specific social educational practices. The subset of research into social education I will discuss in the following, consists of studies dealing with the following three institutional frames of reference:

- social educator recruitment and training,
- social educator professionalisation, and
- the transition from training to professional social educator.

I have thus chosen to focus this summary of current research on social educators rather than research on social education. Such a dichotomy is untenable on any but the most general levels - after all, it claims to separate the practice and the agent completely. Still, as the amount of research in this field beggars belief, some a priori criterion of relevance is necessary. This study neither contains nor concerns actual social educator professional practice, and this is reflected in the selection of research discussed in the following. These studies have been sited in different ways, and have also been performed with different sets of informants. The sites include research conducted in the NISE, and in social educational institutions - the latter encompassing both social educational practice per se, and social educator students’ work practice. The informants vary between social educator students, teachers at NISE, social educators and finally social educators and other employees in social educational institutions.

The following discussion of research on social educators is in part structured by these sites and agents, and the rough chronological organisation that the students’ trajectories impose upon them:

Initially many applicants for the SSPSE have worked as care assistants or other forms of unskilled labour in social educational institutions. As they enroll in the SSPSE, they become students at a NISE, and meet teachers. About halfway through their second term they spend three months in work practice, whereupon they return to the NISE. After two more years of part-time study, they complete their training, and begin working as fully-fledged social educators in social educational institutions. However, the discussion of the current reforms of the NISE cannot be separated from the discussion of the profes-

---

38 Such studies include e.g. research into childrens nutrition, in order to develop nutritional tools for use in social educational institutions, or research into scolding, and how to avoid it as a social educator. While such best-practice studies are in general on the rise(Moos et.al. 2005) the fact that they concern themselves mainly with what social educators should or should not do relegates them to the sphere of social educational practice, unlike the studies concerned with how social educators are trained, and their current practices.

39 I will not be discussing this part of the training since these studies fit under the heading of research into practice rather than into training, but also because an exhaustive discussion of these studies requires also exploring the demands and culture of social educational work, which goes well beyond the scope of this study.
sional status of social educators, and thus this is discussed in relation to the discussion of the history of the NISE. An interesting point is that while there is little research on the classroom training part of social educator training, there is no such lack of studies enquiring into the work practice part of the training. This hints at a possible parallel structure of which facets of social educators have been studied the most, and how social educators are perceived as professionals, a point I shall return to.

3.2 Unskilled Social Educational Workers

All SSPSE students must meet a requirement of five years or more of work experience from social educational settings. In fact, SSPSE was in part instituted in an attempt to train the large number of unskilled workers in the social educational domain. It would thus make sense to consider what characterises these unskilled workers in general. No such study is immediately available, in part due to the heterogenous character of the area. One group which has however received some attention is the nursery and childcare assistants, perhaps in part because they are unionised in The Danish Union of Nursery and Childcare Assistants (PMF), a union all of their own. While one could conceivably go through various other sub-groups of typical targets of recruitment, for example the social and health assistants, most of these make up small fractions of the students enrolled at the SSPSE, share union with others groups, and no data are available on which subsets of them are later to be found within the domain of social education. As the composition of the students at the SSPSE is the topic of Chapter 6-7 in this thesis, I will return consider the other groups of students at that point. However, with the above caveat, research into the nursery and childcare assistants does provide a glimpse of both the working life of future students at the SSPSE, and the motivation for enrolling.

3.2.1 Nursery and Childcare Assistants

My point of departure in this respect is a large study commissioned by The Danish Union of Nursery and Childcare Assistants (Bryderup et. al. 2000). This study surveyed the population of nursery and childcare assistants, and their working conditions, and from a sample of 899 day nurseries obtained answers from more than 2000 nursery and childcare assistants.
The central finding of the survey is the age-related stratification of the population. Three aspects in particular relate to age: The fraction of male childcare assistants decreases sharply with age - while one in three assistants under 25 years is male, only one in fifty assistants above 50 years of age is male. Similarly, when asked what they expect to be doing in three years, 94% of the 2 years or younger assistants expect to be somewhere else, 82% of them expecting to undertake some form of education. Conversely, 85% of the assistants above 50 expect to remain in their current position for the next three years. And (perhaps unsurprisingly) age in general corresponds with increased seniority, the older assistants having held their current position for longer.

From these differences, the study establishes four different profiles, bound up on age intervals, labelling them as follows:

- **Students passing through** (< 25),
- **To stay or to go?** (25 to 34),
- **Stability and responsibility** (35 to 50) and finally
- **That's it...** (> 50).

And as the labels indicate, the two younger are very concerned with their future career and employment, whereas the two older segments consider these choices to have been made. The youngest group is by far the higher educated - 72% of these assistants possess either an Upper 2nd school leaving examination, or a Higher Preparatory examination, compared to just 36% in the entire survey. As age increases, the percentage of assistants with a preparatory secondary examination decreases, while the percentage with some form of vocational training increases.

The study terms these differences as hints of turmoil and break-up in the younger strata of assistants, whereas the older strata have established themselves as satisfied and stable - and not planning to educate themselves further. A larger percentage of the older assistants also state that they are responsible for making decisions and planning the social educational work - but also that they do not desire any responsibility beyond what they have obtained by now. Obtaining such responsibility may, however, in fact require the assistant to train as a social educator, and it is hard to say which is the determining factor.

The theme of whether or not the assistants want more responsibility thus appears to relate to their desire to train as social educators. As the SSPSE was intended to cater specifically towards assistants such as the ones in this survey, it seems an important finding that the desire for further training within their field of work peaks in youth, diminishes sharply once the students are around 35 years, and is more or less unrelated to seniority. While one can assume this to be related both family and economy, it ties in closely with aspects of the divi-
sion of labour between the social educators and the assistants found in other research I shall turn attention to presently.

3.2.2 The Assistants and the Social Educational Work

One important study of the division of labour is the Ph.D. thesis of Bent Olsen (Olsen 2007), which explores whether there exists a hierarchy between social educators and assistants in day nurseries. This study is based on interviews and observations of four assistants in day nurseries, put into a context of by quantitative data on the background of nursery and childcare assistants, and discourse analysis of texts produced in the institutions studied. Olsen proposes two hypotheses: first, that the division of labour in day nurseries assigns symbolic and social tasks primarily to the social educators, whereas the assistants are assigned physical and bodily tasks. Second, that the assistants make up the bottom rung of the hierarchy of work in day nurseries. Olsen finds that while there are situations where formalised rules within the day nurseries excludes the assistants from a number of tasks and thus places them at the lowest level of responsibilities, these are exceptions which are related to seniority and not to any formal hierarchy of education. There is no line of demarcation in the daily work between the responsibilities of the trained social educators and the unskilled workers. The activities observed by Olsen are not hierarchical but rather structured by three roles: manager, assisting person, and audience. All three of these roles are occupied with equal frequency by assistants and social educators, and Olsen finds no discernable hierarchies related to neither symbolic or social tasks, nor related to knowledge. The quantitative data supports these findings in that Olsen finds only few differences between the population of social educators and assistants, the lower average age of the assistants being the key difference. A further part of this study considers the nurturing practices of the assistants, and their relation to the poles of correction and intimacy. Olsen finds that the assistants tend to maintain a positional relationship to the children, correcting and acting upon their actions, producing order. This differs to some extent from the social educators practice, which seems more related to the child as a person. It also appears that the assistants more frequently interact with the children.

40 The data used stem from Bryderup (2000) and Gytz Olesen (2005a) and I discuss them when considering these studies themselves.

41 This is also found in Nørregård-Nielsen (2006), where a survey of parents with children in day nurseries indicated that the parents seldom are able to discern any difference between assistants and social educators.

42 Both these findings recall notions of control found in the work of Bernstein, as discussed in chapter 12. The specific consideration of social educators’ control targeting persons, and the assistants’ control
3.2.3 Summing Up

The studies of the unskilled workers depict them as very similar to the social educators they work with. Neither work nor social background allows one to easily distinguish one group from the other, and seniority seems to compete successfully with education as criterion for responsibilities in the division of labour. As there was a clear break between the younger and the older assistants, this perhaps hints at two different social educational career strategies: either earning a position of responsibility in the organisation by way of educational credentials, or by way of seniority. One might then expect the younger SSPSE students to possess a higher reliance in educational credentials than the older students. Yet the actual social educational practices observed exhibit differences, in the form of control employed, and the actual amount of interaction with the children. Thus the assistants enrolling in the SSPSE arrive with experience from social educational work that downplay the importance of the training, and focus on relational work and maintaining order by way of controlling actions.

3.3 The National Institutes of Social Education and the Students\(^{43}\)

In this section of the chapter, I will discuss the research done on the student population of the National Institutes of Social Education, along with the research done on the NISE themselves. The current admission decline, and the initiatives the NISE have launched in an attempt to avert this crisis are the topic of chapter four of this thesis, and that chapter repeats and re-examines certain points made in this section.

3.3.1 The Origins of Social Educators

The origin of social educator training is tied in with respectively the need for childcare arising during the industrialisation, and changes in the attitudes towards psychically and physically disabled, mentally ill, and socially marginalised children.

---

\(^{43}\) The NISE are, in fact, at the time of writing no longer called NISE, but have instead been fused with numerous of the medium cycle programmes, into University Colleges. For reasons of legibility I will however be referring to all sites of social educator training as NISE throughout this study. However, one should always be aware that beneath such categorial headings, there may be any number of historical changes - whether it be the name, the autonomy, the structure or simply the set of institutions that changes. And in fact all of the above has in fact undergone changes during the time this study has been underway.
persons in general. Tracing the origin of these changes in society, and exploring the processes that led to the establishing of institutions of a social educational nature, and the later struggle towards professionalisation is a massive undertaking, and in fact one which has been undertaken by no less than three ph.d. thesis in recent years (Møller Pedersen 2004, Gytz Olesen 2005a, Baagøe Nielsen 2005). Instead of proceeding with a similar sub-project of my own, I have instead decided to attempt a short, synoptic presentation of these studies.

While Baagøe Nielsen (2005) dates the first organised social educational child-rearing efforts in Denmark to the asylums founded around 1820 (op.cit. p.207), no attempt was made at establishing training until the end of the century, in connection with the first kindergartens in 1871. The word kindergarten be-trays the German origin of both the idea of such an institution, and the social educational ideals of the founders, originating in the thoughts of Friedrich Fröbel. In connection with kindergartens training began taking place, becoming more organised by 1885, and culminating in the firsts Institutes for Social Education, Fröbelseminariet in 1904, and Fröbel-Højskolen in 1906. Neither was in any way affiliated with the state at this point, and there were significant differences in how the social educators were trained. In 1928 the Course for Small Children’s Teachers was founded, this being inspired by the theories of Maria Montessori, and thus began a debate between social educational ideologies, and on the relative merits of planned, structured progression versus following the child’s own desires and impulses in social education practice, a debate that to some extent is still ongoing (Møller Pedersen 2004:217ff.). Møller Pedersen cites a number of writings and speeches by the founders of the training institutions, indicating the particular undercurrent of women’s liberation in these texts. He claims that the social educators (having successfully established themselves as a profession at this point) as part of a professional profiling effort were now establishing a tacit alliance between femininity and societal caring tasks. The profession can thus be said to produce a socially unconscious heritage (Muel-Dreyfus 2001:162 and 207ff.) of mythical figures: the ideals of a small and home-like kindergarten, of absence of oppression, and the profile of social education as fundamentally different from school (Møller Pedersen 2004:225).

---

44 While in no way wanting to slight other efforts, nor to understate the importance of the origin and emergence of the profession, I will devote fairly limited space to this discussion, and direct readers in need of a more thorough examination of the topic to the three titles mentioned above.

45 The word also translates directly into the Danish word [børnehave] still used.

46 Throughout this chapter I will use the term social educator, although there were until 1992 various different subspecies of educators - kindergarden educators, afterschool educators, social educators. While this may cause confusion in relation to this historical discussion, the social educators unions and the Danish Ministry of Education has agreed on the current translation social educator, and to abandon that seems even more confusing to me.

47 Only one male social educator was trained until 1940. (Møller Pedersen 2004:145)
3.3.2 Developments in Training and Profession

Throughout the next decades numerous social educator training facilities were established, in 1948 and 1949 government white papers was produced on social educator training, and subsequently in 1953 executive orders for two subspecies of social educators were enacted. However, no law was passed until 1969, placing the training in a precarious relation to the government until then. In 1958 there was also established three different forms of training aimed at working with disabled or socially vulnerable persons. In 1974 these were unified under the heading Social Educator [Socialpædagog].

During these and the following decades immense changes swept over the entire Danish educational system, including the various form of social educator training. While both relevant and important to my project, the minutiae of these changes are both well-explored in the studies cited above, and a comprehensive summary of them would be lengthier than I deem acceptable here. I have attempted to synthesize an overview of the relations between the profession, the training, and the students recruited, drawing upon primarily the discussions in several studies: Møller Pedersen 2004:212ff.; Bayer 2001:appendix 4; Baagøe Nielsen 2005:27ff. Nørrregaard-Nielsen 2006:45ff. and Gytz Olesen 2005a:50ff. The chart - table 3.1 - below simplifies matters, bordering on reductionism. Yet the essential points in the following discussions of the training are retained, and the chart should thus be read as an synopsis of the history of social educator training when seen from the context of this study.

The essential points are three concomitant trends revealed when adopting a point of view sufficiently distanced to compare the voluntary, private on-the-job training taking place in the 1920es with the mass education of social educators taking place today.

The first trend being a general lengthening of the training, and growing emphasis on theoretical subjects, and academic virtues (Gytz Olesen 2005a:52ff. Baagøe Nielsen 2005:265ff.).

The second trend is a recasting of the professional role of the social educators, from the public mother, to policy-implementors. While this trend to some extent concerns changes in the ideal and ethos of the profession, these are subor-

48 Kindergarten social educator, and after-school teacher, the latter of which was later to become the after-school care workers.
49 General children’s welfare worker(aka. A-line), Small children’s welfare worker(S-line), and Care assistant(not to be confused with the much later, current care assistant training.)
50 The educational reforms of 2001 and 2008, are put in the chart, but will be discussed in further details later on in the present section of this chapter.
ominated to the over change in the public sector from welfare providers to service providers.

The third trend is a decline in the social origin of the students (Gytz Olesen 2005a:61, Møller Pedersen 2004:215).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1: Training</th>
<th>2: Profession</th>
<th>3: Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution 1885/1928</td>
<td>1-2 years, Private, Students be possessed of a genuine Christian mind</td>
<td>Idealistic charity-like calling A mother-substitute / public mother</td>
<td>15-40 enrolers Women only Upper class daughters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion 1953/1969</td>
<td>3 years 3 different titles State-sanctioned Students must have some practical experience, and later on 2nd exam or similar. Increased theoretical focus, shortened work practice</td>
<td>Solidary representative of a welfare project, ensuring and enabling citizens rights. Left-wing political associations and ideals</td>
<td>360 enrolers Middle class origin, almost exclusively women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market 2000-1</td>
<td>Generalist, Bachelor of Professions Teachers must have Masters degree COM-subject introduced</td>
<td>National specification of standards and tasks</td>
<td>6800 enrolers 80% working class origin 18% men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-8</td>
<td>Selection of main subjects and client group specialisation, Core Knowledge and Proficiency areas established</td>
<td>Implementors of state managed policies and programs</td>
<td>3023 enrolers 19% men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Social educator training history

To some extent, these trends may be said to be in collusion, resulting in a de-professionalisation of the social educators. As their origin becomes less academic, the academic demands in them are increasing, and their work is being regulated
in increasingly minute details. I shall return to this discussion when considering the professional struggle and status of the social educators presently. Those familiar with the succession of social educator training reforms, may note that the all-encompassing reform implemented in 1992 (LOV nr 370 af 06/06/1991) has not be detailed in the above chart. The implementation of this reform was the subject of the perhaps most exhaustive study of social educator training conducted so far, and these reports make up the main body of evidence in section 3.4 below, exploring the social educator training. The trends explored in the chart above are not gainsaid by findings in these studies, and for that reason, and in order to avoid repetitions, the reforms of 1992 and 2001 (BEK nr. 706 af 23. juli 2001) will discussed only in section 3.4.

3.3.3 Centres for Higher Education and University Colleges

The lowermost two rows of the chart concern educational reforms that I have not discussed yet. In 2000 a law (LBK nr 684 af 11/07/2000) was passed enabling the establishment of Centres for Higher Education [CVU]. The political argument was that the current mono-professional training institutes for medium cycle programmes were too small and to narrowly focussed on the professions they trained for, and merging them into larger units - the Centres for Higher Education - would ensure that the were able to meet advanced demands for flexibility and knowledge. And so, in the following years - from 2002 on - most NISE, Nurse training colleges and teacher training colleges along with several other medium cycle programme providing colleges began establishing such centres.

Concurrently a new executive order (BEK nr. 706 af 23. juli 2001) for the social educator training came into effect, granting the right to title of bachelor of professions to social educator training, and several similar medium cycle programmes (teachers, nurses and others). The impact of the latter reform is examined by Gytz Olesen (2005a), and the table above sums up the points I wish to retain from his analysis.

Yet the impact of the establishing of Centres for Higher Education feature less in either of the studies cited above. Hjort (2004b) provides a framework for examining the impact of the Centres, by discussing some possible scenarios, examining the extent to which the Centres for higher education contribute to the quality of and within professional work from a democratic angle. While Hjort lists both the professional autonomy and the life processes meant to be supported by the work of social educators, of particular interest in this con-

---

51 Hjort also casts her net wider than the topic I am discussing in this section, as her discussions extends to the impact on profession work in its entirety.
text is the question of whether the inner workings of social educators training institutions become less transparent to both the profession, the students and teachers, and the public in general. The establishing of Centres for Higher Education to some extent induce the need for the educational institutions to adapt to market-like conditions and embrace an economic rationality, and a range of decentralisation, still within a framework of central government demands. While the latter allow for individualised versions and adaption of the training, Hjort claims that the political climate may favour the economic rationality over these user-focussed options. She presents two possible scenarios of how the Centres for Higher Education may end up recasting the relationship between professionals and training.

In the first scenario: the best case, the reform supports the general development studies being done in the NISE\textsuperscript{52}, allowing knowledge to develop and circulate with few restrictions between professionals and NISE, providing space for professional reflections. The second scenario - the worst case - instead depicts a hierarchy descending from Centres for Higher Education, through their developmental and knowledge-producing efforts, to the training, and bottoming out at the level of the actual professional work. This scenario inherently posits academic knowledge-forms and -production as the superior to practical ones, and conversely knowledge is expected to peter down the hierarchical structure, rather than circulate between contexts. Hjort warns that this may be lead to a reverse flow of resources, where the training and practice-related activities provide the sustenance for the aloof academic activities. While Hjort does not note any decisive indicators as to which scenario was the most likely, she does stress certain worrying (op.cit. p.87) indicators: Unions of the affected professions strive towards an alliance between professionalisation struggles and the negotiated modernisation reforms of the public sector entailing academization as a strengthening of knowledge and formalisation of the ethical foundations of the professions (cf. BUPL 2008). Yet such an effort threatens to elevate professional knowledge in the way depicted in the worst case scenario - the profession work becoming leavened by professional standards, evaluation, and increasing workload on self-managing teams. Hjort concludes by exploring some aspects of how professionalisation respectively service-provision may reveal themselves in the Centres for Higher Education.

The impact of the two following reforms (LOV nr. 562 af 6. juni 2007 and BEK nr 220 af 13/03/2007) can barely been assessed yet, both of them having been passed within the last years, and implementation far from completed. For now I will make use of some very preliminary assessments of them.

\textsuperscript{52} Hjort does not restrict her analysis to NISE - this is my focus.
In his analysis of the preludes to the new executive order Gytz Olesen (2005b) more or less reiterates some of the points made by Hjort (loc.cit) in her depiction of the worst case scenario. Social educators struggle to maintain professionalisation is hampered by historically having occupied a academically and socially dominated position as mother-substitutes (cf. Table 3.1 above). This contributes to establishing an alliance between political and professional agendas, where the need for professional legitimacy allow, even invite, political control to encroach on territory hitherto controlled by professional autonomy - for instance by setting up standards for social educational work, such as the enclosures to the executive order describing Core Knowledge and Proficiency areas for each subject in the training. Gytz Olesen (2005b) underscores that social educators are different from teachers as the former draw upon a history of social commitment. But, by employing profession-legitimising rhetoric, social educators come to occupy a discursive position similar to that of teachers: That is, a dominated position within both the field of education and the field of welfare, from whence the profession is unable to ward off demands to document neither the utility of all aspects of the training nor the professional work in relation to national economics. Such demands permeates the new executive order, replacing the core of social educator training with an entirely new perspective: that of ensuring the transmission of societal goals and values decided upon on at centralised national level. Similar considerations can be found in Andersen (2006), assessing the final enactment of the executive order.

The above points indicate how the NISE are suspended between the demands of respectively the domain of social educator training (being dominated within the field of education) and the domain of social education (being dominated within the field of welfare). One comparatively recent example of the opposite sort of demands than the ones defended by Gytz Olesen is represented by Camilla Wang (Wang 2009). Wang is the leader of the Danish Evaluation Institute’s department Early Childhood Education, and so speaks from a somewhat dominant position, and one where assessing utility is paramount. The analysis cited criticises, from an economic point of view, the amount time social educators spend on of practical work (shopping, cleaning, doing dishes etc.). Wang rhetorically questions whether social educational work should in fact be an institutionalization of home, and of motherly care, and concludes by wondering whether “we can bring about an understanding of social educational work, as not just a string of practical tasks. And that it is a profession also concerned with planning, evaluating and documenting.” (ibid.) These two opposed positions seem to revolve around what Møller Pedersen above called the mythical figures of social

\[53\] Gytz Olesen refers here to Goodson (2007), whose position I shall return to in the section 3.9 below on professionalisation.
education; Gytz Olesen by recapping the ideals of social educators as *not* being school, and instead homely and caring motherly femininity, and Wang on the other hand arguing for social educators as knowledgeable implementors of social and educational policies. And so both the trends of growing focus on academic knowledge-forms, and a recasting of the professional roles of social educators as policy implementors seem to continue.

These opposed positions reappear in relation to the subsequent introduction of University Colleges ([LOV nr. 562 af 6. juni 2007]) - an even larger scale merging of almost all medium cycle programmes, and numerous short cycle college programmes into ten university colleges. The quite pressing question of what political motives were behind this decision is the topic of an article by Møller Pedersen (2008). It would seem (and as these developments are very recent this is perhaps the only level of certainty one can hope to achieve) that the main difference between University Colleges and Centres for Higher Education is the scale of the merger. The other point made by Møller Pedersen is that while the University Colleges are clearly not meant to conduct research, the gap separating University Colleges from regular Universities seem to be narrowing, a point in continuation of the growing emphasis on academic knowledge Gytz Olesen noted above. Yet if the University Colleges are in fact to strengthen the professions, this historically arbitrary gap is perhaps becoming more of a hindrance. Both Universities and University Colleges are also losing autonomy and generally being positioned as service providers, leading Møller Pedersen to conclude that while future competition between University Colleges and Universities for both funds and students seem inevitable, it is in the long-term interest of neither.

### 3.3.4 Summing Up

In table 3.1 there were three trends explored. Of these, one concerned the decreased level of the average social origin of the students enrolled at the NISE. This trend I have not been able to confirm or deny, and to do so would require a much more detailed study of recruitment. The other two trends, the motherly caring feminine role being replaced by that of policy-implementor, and the increased emphasis on academic virtues can be re-found in the recent reforms, in effect demonstrating the demands of the domain of social educator training. The consequential misgivings on behalf of the profession, as voiced by Gytz Olesen, as to whether this implies a future de-professionalisation of social educators attempts to redress the historical alliance between femininity and the caring profession, in effect representing demands of the domain of social
education. The current discussion about the educational reforms can also be read as at least a partial re-enactment of the polarity of the pioneers’ debates during the establishing of social educator training in Denmark, where the carefully planned and structured pedagogy were opposed to more freely approaches, taking the children’s lead.

This relates to the SSPSE, and to my study, in several ways. First of all, the three trends are both relevant as possible frames of reference in the fieldwork, and in the statistical analyses: Can I confirm these findings? Can they serve as explanatory context for the inner dynamics of the training? But more subtly, the reforms that most recently embody these trends, have yet to be imbued with any practical content. What sense will be made of the new subjects and the new institutions by teachers and students? Current struggles between the two domains, incarnated as academic virtues (Wang) and professional emphasis social commitment (Gytz Olesen) seem to reiterate the struggles of the professions origin. How do these struggles affect the training, when seen from within?

3.4 Social Educator Training

It has been - to me, at least - somewhat surprising that hardly any traditional classroom studies nor observation based studies have been conducted of social educator training. With the exclusion of Dybbroe(2001, 2005a, b) and Gytz Olesen (2005a), I have been unable to find any studies containing direct observations of social educator training at the NISE\textsuperscript{54}. It would appear that most studies have contented themselves with a black-box-model of training, only peeking into the box by way of the students recollections and narratives. Some studies are quite massive undertakings - notably Johansen et.al.(1998) which is based on 45 group-interviews - ruling out resource-limits as the obvious explanation. If one turns to day care or primary school research, there is no such shortage of classroom or observation studies. This is a point I shall return to in the very final section of this chapter.

This contrast between how children respectively social educators students have been targeted by research depicts social educator students as research subjects who are able to reflect and understand their own position as subjects of learning, whereas children are not universally ascribed a similar self-insight\textsuperscript{55}. Fur-

\textsuperscript{54} A Master's thesis by Thomas V. Petersen, and a study by Jakob D. Boje are both underway, but so far no publications present the findings of neither.

\textsuperscript{55} There are plenty of studies that do research children as both knowing and reflecting subjects. The point is that this is more or less the only kind of studies of social educator training approaching the students.
thermore, there are relatively few studies taking the students’ perspective on the training. Either the perspective is that of fully-fledged social educators recalling their training, the teachers extolling the difficulties of implementing the reforms, or the perspective of clients, examining whether the training matches the needs of one or another client group.

The next sections are both quite dense and quite lengthy, as this is where I try to establish an overview of the research hitherto done on social educator training in Denmark. The structure of the following five sections in which I present summaries of the research on social educator training, is as follows: This first section - 3.4 - is concerned with how the training is being planned and designed. The next section - 3.5 - examines the two above mentioned studies doing actual observations in the classrooms of the NISE. The section after that - 3.6 - discusses two studies on the SSPSE - to my knowledge also the only ones. Section 3.7 presents a discussion on combining the findings of on sections 3.5 and 3.6, and Section 3.8 sums up the preceding four sections, presenting a summary on Danish research on social educator training.

3.4.1 Planning and Formal Control of the Training

Andersen et al. (1996) was the first study published in the impact research series Social Educators’ Qualifications, a large study of social educator training, begun in 1996. Being a survey of NISE leaders’ - Rectors and deputy managers, mainly - view of implementing the executive order enacted in 1992, Andersen et al. sets up a frame of reference for the later studies published in within Social Educators’ Qualifications. In order to completely follow the analyses and focal points of these, a short digressions is required. The Social Educators’ Qualifications studies were occasioned by the reform of social educator training in 1992, and I will briefly resume the main changes this reform entailed. The 1992 reform merged the three former partially separate sub-professions into one. The formerly kindergarten educators and after-school careworkers were pre-1992, trained at what was then called Child and After-school Institutes of Social Education, whereas the social educators were trained at other institutes. While the preparatory work for the reform focussed on shortening the training, and reducing costs, in the end the

---

56 This series of publications was also discussed briefly in the introduction to this thesis. Apart from Andersen et al (1996), both Johansen et al (1998), Hjort (1999) were produced and published as part of this project. The study series was financed by unions and in part supervised by NISE teachers. That the studies in the series only occasionally adopt a students perspective is likely related to this. Additionally, 6 further reports were published on the three work practice periods, on the organisation of work practice, on the board of NISE and on the social educators unions. Neither of these latter studies have much bearing on my present research, and I will not be discussing them here.
training was prolonged by ½ year. The cost reductions were in part achieved by making the two half-year long work practice periods waged practice, thus making the students employees during their work practice. Previously (from 1974) the students had still been receiving students grants, during work practice, and it was generally thought by both unions and NISE that being “outside” the social educational work force in this way facilitated the students’ reflections and learning. The work practice’ relative share of the training increased slightly. The subjects were more or less identical to the previous syllabus of kindergarten educator training, with one exception: the introduction of the subject COM - Communication, Organisation and Management. And finally, the reform allowed for experiments with a specially planned form of training for students with special vocational prerequisites - which was to become the Specially Structured Program for Social Educator training.

Returning to Andersen et.al. (1996), this study surveys newly hired teachers. The stated policies in general focus on young teachers with a university degree, but who are also familiar with the field of social education. The combination of the two latter criteria conspire to impose a limit on how young the new employees can in fact be, which is apparent from the average age of 41½ year of the newly hired teachers. There are differences, when comparing the newly hired by subjects taught (Andersen et.al. 1996:13ff): It is male teachers primarily who are carrying the academic associations and virtues into the NISE, with two subjects offering partial exceptions. Psychology, which has the highest percentage of academics overall and where the academic percentage is not gender-skewed; and Social Education Studies, which is the only subject where more women than men possess an academic degree. Andersen explaining the latter by the demand for knowledge on practical social educational work asserted forcefully in hiring, which reduces the number of potential employees. However, an equally important implication is that the subject Social Education Studies is understood to be a practical subject, unlike Psychology, which carries more academic associations.

This study also shows that the two former types of NISE have adapted differently to the reform: project-organisation is now central to both, but whereas it has been long a part of the pedagogy in the former social educational NISE, it is new to the former child- and after-school NISE. This also demands that the teachers represent the NISE instead of only their subject, and relates to an increased expectation of student self-reliance and freedom of choice as to the content and themes. It would thus seem that the reform succeeded in establishing generalist social educator training, and the NISE adapt to this by partially demolishing internal demarcations, and allowing students to chart their own course through the training. The subjects with few academics tend to lose their
borders and clarity as subject to a greater extent than a subject such as psychology.

Another study examined *educational ways of thought* (Johansen & Weber 1993). The concept combines pedagogy and didactical ideas with the need to not just implement the contents of an executive order, but to actually re-invent the training in light of new executive orders. Thus, educational ways of thought are what imbue the executive order with meaning and coherent values and ideals, translating the executive orders into syllabi and curricula.

The study maps out the following ways of educational thought:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic rationality</th>
<th>Ideological values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualifications:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reform-pedagogy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training must qualify the students to attend to the task delegated by the state to social educators</td>
<td>The students learn by doing, experimenting and experiencing, with committed teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local community:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Culture:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NISE are Centres of local development and culture, relating to the needs and the social condition of the near local community.</td>
<td>Students develop culturally, clients are cultural groups, students employ and transmit cultural resources in their practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Policy dimensions in educational ways of thought

These ways of thought are not mutually exclusive - in fact, the study traces them as separate competing voices present at different levels in the syllabi of the NISE. The current developments merging the NISE into Centres for Higher Education and subsequently University Colleges may however have dispelled the relevance of the local community way of thought, replacing it by a diagnostic-evidential way of thought, where training does not focus on what task social educators are to solve, but rather what procedures they are to follow, and how they discern what procedure is applicable in each case. With the Core Knowledge and Proficiency areas now specified as enclosures to the executive order, and a growing focus on health studies, there would seem to be ample support for such a way of thought to take root. This hypothesis is in part supported by Johansen & Weber’s (1993:49f.) analysis of the new subject COM. This subject, in their opinion, introduces a completely new form of knowledge into the social educator training: one based on successful problem-solving, un-
anchored to any academic discipline, and it “could perhaps even be said that theory is being abolished” (op.cit.p.50). While the latter statement is probably polemic, it does serve to stress that the current developments were beyond Johansen & Weber’s horizon of possibilities in 1993. The COM-subject opened a door for an entirely new way of thought. One final aspect of the syllabi is noted by Weber(1993c): there are three different concepts of learning at large in the documents:

• A classical concept of academic learning, found in the theoretical subjects. Here learning is derived from books and theories, and such learning relies on a assumption that theories can supply practice with clear directions.

• Learning by realising creative and artistic potential. Not by producing works of art, but by acquiring and applying artistic skills can one learn to conduct and inspire social educational activities.

• Learning in (work) practice. Either by coming in situation hitherto unknown, which either triggers skills already acquired or uncovers specific learning needs.

This shows how disparate practical and academic knowledge ideals are embedded within the educational ways of thought, as the first and third forms of learning, and one would assume that this entails their presence as demands on the students as well. The opposition of the two domains (and, as I shall return to in section 3.9 later on, professionalisation strategies) are here incarnated in the different learning concepts.

3.4.2 Students’ Background and Planning of the Training

Johansen et. al.(1998) is based on 45 group interviews from 6 different NISE. Here the concern is again the manner in which the 1992 reform has established itself at the NISE. The study exposes a number of apparent elisions or inconsistencies in the implementation and adaption of the executive order, resulting in the following questions put forward as possible, worrying depictions of the impact of the 1992 reform, and not as irrevocable findings:

• Has the NISE neglected to relate to recent wide ranging structural changes to the social educational field of work?

• Has the NISE reduce student exposure to concrete knowledge of client groups, in favour of abstract reflective qualification?

• How are the students’ educational and work experience background understood and possibly made use of? (Kampmann & Weber 1998a:53)
Numerous findings from Weber(1993) reoccur in the interviews of Johansen et al.(1998), revealing that the educational ways of thought are just that: ways that the agent within the educational setting think. In short, the introduction of culture as an educational way of thought persists, and within the culture/activity-subjests, it relates to a creative proficiency that both enables and (through application to the students own personality) empowers the student to act. The theoretical disciplines revolve around the concept of reflection, requiring the student to reflect his relation to the clients, rather than rely on traditional specific social educational positions. Both are figures of self-administrative practice (Kampmann & Weber 1998b), implementations of a modernised perception of the students.

The teachers seem to experience the students as having a very wide range of prerequisites. This may be a matter of perception, relating to both the students’ more demanding demeanor in the classroom (and possibly a modernised school-socialisation), and to the open framework of project-based study forms, making navigation a more pressing issue for students. But the students do seek a solution, that the teachers seem reluctant to supply: an increase in traditional classroom tuition, with the teacher presenting and teaching from his desk. The teachers relate to the (perceived) scattered student prerequisites as a hindrance that they must cope with(op.cit.p.187) - and not as qualifications or resources. No teachers at any of the NISE mention the students’ background as a source of experience and qualifications that the training could take as a starting point.

An particularly pertinent example is given (op.cit.p.190) of the SSPSE students, who, struggling to maintain an equilibrium between family life, work and training, tend to perceive periods of self-study as a waste of time. The teachers understand this, but rather than planning the training so that it accommodates these conditions of the students actual life, the teachers view it as a lack of study skills. In a similar vein, the teachers relate episodes where the students demands higher theoretical levels of teaching, as an example of the different prerequisites of the students, and the way this comes to the fore in classroom. The teachers are, in the interviews, vehement that this is not acceptable, drawing on an underlying understanding of democracy as an inherent goal of social educator training, and the classroom as a particular important means of such democratic socialisation.

Apart from the immediate relevance of the SSPSE, this example also illustrates how the students’ perspective, such as it is, is typically available in the studies of social educator training; as a kind of hearsay, extrapolations of the teachers’ perspective on the students. While this may be quite correct (and in fact it is, in this case, Cf. Ahrenklel(1998) below) the fact that students are only rarely interviewed, and even more seldom observed indicates that research on social educator training have mainly been interested in what the social educator profession or practice desires form the training, not how the training takes place.
(Johansen et al. 1998) concludes with an article (Baagøe Nielsen 1998) entitled *The Gender that Disappeared*, highlighting the conspicuous absence of gender in the educational ways of thought. Gender would seem a relevant category, since the majority of the students are women, the majority of social educators are women, and the students are thus headed for largely women-dominated workplaces; all figures that have not changed substantially in the decade preceding the study. While there are gender-managing educational practices in place at the NISE (such as ensuring an equal distribution of male students in the classes), most of these are informal, not described or substantiated in any documents. The teachers only reluctantly consider and accommodate the gender aspects of the student population and of the prospects of employment.

### 3.4.3 Summary of Research on NISE Planning

In conclusion, studies of the ways of educational thought as an inner central component of how social educator training is being planned, show that there is an increasing emphasis on certain agendas that relate to modernisation. The establishing of a generalist social educator training with the reform of 1992 resulted in demolition of numerous internal lines of demarcation within the training, related to both the role of the teacher, and the pedagogy. The former de-emphasising the *subjects* in place of the NISE, and the latter entailing more project- and interdisciplinary pedagogy, combining to require a sizable amount of self-reliance of the students. The learning concepts relate to reflective application of theory, and to some extent this entails an abolition of classical academic theories within the curriculum, usurped by theories focussed on problem-solving and rule-following.

The teachers recount the students asking for more traditional forms of education, which is at odds with the teachers’ own perception of the purpose of the training - and the teachers do not relate these demands to student background. In the numerous interviews neither the age, life-style, gender, work experiences nor other background aspects of the students informs the ways of educational thought. The combination of this with the emphasis on reflections and self-reliance would seem to indicate that the actual *students* are being de-focussed, by which I mean to that they are thought of less as the bearers of specific social and subjective qualities, and thought of more as generic *feedstock* for the production of social educators. This may well be political discourse, and educational policies being reproduced in the speech of teachers. This seems likely, as the empirical data for this study are largely interviews about the im-

---

58 Nor since that study was published. The percentage of male social educators remains stable at 15% (BUPL 2006), and the percentage of male students hover between 18 and 22%.
plementation of specific executive orders, a context in which interviewees may likely find themselves lining up with (or even defending) the reform they are implementing. It thus seems all the more pressing to compare these findings with studies of actual classroom practices.

3.5 What Takes Place in the NISE

The two observational studies of classroom practices in NISE are the first topic of this section. Both of these are related to the implementation of the 2001 reform (BEK nr. 706 af 23. juli 2001): while the studies of Dybbroe (2001, 2005a, b) concern an early attempt at incorporating certain aspects of this reform, Gytz Olesen’s study takes place after the reform has been implemented. As discussed previously, this reform entailed certification as bachelor of professions for social educators, an increased focus on current research, methods and methodology in the training and academic training at Masters level became mandatory for teachers. In addition, the reform required that the training prepare students for further studies.

Subsequently this sections looks at several other studies which, while not in fact studying the training of the students, providing important points for understanding the previous studies.

3.5.1 Project pedagogy and Self-reflection

The Dybbroe study (Dybbroe 2001, 2005a,b) followed an early experiment with implementing some of the changes in a project-course at one NISE. As an experiment, the NISE implemented the reform’s demands for a closer relation to research etc. by reorienting this project-course towards reflexivity and study-related skills, in particular methodology and research-processes. The students themselves were to be in charge of the course of their studies, and their reflections on social educational work were to replace a teacher-defined social educational curriculum. The project-course thus allowed for wide-ranging students self-management, and the teachers’ role was to introduce to the state of the art research within their subjects. The student-teacher interaction was reduced a great deal, and was intended to merely provide the students with the methodological skills to produce knowledge themselves.
However, as the project went on, the students chose very similar target segments\textsuperscript{59}: children and other client groups who have been neglected or abused. This was a great surprise to the teachers, yet the tuition provided continued to focus mainly on methods and current research. When meeting with their supervisors, the students were not completely clear on the topic and problem of their projects, and had difficulties in posing precise questions to their teachers. Dybbroe notes that this a relatively common situation in project-based pedagogy. But the teachers’ reaction was to remove themselves from the social educational content of the students’ questions and retain the focus on methods. This in turn led to a great part of the students altogether abandoning the supervision. The students were assuming, says Dybbroe, that they and the teachers were part of a social educational \textit{practice community}, and so the students expected to glimpse professional practice, and to discuss their own novice experiences from practice. They were not sufficiently aware that they were located in an educational context, rather than an social educational one. Yet the teachers did not respond or adapt to the students’ expectations, and instead dismissed the student experiences out of hand and did not make use of them in their teaching. To some extent these experiences instead cropped up in the students groups when unsupervised, and in fact led to small measures of independent knowledge production, as was the experiment’s goal. But the students proved unable to connect such knowledge based on their experiences and the methodological knowledge available from teachers and literature.

At the end of the course, both each students’ project and the entire effort of the students were criticised massively by the teachers, being of an insufficient level. This was explained as the projects having little or no focus on societal and macro-sociological aspects, lacking in methodology, being \textit{unreflected}, and having no professional distance to the clients. The students reaction was a massive disappointment, anger and shamefulness, in some cases threatening their identity as students.

The above course of events was caused by an exclusion of subjective knowledge perspectives - specifically the learner’s and participant’s perspectives, in favour of a professional and academic perspective. The student’s position as being in the midst of acquiring an identity as social educators meant that the student’s life histories and their recent practice experiences became the source of their professional interests. The teachers considered these interests superficial and did not discuss them. The students reflected upon their own practical

\textsuperscript{59} Target segment is my translation of a very fundamental aspects of working in groups in social educator training: Since all social educational institutions caters to a specific groups of individuals (people with Down's syndrome, Autism spectrum disorders, from 1 to 3 years old, older kids with social problems and so on) defining the group of people a social educational project caters to, is often a demand.
experiences, but were expected to reflect theory, academic knowledge and re-
search.

Dybbroe considers the experiment to expose a potential struggle between
forms of knowledge (and implicitly, concepts of learning, Weber 1993c), in-
scribed in the student and teacher positions. The academic knowledge ideals
embedded in the experiment (and, indeed, in the 2001 reform) draw reflection
within the training towards pure theoretical knowledge, and away from practice,
ethics, ideals, and the conditions of social educational work. In this inner po-
larisation of the training, the opposition between the academic demands of the
domain of social educator training, and the practical demands of the domain
of social educator training are plainly visible.

3.5.2 Applicable Theory and Self-reflection

The observation study by Gytz Olesen is a substudy from his thesis(Gytz
Olesen 2005a, p.351ff.). His observations focus on the classroom discourse,
and are presented describing numerous minutiae of how the lessons he ob-
serves proceeds. He is concerned with the way the dialogue and speech in the
classroom structures the situation, but from the quite specific theoretic per-
spective of Bourdieu, which is meticulously discussed before and throughout
the observations - a similar discussion can be found in chapter 12 of this thesis.

Gytz Olesen analyses three lessons, one in social education studies, one in
social studies and one that is part of an interdisciplinary project between social
studies and COM. The lessons in social education studies leaves the impres-
sion that keeping the pace in their teaching is important for the teacher. The
classroom speech revolves around the teacher following a prepared manuscript
(albeit far from a verbatim lecture), and the students only rarely interrupt or
pose questions. Later, as the teacher urges the students to provide input, the
interaction takes on the shape of a conversation, with the teacher selecting
and prompting students, jumping from one student to another. This is a vari-
ant of a classical scheme for teacher-student interaction: Initiation-Response-
Evaluation(Sahlström 1999) , or IRE.

Gytz Olesen explores this interaction by way of the Bourdieuan terms of
recognition, acknowledgement and miscognition (again, cf. Chapter 12). Both
students and teachers acknowledge the interaction as a supposedly meaningful
game into which it is rational to invest themselves - and this is a precondition
in order to accomplish the tuition. It is based on the students recognising the
legitimate right of the teacher to conduct the interaction as he sees fit, and by
recognising this, the students miscognise the symbolic violence that is in fact
taking place, and by which the teacher inculcates specific cultural meaning. This process gathers up input from numerous sources - the everyday life of the students, concepts and catch-phrases from sundry theories and researchers, and situates them as part of a meaningful and coherent structure: a teaching session. This hodge-podge of numerous fragments is what is meant, when the students refer to theory in the NISE, and the students are required to master this discourse and somehow relate this to social educational work. The teacher relates to the students as to an audience, rather than as to participants, or perhaps more precisely as to occupants of the social position student, from the social position teacher, within the domain of social education. Gytz Olesen underscores that this interpretation neither belittles nor disallows that the students are learning in the described situations; but he emphasises that such learning always takes place within a specific scope of possibilities, precluding certain elements and promoting others.

In the social studies lesson, Gytz Olesen observes a different kind of interaction, and a different discourse, as the lesson includes a longer discussion relating to crime, and to “aliens.” The discussion is a follow-up to a student presentation; the teacher has withdrawn to a corner of the classroom, and the presenting students occupy the teacher’s desk. While the presentation focusses on factual points about youth crime, the discussion that follows is more in the vein of opposing opinions and assumptions, drawing on the everyday experiences and acquaintances. Unlike the previously cited lesson, the students are allowed to exchange what Gytz Olesen terms everyday opinions. One student, whom Gytz Olesen notes to have a lower class background (op.cit.p.381f.), makes a series of critical statements as to the degree of crime committed by aliens. Another students, whom Gytz Olesen notes to have a middle class background (ibid.), makes claims that reiterate a humanistic and tolerant position. As these two representatives of different social origins are allowed to exchange opinions openly, they reproduce the discourses related to their social origin, says Gytz Olesen: The lower class student drawing on a discourse of the concrete, and practical, whereas the middle class student draws on a more academic discourse, connecting her points to concepts of language, identity and culture. Gytz Olesen points out that while this may seem a much more open context, the order and control found in the first lesson are still present - the lower class students, who were presenting occupies the teachers desk, which imbues his utterings with a symbolic force. The discussion goes only on for as long as the teacher allows it to, from his secluded position in the corner. And while the exchanges superficially resemble any commonplace exchange of opinion, there is a tacit understanding at work, that such debate equals tuition, and in fact the way the students are
deploying their on experiences is a particularly salient feature of social educator training. As the teacher rounds off the debate, he explicitly states that “...there was something that was urgent to you lot here today. Couldn’t you feel that? And so I thought we’d better let it run its course...” (op.cit.p.387) and suggests that the students go home and think more about it. In other words, the discussion is framed as part of a process where the students are to reflect and work with themselves.

3.5.3 Summing Up on the Classrooms Studies of the NISE

Summing up, Dybbroe’s study demonstrates how the reform of 2001 embeds a potentially very difficult conflict of knowledge and reflexivity in the training. The course of the experiment documented in her research stressed the students’ background and experiences as an object of reflection. Gytz Olesen show how the classroom interaction does not target the students as repositories of experiences that should be examined. Rather there are a number of pedagogical devices at work in the classroom, by which the teacher inculcates academic forms of discourse, and deploys the academic theories as tools for the students self-transformative efforts. The students’ experiences are not a form of knowledge in itself; instead they express the extent of the students’ self-transformation so far. The teachers are not relinquishing control, nor are they drawing the students’ experiences into the classroom as anything other than raw material for illustrating theoretical points. In short, the training seems to solicit application of theory to some representation of practical social educational work, and the demonstration of reflection as a means for self-transformation.

The issues raised by Dybbroe and Gytz Olesen indicate that the experience of the social educator students may be one of confusion and complexity as to the relation between training and practical experience. In the rest of this section, I will discuss a study(Hjort 1999) of how the social educator students themselves experience the training, how they later relate to it, and in what ways they try to adapt to the codes and logics of the NISE.

3.5.4 Taking Or Getting?

I want to start off presenting a point from a study, which does however not concern social educators; the paper “I think it's too lax” by Elisabeth Hultqvist(1998). This paper concerns the students on the Swedish individual program - a one year upper secondary school programme for pupils lacking the prerequisites (reading and writing difficulties in particular) for regular upper secondary programmes. I have included it because it analyses phenomena that several studies on social
educators (Kampmann 1998a, Hjort 1999) encounter. In Kampmann’s study, a central point is the student’s initial expectations to the NISE. They are expecting something very similar to (primary) school: classroom tuition, the entire class going over assigned literature, the teacher explaining difficult points etc. This is not what the NISE offers, something which Kampmann finds clearly expressed in the catch-phrase “Social educator training isn’t something you get, it’s something you take.” With this phrase, the teachers emblazon the actual classroom interactions, shifting responsibility for coherence and purposefulness of the training to the students, but also (op.cit.p.206) in part absolving the teachers themselves of this responsibility. The students interviewed are in fact quite eager to take on this task, and are quite dismissive of other students who are less eager or willing to do so. The students are thus required to shed themselves of these expectations of school, and the teachers seem to have a limited recognition of the difficulties this task poses. Kampmann & Weber (1998b:181) cite teachers as interpreting the students’ demands for mono-disciplinarity and tuition ex cathedra as expressions of teacher dependency and absence of social educational knowledge.

Returning to Hultqvist, she wonders why it is that the pupils she interviews are fiercely critical of freer forms of pedagogy, very similar to what I outlined above. Her informants state that: It is altogether too lax: the teachers demand too little, the daily schedule has too few lessons, there is too little homework, and there are no grades. Hultqvist relates these impressions to her observations in the classrooms, which are dominated by invisible pedagogy (Cf. Chapter 12, Bernstein 2003). Invisible pedagogy is characterised by the demands and the control being conveyed implicitly, rather than explicitly. This pedagogy takes on forms such as the teachers suggesting that the class play the Jeopardy board game, make small performances, and discuss general moral topics. To an outsider, it would seem that there is an extremely low degree of teacher control, and that no demands are made. The pupils respond as if their experience is similar, they “would rather get on with the math” (ibid.) than answer riddles, and “would rather learn to read and write” (ibid.) than play Jeopardy. Hultqvist notes that the pupils frequently ask aloud what they are supposed to do, and why? Similarly Hultqvist notes several examples of task set by the teachers in a very open way being interpreted in extremely concrete ways. Hultqvist interprets this by considering how the invisible pedagogy is deployed in order to meet the assumed needs of “weaker pupils”, convey-

60 It should be pointed out that the students interviewed by Kampmann (loc.cit) are all active within the NISE student democratic forums, and they are unlikely to be representative of the students population. (op.cit.p.207)
ing to them an understanding of ways to obtain knowledge, rather than inculcating specific factual knowledge. Yet the pupils in the individual program associate school knowledge precisely with such facts, items of knowledge that are true or false, right or wrong, an association that relates to their lower class origin and lack of academic success. They do not possess the academic habitus that the invisible pedagogy presupposes. The pupils thus solicit explicit explanations of purpose and goals, because they want to know if they have got it right. And, as they are being presented only with implicit demands, they respond by soliciting explicitness - visible pedagogy.

When teachers in the NISE, as cited above, interpret their students’ expectations of school as teacher dependency and student immaturity, they are effectively disregarding the societal aspects of the students life histories and the NISE pedagogy. A meeting between incompatible social codes is decoded as an individualised inadequacy, removing cultural and social aspects of dominance. Taking this process one step further, the teachers interviewed by Hultqvist cite likely diagnoses (ADHD, dyslexia), as the reason for their pupils’ difficulties and demands, shedding the student of subjective reasons for disliking the pedagogy, and leaving only biology as explanation. It is hardly surprising that some students experience such pedagogy as disenfranchising, and respond by soliciting grading, homework, and possibly even tests.

3.5.5 Geography and NISE Culture

In a study by Hjort(1999) of three different NISE, some of the points found above crop up again, but some interesting regional differences between NISE are also found. The study - which is part of the study series Social Educators’ Qualifications - explores what social educators learned in training after the 1992 reform, by way of individual and group interviews with 12 social educators from the first classes who completed training under the 1992 executive order. The 12 students are from three different NISE located in Copenhagen (Eastern Denmark), Jutland (Western) and Funen (Mid-Denmark). The interviews were conducted 6 months and again a year after completed training. The students showed pride having trained at their NISE, and great loyalty towards the training and the project-pedagogy. They tended to refer to important teachers, rather than subjects or specific topics or theories. The study also includes a substantial discussion of which aspects of the training the students consider relevant qualifications for social educational work, which I have skipped over here, for the reasons given in the introduction to this chapter.
sponsibility for lacking specific skills or knowledge, which they had not been taught at the NISE. In their opinion, their training reflects their own choices and were their responsibility. Yet the students at all three NISE also criticise the training as at times frivolous or slap-dash; the students recalled difficulties and confusion when surveying the training in its entirety, and would have liked help in navigating in the training. Hjort on the one hand interprets this as the result of teachers struggling to change the division of labour between students and teachers, and demolish the classical school-behaviour and habits of the students. Yet as one student explains (op.cit.p.97f.) that she felt she was unable to answer the teachers questions about what she wanted to learn about, since she did not have the requisite knowledge, Hjort interprets this as a search for challenging response from the teachers, qualifying her choices, rather than a demand for a traditional pedagogical division of labour, a critical point when compared with the previous findings about the teachers perceptions of such demands(section 3.4.2 above).

The three NISE Hjort studies are also compared in an attempt to map out different ways of implementing the 1992 reform. Hjort extrapolates three ideals characteristic of the students at each of the three NISE, and I will discuss each of them at some length here.

In the eastern NISE, this theme is *Love thy neighbour*. In the interviews with the students from this NISE, they express what Hjort likens to an ethical imperative: the social educator should be able to handle conflicts with clients, facing their aggressions while maintaining everyday routines, and losing neither self-control, humour, nor most importantly unconditional attentiveness to the clients needs. This means focussing on the *client* in the social educational relationship, and the central practical quandary thus becomes the doublebind of *realising* that ideal. To Hjort these are almost superhuman demands, bordering on self-sacrifice, and leads Hjort to suggest that perhaps what was formerly spoken of as politics, has now been individualised as a personal ethical demand. While it might put the students under extreme pressure if these ideals are not understood as *ideals* but are taken to be realistic, the interviews seem to largely disprove this. The social educators seem to very well prepared for the actual “inhumane” and “unethical” (op.cit.p.38) reality they face as fully fledged social educators. But the informants from Copenhagen do tend to explain any unsatisfying course of events in practice as their *own* fault, ignoring the possibility that the clients, institutional conditions, theories etc. could be at fault.

The western NISE is characterised by the theme *Know thy self*. The students express in the interviews a desire to explore who they are and who they are becoming themselves. They are focussing on the other constituting pole of the
social educator-client relationship, compared to the Eastern NISE. The western informants speak of their need to be self-reliant and take responsibility for one's own growth as a social educator, as a precondition of achieving social educational goals. Where the eastern NISE informants put the client's needs and struggle entirely ahead of themselves, the western NISE informants have an explicit agenda of their own on behalf of their clients: They are to be set free of cultural conventions and taboos, a decidedly modern project. This places the quandary of traditional vs. renewal central in their reflections on practice, and the informants are quite divided on the value of traditions and conventions. Hjort reflects that this may to some extent relate to the fact that the students at the western NISE possess what she terms traditional female caring skills (op. cit. p. 60), and a strong social responsibility felt by “the strong women” that are an important part of the students in the west.

The mid-Denmark NISE is characterised by Hjort with the theme *Talk to each other*, although this theme is less apparent than those of the other two NISE groups. Hjort suggests (op.cit.p.68) that in fact the immediate impression of very heterogenous informants, with very few common elements, may in fact be the reason that dialogue and communication becomes central to these social educators. Whereas the eastern and western NISE focussed on respectively the client or the social educator end of the client-social educators relationship, the mid-Danish NISE’s attention is turned to the actual relationship, and how it is maintained through dialogue and respect. This also includes the relations to colleagues.

Hjort’s findings of the close relations between the cultural (geographical) context and the NISE is highly important to any study of social educator training, as the executive orders are only setting up the framework for any social educator training. In the regional differences described above, one can glimpse the outline of answers to the question of how the actual content of the training is subsequently constructed by each NISE, what determines this content, and most importantly how the students incorporate such cultural themes in building their professional identity. One final point, made by Hjort, underscores the possible national/cultural context: The three characterising themes found in the study when lined up together: *Know Thy Self*, *Love Thy Neighbour*, and *Talk to each other* more or less present an ideal social educational relation - a set of social educational commandments or an *ethos* - in humanist-protestant cultural traditions. Another very similar study (Olsen 1995) makes a closely related
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62 Olsen (1995) also interviews recently trained social educators about the relationship between training and work. An important difference is that Olsen's informants are selected from a set of social educational institutions, rather than NISE. They do not, in other words, share classroom experiences, as do the informants in Hjort (1999).
point: that social educator students first and foremost learn by being immersed in a particular cultural setting, rather than by acquiring specific knowledge.

3.6 The Specially Structured Programme for Social Education

Only two studies exist, which are concerned with the Specially Structured Programme for Social Educator Training (Svejgaard 2006, Ahrenkiel 1998). Both make similar points, and points that are quite essential to my project, concerning how the students adapt to the unfamiliar culture of the NISE setting, and how the students acquire NISE cultural sentiments on their course through the training, and how the social position of the SSPSE students is directly relevant to how they relate to the training.

3.6.1 Getting the Training Over and Done with

The first study I will discuss, that of Ahrenkiel(1998), is one of the only studies done on the students enrolled in the SSPSE. This study addresses the question of how the previous life history of the SSPSE students affect their participation in the training - and how does the training affect their everyday life. It can be said to pick up a thread from my discussion of Hjort(1999), where the internal culture of the NISE was explored. The study also addresses the questions raised by Johansen et.al.(1998) as to whether the NISE were ignoring the background of the students as anything other than a source of heterogenous prerequisites, but this study does so from the students’ perspective.

Ahrenkiel’s study consists of 13 life history interviews, some of which are SSPSE students, and some of which are studying Adult Education at Open University. Ahrenkiel reconstructs from these interviews the students’ educational strategies in a Bourdian sense; that is, strategies as not necessarily conscious series of actions, adhering to the logics of one of more fields, the social meaning of gender and class being mediated by that field as well(cf. Chapter 10). As was noted by Kampmann & Weber(1998c) the SSPSE students experience numerous conflicts between home, work and education. Ahrenkiel’s interviewees have not had education as a goal in itself, and in several cases, any plans for education had to take a backseat

63 While the study itself compares and contrast the two throughout, I will only be discussing the findings relating to the SSPSE students here.
to the need for financial security due to early marriage/settling down and parenthood. Instead, the decision to apply to the SSPSE training is commonly an attempt to retain their employment in the future, to improve their bargaining position towards colleagues, or to increase their income, rather than an attempt at realising inner hopes and longings. The SSPSE students interviewed have all been hesitant in applying, and have had severe doubts as to the wisdom of enrolling, and whether they would be welcomed as applicants, and indeed as students.

One informant states that if she could have drawn the certification from a vending machine, she would (op. cit. p. 133). In other words, there are no expectations of learning, or of any important knowledge to be imparted - the purpose of studying is to obtain the degree, and any other gains are incidental. Yet when they are admitted, they are surprised and in some ways feel vindicated, as this to them symbolise that their many years of employment and the practical experiences that they possess are being recognised as valuable by the system. They are proud, and happy to be even admitted.

The everyday life strategies of the SSPSE students are termed *Everything-in-its-place* by Ahrenkiel - meaning that there is no overlap, nor coincidence between family life, education and work; the students alternate between these three completely separated arenas.

The training introduces new demands on the SSPSE student’s life, which they have difficulties meeting - effectively they try to slot in studying without reducing the workload stemming from the other arenas. As an example, the SSPSE students have not previously had many spare time leisure activities. Consequently, there are no vacant timeslots to be reallocated to doing homework. Similarly, their husbands and families have difficulties adjusting to the SSPSE students’ not having the time to maintain the household.

The *Everything-in-its-place* strategy also means that the social life and the extracurricular activities have a relatively low priority in the SSPSE students’ lives, limiting the impact of the life as a student somewhat. Ahrenkiel terms the resulting educational strategy of the SSPSE students *Getting-it-over-and-done-with*. Over and done with, so that the students can get back to their job, back to the way of life, their studies has temporarily upset, possibly with a slightly improved financial situation and a less tenuous security of employment. Yet this upset provides them with some personal learning potential, that may have impact on their future everyday life strategies, even though this was neither expected nor solicited.
by the SSPSE students. The interplay between the life histories of the students and their budding career as students is thus very little to do with the actual content of the training, such as the story is told by Ahrenkiel’s informants. However, considering the findings of Olsen(1995) and Hjort(1999) the concomitant relations to education may be an expression of the SSPSE student culture. The SSPSE students come from a partially subordinate position, and enter a sphere of education where they have difficulties staking out a position. Their disdain on the content of the training, and the emphasis on their families and settled-down-life may also reflect the students establishing a student position within the sphere of education.

3.6.2 A Present Day Assessment

The final study that I will examine in this section is an evaluation of the SSPSE, Svejgaard(2006). This study was occasioned by a complete evaluation of the social educator training in 2003, which omitted the SSPSE. The Danish Rectors conference of National Institutes of Social Education decided to rectify this, and so commissioned the Svejgaard study, which took place between 2004 and 2006. The study consists of three sub-studies, examining respectively the recruited students, the course of training, and the transition back into the social educational labour market. The empirical data were produced from the admission data of all SSPSE student enrolled in 2003-4, and numerous group interviews. More specifically, the study attempts to answer the following questions (Svejgaard 2006:12)

- What are the SSPSE students’ prerequisites for engaging in the training,
- What possibilities and barriers does the SSPSE present,
- How do the enrollers become students, and how do the students become social educators?
- How does the training relate to the students’ social educational employment?
- How do employers and fully-fledged social educators relate to the SSPSE graduates?

Before going into the findings of this study, it should be noted, that this study, being commissioned by the NISE Rectors Conference, deviates from many similar studies. It has almost unlimited access to the NISE, and its purpose is to provide the foundation for further developments of the SSPSE. The study thus makes a trade-off by accepting being indebted to its commissioners, whose
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64 It should be noted that it is the data from this substudy, that I have been granted access to, and which I analyse in chapter 5.
work it is assessing, in exchange for privileged access. This trade-off is important to keep in mind, when looking at the findings of this study. The main findings of the study are that the SSPSE caters to very different educational needs, according to the geographical location of the NISE, and that, while the training imposes severe personal and financial costs, both students, colleagues and employers are very satisfied with the SSPSE training. These very general trends are perfectly in line with the findings of Ahrenkiel(loc.cit) and Hjort(1999). Looking at the questions posed by the study in more detail, the employers acknowledge that completing SSPSE training requires much of students, but they value the older and experienced assistants becoming fully-trained social educators. There is little discernable differences between SSPSE-trained social educators and ordinarily trained ones, when it comes to hiring or employment in the social educational domain, baring the occasional situations where the SSPSE graduates are preferred, being older and more experienced. The training seems to speed up the (perhaps hitherto somewhat stagnant) careers of the SSPSE students - they seek employment in new areas of social education, begin thinking about further education and courses, or consider applying for manager positions. Most students fall in one of three categories of typical applicants:

- Middle aged women, with vocational training of some sort, and most of her social educational work experience from nurseries or nursery schools. These are most common in the larger cities.
- Middle aged women with vocational training, and social educational work experience as a day-carer. These are most common in the provinces.
- Younger men with a preparatory secondary exam and most of their social educational work experience from nursery schools and nurseries. These students are most common in the capital.

These three categories are of course all present at all NISE, but different categories dominate different NISE, indicating that the SSPSE caters to different groups of potential social educator students in different regions. This would seem to indicate that the informants in Ahrenkiel(1998) are not representative of all the student types in the SSPSE. The majority of students have either preparatory or vocation training educational qualifications, and only 1 in 10 students have completed Care Assistant training or similar with the specific purpose of qualifying for the SSPSE. A little less than one in five students have been exempt from the educational requirements, twice as many in the capital as in the provinces. The average age of the SSPSE students is 38 years, with the ones enrolled in Copenhagen averaging two years younger. Contrary to popular

65 These geographical categories are the ones I use later on as well. The category Large City is used for NISE located in a City with more than one NISE. This includes the cities Århus, Odense and Ålborg.
belief, the SSPSE students are not in general lacking in academic qualifications. But, while the students feel they know what they need to know, the NISE culture is unknown to them, and they have difficulties navigating in it. They feel they need to adjust their expectations of what educational is and entails, need to develop their reading and writing skills, and need to develop their ability to absorb theories (op.cit. p.28f.), and as the students immerse themselves in social educational theories, their view of social educational work broadens. While Svejgaard takes these statements at face value, there is an element of the students reproducing the educational ways of thought (Cf. Weber 1998) that they are exposed to within the training. It is thus difficult to assess what is reproduced NISE culture, and what represent the students’ adaptive processes, and to what extent they coincide. One point that the students do make, is that they feel the phase-in process would be a lot easier, if the tuition was more structured initially and the teachers’ gave more explicit feedback - a point similar to the one found in Hjort (1999).

Unlike the students interviewed in Ahrenkiel (loc. cit.), the students interviewed by Svejgaard are harbouring expectations to both the content and the completion of the training. While the expectations related to completion relate to future employment and status in the job already held, and thus are quite similar to Ahrenkiel’s findings, the students also expect to understand what theoretical reasoning is behind their practice. They are thus not expecting to learn anything new, or beyond what they already know - rather they expect to come to know what they already know, at a deeper theoretical level, perhaps reinforcing their professional position, and so they are not that different from the informants of Ahrenkiel.

3.7 Navigating in the NISE Summary

The extensive discussion of the research on how the students navigate and adapt to being social educator trainees is perhaps not easily summed up. There are two major threads that I consider important here: The geographical/regional aspects of NISE culture, and the internalisation of NISE pedagogy and culture. The geographical aspects was originally touched upon by Hjort, whose characterising themes (Know Thy Self, Love Thy Neighbour Talk to Each Other) were in part related to generational culture differences and to regional differences in student age. The older, western students were bearers of a culture with a stronger focus on collectivity, and the younger, eastern students possessed of a
more individualised culture. To this analysis, Svejgaard (2006) provides the perspective of the SSPSE regional differences: that youth and male gender seem to coincide in the Capital, whereas the provinces more often produce female, middle-aged SSPSE students. The SSPSE caters to different educational needs in different regions, was Svejgaard’s interpretation. We may then wonder if the students in the different regions are exposed to SSPSE culture and pedagogy that actively address these different needs. This is a more precise way of posing the question of whether, and how, the NISE incorporate the student life history into their pedagogy (Johansen et.al. 1998) The student internalisation of NISE culture relates closely to the NISE pedagogy.

The initial presentation of Hultqvist’s interpretations of demand for more visible pedagogy show how these demands can be understood to go beyond the subject and the training. Hjort (1999) found that the students took it on themselves if they had not learned what they later found they needed, and were quite loyal to the NISE they graduated from, and to the pedagogy. Yet the students also did demand a more explicit introduction from the teachers. Similar findings were also reported by Svejgaard, and all three studies make note of how difficult the students felt it was to interpret and decode the structures of the training initially. Hjort (1999) argued that such demands for higher initial explicitness by teachers should be understood as request for challenges qualifying the students’ knowledge of the field, rather than a demand for a classical school-like division of labour. Yet could it not also be the position of the fully-fledged social educator, who, having completed the training, expresses his loyalty towards the training, and thus reinforces professional closure?

Hjort’s informants acknowledges that it was difficult in the beginning, but instead of opposing the pedagogy, they suggest a more sensitive period of acclimatisation. Put simply, the difference between the strong demands of Hultqvist’s pupils, and the moderate ones of Hjort’s social educators, is that the latter have completed their education. Neither the opinions of those who are in the midst of adapting to the NISE educational culture, nor the ones who dropped out and were not able to adapt, are available to Hjort. Svejgaard noted that the students were in general satisfied with their training, and in their assessments of their own learning, they reiterate the ideal of NISE pedagogy. Yet their expectations of theory and learning is in fact quite similar to that of Ahrenkiel’s informants, neither expecting any actually new knowledge. They do not expect to learn something new, or something that will alter their everyday practice. Ahrenkiel’s informants adopted a Getting-it-over-and-done-with strategy of education and so do Svejgaard’s informants. They would like a deeper knowledge of what they are doing in practice - but they are not at a loss at to what
they should do, and they are not interested in questioning their practice either. They are, however, uncertain about their abilities as students, an uncertainty stemming from the domain of social educator training, rather than from the domain of social education. In response to the challenging context of the training, the SSPSE students appear to adopt a stance where NISE training content is irrelevant. Or, less radically, a stance where the irrelevance of the academic aspects of the training outshines any practical relevance. They become members of a NISE culture, incorporating an ethos and pedagogy that they feel does not relate much to their practice, but still can coexist peacefully with it, thus resolving the opposition between the two domains as they pertain to being an SSPSE student.

3.8 Summing Up on Social Educator Training

The above sections have taken me quite far a field, and it is a rather challenging task to sum up the numerous diverse points made so far. I began by tracing some aspects of how the planning and implementation of social educator training was affected by the 1992 reform. The studies of educational ways of thought indicated that several different ideals of knowledge were active in the syllabi and curricula of the NISE. There were an increased focus on interdisciplinarity and project-based pedagogy. The learning is intended to be an individual project, and the catch-phrase social educator training isn’t something you get, it’s something you take captures the ideal learner in the NISE post-1992. As the project pedagogy demolished subject borders, Johansen et.al. raised the questions of whether the NISE were sufficiently aware and responsive of the students’ background. Numerous interviews with teachers in several different studies demonstrates that the student diversity was consistently seen as troublesome, hampering the teaching, and at no point understood as a source of experiences that could underpin learning. Similarly student difficulties are related to the students abilities, not to differing social or cultural life historical conditions. Understanding students background as a deficit of students qualifications coincides with a complete absence of reflections on the NISE’s own educational culture.

Within social educator training, Dybbroe showed what impact the 2001 reform could come to have. A growing focus on academic skills and theoretical knowledge coinciding with project-based pedagogy clashed with the students practical subjective experiences, and their need to examine these. This led to
teachers almost violently berating the students, in a way very similar to how
the teachers understand students’ difficulties as relating to the students lack of
studying skills, rather than as an expression of their experiences and (limited)
practical knowledge. Gytz Olesen’s minute examination of the control-mecha-
nisms in the classrooms revealed a symbolic violent pedagogy, striving to install
specific theoretical discourses of applicability, and targeting the students’ reflec-
tions towards themselves as persons, requiring the students to reflect upon how
he stages his performances in the classroom.

I next turned my attention how the students navigate in this complex
pedagogical universe. Hjort (1999) demonstrates how NISE in different regions
of Denmark and their different recruitment is reflected in different social edu-
cator training cultures, and thus how the professional skills and knowledge de-
pends on the social and cultural site of learning, as well as the content of the
training and the learning subject.

Ahrenkiel and Svejgaard show the SSPSE students often disown the
theoretical and academic aspects of the training, at best assuming that it may
provide some in-depth understanding of the practical proficiency they already
possess. The life histories, and current conditions of family and working life
impose limitation on both how the SSPSE students can participate in the train-
ing, and what expectations they have of the training.

The disavowal of the prospects of theoretical learning, and the inform-
ants in Hjort (1999) calling aspects of the training frivolous or slap-dash should
both be taken to express the students’ uncertainty and difficulties in adapting
to the invisible pedagogy so widely employed by the NISE. Taking a further
cue from Hultqvist, these reactions should be interpreted as related to both the
pedagogical culture of the NISE and the students’ social origin and shortage
of educational capital. Compared to the students in the experiment witnessed
by Dybbroe, the fully-fledged social educators seem very tolerant of large gaps
between their work experience and their training, taking it upon themselves to
bridge this gap. As they have completed the training, the pedagogical principles
of the NISE culture have become self-evident.

This leaves the questions of the extent to which the relations between
NISE, pedagogy, and student background described above are to be found in
similar, transposed or contradictory ways in the SSPSE setting. This amounts to
examining the following aspects

• What social background and experiences do the SSPSE students possess?
• Whether and how the training relates to this background?
• What impact the NISE pedagogy has on the SSPSE students?
• How do the SSPSE students navigate in the training?
These questions are very similar to my research questions, as is hopefully apparent.

3.9 The Social Educator Profession

As should be apparent by now, an important factor of understanding the NISE as sites of training is the inscription into both the domain of social educator training and the domain of social education. The latter has largely been avoided until now, but I will briefly, in this last section, discuss how the status of the social educator profession and various strategies for attempt to elevate this status, affect the training and the NISE.

Danish research into professions such as nurses, teachers, social educators, social workers and others - take leave from the classical sociological positions of Max Weber and Talcott Parsons (E.g. Laursen 2004). For that reason I will sketch out these two classical theories as well. What in fact constitutes a profession is a matter of debate, which I shall return to, but one cautious conceptualisation is the one Laursen cites from Andrew Abbott (op.cit. p.22). Here professions are said to be “exclusive groups of individuals applying abstract knowledge to particular cases”; the exclusivity and the limited availability of the knowledge of the group being stressed. Whether there is an all-encompassing and correct definition of what a profession is, and whether the social educators fit within any such definition is not important in itself, but the sociological theme of professionalisation (and what it implies for the status and merits of the work and training) is.

3.9.1 Classical and Postmodern Profession Research

Max Weber lists professionalisation as one of several social closure strategies - that is, strategies through which one group may obtain and maintain a monopoly on certain privileges, specifically socially scarce goods such as power, money or prestige, by limiting access to the group. In the case of professions, this access limitation relies on credentialism - that is, specific training or certification as the demarcation criterion. This position is often referred to as being critical of the professions, and it does miss the fact that professionalisation requires specific subjects to be possessed of a desire to actually obtain and practice the knowledge and skill of the professions (Salling Olesen 2004).

Talcott Parsons, being a functionalist, explores what purpose the professions fulfill, and what perpetuates them, rather than the Weberian critical stance.
Professions serve the function of imposing regulations on how certain vocations are practised, in return for their privileged status - what Parsons terms an implicit social contract. Professions are thus possessed of a unique professional ethic, which regulates the relationship between the professional and the client; in particular their relationship is unclouded by affection.

A number of later discussions on the concept of professions are discussed by Dahl(2005) and Brante(2005), as an attempt to trace a path between the classical positions and more postmodern views of professions. Dahl emphasises the increasing attention paid to the context of professions, notably the state. Dahl turns to Swedish sociologist Thomas Brante for five subtypes of professions, each type relating to a particular stage in the development of the modern welfare state(op.cit. p.45, and Brante 2005:18ff.) The professions that emerged first alongside the national state: lawyer, doctors, priests are termed academic professions because of their university affiliation. Later professions such as engineers emerging from industrialisation and technological development are termed capital professions. In the third stage, where welfare policies begin to be applied, a new type of people-processing professions emerge: the welfare-professions. These are more or less identical to what in much Danish research is termed semi-professions such as social educator, nurse and social worker, and the emergence of these latter groups is contingent on the women entering the labour market.

Linking the welfare state to the professions as Brante does, resolves a problem with the functionalistic conception of professions. Parsons insists on the importance of the un-emotional relationship between professionals and clients, an aspect derived from the fact that he exclusively studied the academic professions. Such absence of affection and subjective commitment is in complete opposition to the ideals of the pioneers of social education, as was shown in the previous section. This apparent contradiction relates to the relation to the state, at the time where the professions emerged. It is thus important to consider the state as an active participant in professionalisation processes in its own right, with disparate agendas at different times. An important point made by Kirsten
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66 Dahl cites Brante's construction of two further types of professions - the political and the free professions, which I will not be including in my discussion here.

67 Dahl argues that medical doctors should be included in the welfare state-professions, but apart from this, welfare-professions and semi-professions coincide, and accordingly I will use the former term from here on.

68 Some sociologists(Nørregård-Nielsen 2006 is one) argues that a more sensible description of these differences can be derived from the relationship between professional and the client, with the academic professions being completely in control of the nature of their work, capital professions negotiating the extent of this control with their clients, and welfare professions (here known as mediated professions) are controlled by the state or some superior profession, which mediates between professionals and clients. I have chosen to use the terms used by Dahl and Brante, as they include the historical emergence, but these two sets of profession types are quite similar.
Weber (Weber 2004) should be noted here: Once a profession has been successfully established as a profession, the professionals also attempt to monopolise the production of professional knowledge (op. cit. p. 221) both subjectively - in the consciousness of the professionals - and socially, as a way of maintaining the social closure. Professions close themselves socially at different times, under different social and political conditions, and thus the shape of professions differ in accordance with the time of their emergence. The degree of success of these moves vary, in part precisely due to the changing role of the state in relation to the professionalisation. This relationship in itself is worthy of much more discussion, but for now, I will only point out that the relationship between academic virtues and practical knowledge reappearing here restates the very opposition the NISE are put in, sited in both the domain of social educator training and the domain of social education.

Dahl makes a point of exploring feminist research on professions, noting that the forms of professional knowledge (academic or practical), the degree of autonomy of professions, and the character of the relationship to clients (neutral or affective/emotional) coincides with the gender of the professionals. Referring to the welfare-professions as semi-professions thus contributes to a somewhat disparaging construction of a dichotomy between the original, academic, neutral, and autonomous male professions and the practical, affective, heteronomous female professions. I previously noted the historical alliance between a caring-mother ideal of social education, and the predominantly female professionals, this should also be understood as a representation of the profession’s dominated position in social space (Muel-Dreyfus 2001).

Callewaert (2003) makes a similar point on hierarchies of professions, stating that practice and theory contain completely different logics, meaning that subordinating practice to theory and insisting that the former should be an continuation or straight-forwards implementation of the latter is absurd. Rather the various forms of knowledge should be considered as such in their own right - and it is a short step from that point to seeing the academic-professions and the welfare-professions as encapsulating two different forms knowledge, rather than the welfare-professions being unsuccessful attempts at becoming academic professions.

In a similar theoretical vein, Brodersen (2009) has proposed to abandon the conventional transhistoric perception of professions, as a meaningful way of describing the welfare workers. Instead she introduces the field of welfare work, wherein the professions Brante describes as welfare professions belong. This enables her to posit the common features of these professions not only as a relation to the state, but as a specific ethos, and a relative autonomy - precisely
in relation to the state. While I will be continuing to refer to social educators as a profession, for reasons of continuity, I also consider the notion of a field of welfare work to be sensible, and the two are not necessarily contradictory - after all, many of the agents situated within the field of welfare work belong to the professions, and it is thus a socially coherent category. It is this notion of a field of welfare work, and the subsets of agents within it belonging to the social educator profession, that I have termed the domain of social education here, and in the first chapter.

### 3.9.2 Professions Being Challenged

One recurring theme in research on Danish professions is whether modernisation have caused a crisis in professions (for instance, Weber 2004). At least part of this debate originates in a conflation of the welfare-professions and the academic and capital professions, designating the current state of welfare professions as future fate of classical professions.

There have been two avenues of status-consolidation sought by welfare professions have sought: an * academic and a * practical professionalization strategy, attempting to either consolidate the status of the profession by referring to further and more demanding * academic credentials or to the possibly tacit and elusive knowledge derived from practice, and unavailable to those not founded in practice. These challenges are very much present in social educational work, the parents being unable to discern which adult employees at their children’s institutions are unskilled and which are social educators (Nørregård-Nielsen 2006) and 3 in 4 social educators considering or expecting to educate themselves further (Brinkkjær & Bayer 2003), either in order to obtain a stronger position within their work with municipalities, case-workers and parents, or in order to advance their career out of social educational work. Salling Olesen(2004) makes the point that professions need to resolve the contradiction between democratization and professional division of knowledge, since the professional crisis stems from general misgivings about expertise - clients have come to expect expert rationality to be transparent and challengeable and thus professions need to replace bureaucratic legitimation with dialogue, although this may require relinquishing some of their authority. Salling Olesen is thus in line with the position of Brante and Dahl, when relating the apparent differences in status of various professions to the societal context, rather than the inner dynamic

69 If one is to acquiesce to the characterisation of contemporary society by its dynamic relation to information and its availability, a case could be made that professions are losing their status and privileges due to the decommodification of information. Such discussions, however, goes far beyond the topic of this thesis, and, more to the point, stray of the mark, since social educator knowledge has never been ascribed the kind of preeminence that mark out the expertise of the academic professions.
of such professions. I will present two positions that expound on the details of how welfare-professional knowledge is being subverted by democratization processes. MacDonald(1995) explores the client-professional relations, whereas Ivor Goodson(2007) focusses on the professionals’ reliance on the state in their professionalisation project.

The professional crisis has been explored by Keith MacDonald(1995) in an attempt to explain the legitimation difficulties experienced by welfare-professions. He relates the diminishing status ascribed to welfare-professions to three aspects of how these professions manage their knowledge-base.

First, the absence of indeterminacy within their practice, by which he means the aspects of the professional practice which rely on knowledgeable exercise of judgement and cannot easily be routinised nor inspected(op.cit. p.135). This reiterates the point made by Dahl about the welfare-profession’s knowledge base being derived from practice, rather than from academic disciplines. This results in an apparent devaluation of the knowledge aspects, and conversely an emphasis on the caring aspect, making the professional practice appear all the more mundane to outsiders.

Secondly, as the knowledge applied in judgements appear mundane to adjacent professions, drives for managerial efficiency will want to replace such judgement with rulefollowing whenever possible; if there is no apparent professional knowledge at work, professional autonomy will appear unnecessary. Such drives for evidence-based practice are effectively de-professionalising (op.cit. 165f.), recalling the points about welfare-professionals becoming theory- or policy-implementors made by both Callewaert and Gytz Olesen previously.

Finally, the welfare-professions’ ethos insists that professionals should not appear as professionals to their clients, since this induces distance and makes for impersonal relationships, positioning the professional and the client as equals. This undermines the claims of specialised abstract knowledge of such professions. In short, MacDonald claims that the knowledge-form and the ethos of welfare professions preclude them from obtaining both professional autonomy and authority.

Ivor Goodson, of lately an oft-cited researcher in teacher professionalisation, has specifically investigated the difficulties faced by the teacher profession, and both Møller Pedersen(2004) and Gytz Olesen(2005a, 2005b) applies his findings to social educators. He considers the crisis to be a specific dilemma between professionalisation and professionalism. (Goodson 2007:151) The professionalisation project of teachers, that is, their struggle for professional recognition and privileges hampers their professionalism; that is the development of their
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70 Being from the UK rather than Scandinavia, MacDonald uses the term semi-professions. His use of that term is completely congruent with Brante/Dahl’s term welfare-professions, and so I will stick to that.
didactic and pedagogical skills and knowledge. By allying themselves with the state, and accepting national standards in the hope that this will reinforce their professional position, teachers allow the state to encroach upon their professionalism. This creates two different professionalism positions within the teacher corps, termed classical and practical professionals. The classical professionalism position adheres to the claim that academic knowledge is the foremost foundation for teacher professionalism. The practical professionalism position instead strives to ascribe dignity and status to the professionals’ practical knowledge and assessments, and thus accepts that standards and methods are decided upon at national levels. While Goodson concedes that the classical professionalism is an untenable position (for reasons similar to those given by MacDonald, op.cit.p.154), neither does he have faith in the practical professionalism. The problem is that a professionalism derived from practical knowledge has no outer frame of reflection, and thus professionals themselves can neither deal with disparate propositions adopted by different professional individuals, nor can practical knowledge reach beyond practice, and thus all moral and societal legitimacy is beyond a purely practical professionalism. The practical professionalism thus threatens to de-professionalise professionalism. Goodson instead suggests adopting a position he terms principle-led professionalism (op.cit. p.157ff.), outlining an ethical codex for teacher professionalism, and the corresponding necessary working conditions. I previously underscored a point made by Kirsten Weber: that establishing a profession implies that future professional knowledge-production to a great extent comes under the aegis of that profession (Weber, loc.cit). This is a point made as part of a critique of a certain type of professional theories (specifically those of E. L. Dale, op.cit.p.220ff.). Weber states that theories formulated within the profession, from the point of view of the professional, tend to consolidate and in part reproduce the position of the professions. This form of intraprofessional critique is limited to profiling and defending the profession, possibly immunising it self from external criticisms. This is also the case with the principle-led professionalism position adopted by Goodson; professionalism based on even the most reasoned ethical stances can only respond to external critique of practical quandaries by referring to the very professionalism being challenged, instead of reaching beyond the professional knowledge. It is very hard to see how this stance differs from the practical professionalization strategy, if the professional knowledge base is being challenged.

In summing up, the claim by Salling Olesen, that professions need to reconcile democratisation and knowledge-base is in deed a central one, and as  

71 In passing, one notes that Goodson’s classical and practical professionalism-positions are more or less the emergence of respectively academic and welfare-professions recast as professionalism strategies.
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MacDonald demonstrates, particularly pertinent to the welfare-professions, for whom the relation between the nature of their professional knowledge and practice subverts academic professional status. And neither academic or practical knowledge, nor the professionalisation strategies attempting to enshrine either, provide an escape from professional loss or authority or autonomy.

3.9.3 Summing Up

Attempting to understand social educators as a professional group requires including the relations to the welfare state, and to gender, in order to transcend the reductive polarity of genuine versus semi-professions. But even when considering social educators as one of a group of welfare-professions, the practical focus and the mundane appearance of social educator knowledge hampers professionalisation. Replacing indeterminate professional practice with rule-following and stipulating national standards, the state reduces social educational autonomy, while the professional ethos deflate social educators as authorities. It seems unlikely that neither ethical reinforcement of social educator professionalism (Goodson), emphasis on practical knowledge nor increased academic-abstract qualifications can provide the foundation necessary. This leaves Salling Olesen’s suggestion of replacing professional authority with dialogue as perhaps the most prescient position available, and underscoring that the polarity between practice and academia is central to the profession, which in turn reiterates the NISE as sited in two domains.

3.10 Social Education and Social Educator Training

In the above sections, I have examined research on four aspects of social education, NISE and social educators.

- Initially I looked at two studies concerned with the unskilled nursery assistants, who they are, and how they and the trained social educators divide the labour within daily social educational work.
- The next section discussed the origins of social educators and the NISE, and the numerous reforms of these in the last few years.
- The next sections discussed the actual social educator training, considering impact studies of in particular the 1992 and 2001 reforms. I looked at two classroom studies of the NISE training, and two studies of the SSPSE training.
- Finally, I discussed the social educators as professionals, reiterating clas-
sical positions in the sociology of professions and Brante’s concept of welfare professions. I looked at the claims of a professional crisis, in particular how it pertains to social educators.

This section presents a summing up of the points connecting the four previous sections, resulting in an overview social educators training: The NISE and the students as agents sited in two domains. In this write-up, I will be focussing on the SSPSE students.

3.10.1 Unskilled Nursery Assistants

Knowledge on some of the people who is actually recruited to the SSPSE comes to me from two sources: the Svejgaard data which I will discussing in chapter 4 and 5, and the nursery assistant studies of Bryderup et.al.(2000) and Olsen(2007). These two studies agreed upon the importance of age. Bryderup et.al. partitions the nursery assistant into four age segments, of which the two younger ones (< 25 and 25-34) were oriented towards further education. The older segments were happy with their career and position as it was, and were also given more responsibility due to their seniority. Olsen (2007) went on to demonstrate that while there were no obvious hierarchy between skilled and unskilled labourers in social educational institutions, there were differences in their practices, with the unskilled workers using more positional interventions, and focussing on maintaining order. The practical experience brought along to the NISE by this group (and nursery assistants only account for part of the recruited SSPSE students) is one way in which the domain of social education quite literally influences the perception of training as a social educator.

What lacks, and which the present study attempts to redress, is a more complete survey of which sorts of students the SSPSE in does recruit, and how their diverse background in fact affects the training. As discussed in chapter 2 this is the purpose of the geometric data analysis and biographical methodological modes.

3.10.2 The National Institutes of Social Education

The research on social educator training as an institution summed up to three current trends:

• lengthening and academization of the training,
• change of professional role from caring mother-substitute to policy implementor
• lowering of the social origin of the students
The caring-mother-ethos relates to the training’s origin with upper middle-class daughters charity-like work, but also to a humanistic-protestant ethic, as noted by Hjort (1999).

The recent reforms of the training assigning social educators a Bachelor-degree, and the establishing of Centres for Higher Education and subsequently University Colleges are likely to compound these trends, in part by establishing an academic-theoretical hierarchy encompassing social educator training and closely related to social educational practice, and in part by specifying the content of the training, and by an increasing focus on explicit, planned pedagogy, rather than the former homelike and motherly ethos. These new academic elements of the training demands the NISE shift away from the domain of social education towards the domain of social educator training.

In continuation of these points, the present study addresses the shortage of knowledge on how demands of academic and practical origin permeate the training, and what pedagogic forms the training takes. In addition, the geometric data analysis provides an analysis of differences between NISE, and between regions, related to recruitment and competition.

3.10.3 Social Educator Training and the SSPSE

The training embeds several conflicting knowledge ideals. While resolving the relation between practical experiences and academic theories goes beyond the scope of this (and most likely any) study, studying the SSPSE does seem to require a special attentiveness to these polarities. The SSPSE students are, as Ahrenkiel (1998) and Svejgaard (2006) showed, neither expectant nor interested in this opposition per se, and while this is likely to change during training, it does mean the NISE will not appear neither attractive nor relevant in their own right. Most SSPSE students appear to enroll for other reasons than just to learn or get better at their job, and in fact their family and working life make studying is a stressful addition to their life. It is thus all the more important to note that the NISE in general seem to disregard the subjective aspects of the students’ background and experience. The SSPSE students differs from the ordinary students as to both age, and work experience. Furthermore there is a systematic regional variation in what type of SSPSE student is prevalent, as to both gender, age, social educational work experience and educational, as shown by Svejgaard. Hjort’s study (Hjort 1999) of regional differences in how the 1992 reform was implemented shows that the NISE culturally adapt to the prevailing students, but I hesitate to equate this with the training acknowledging and making use of the students life histories. Dybbroe’s study (Dybbroe 2001,
of an experiment with the demands of the 2001 reform confirms this, and shows that the conflicts between knowledge forms and subjective perspectives persists. The distance between the practical background of the SSPSE students and the knowledge ideals entrenched in the training may be increased by the increased use of project pedagogy and invisible pedagogic devices, as Gytz Olesen (2005b) shows it. Hultqvist (1998), Dybbroe (loc. cit) and in part Hjort (1999) explore the aversive reactions to the implicitness of the demands in such pedagogy.

The present study proceeds from the above speculative connections, and seeks to construct a differentiated homology between the specific background of students, their strategic perception of the training, and the success with which they apply these strategies to the training.

### 3.10.4 The Social Educator Profession

The status of the social educator profession ties in closely with it relation to the welfare state. The professionals are facing difficulties. Brante’s concept of welfare-professions identified aspects of the social educator heritage that hamper professionalisation: the caring ethics, and the lack of indeterminacy in social educator practice. MacDonald showed how these prevent the success of classical professionalisation strategies, whereas Goodson indicates why an attempt at becoming practical professionals has both a limited reach and effectively de-professionalises the social educators. The social educators are both losing authority in the eyes of their client, and losing autonomy due to the encroaching evidence and diagnostics paradigm. Salling-Olesen identifies the most pressing future quandary for all professions to be democratisation challenging professional authority, and suggested that dialogue may be the only strategy that allows social educators to defend their professional status.

My study does not as such address the professional situation of the social educators. It does provide a detailed examination of one avenue of status-assessment: the applicants to social educator training, and the subsequent strategies employed by the NISE in order to redress this loss of status. And while not immediately a contribution to the sociology of professions, the impact of professionalization struggles on the training become visible, as discussed in section 3.10.2
3.10.5 In Conclusion

The total picture of social education and social educator training, as I have chosen to examine it here revolves around two partially opposed conceptions of what knowledge is important to social educators, and how the training, the work and the profession can incorporate that knowledge, and in the end consolidate itself as profession by virtue of that knowledge.

The first strand is attached to practical knowledge and experiences. It relates closely to historical ethos of the caring mother-substitute, whose personal relations to the clients resemble home, and gives rise to an expectation of social educator professionalisation deriving from the implicit value of such (tacit) caring skills and knowledge: The practical professionalization strategy. While such skills and knowledge arise from the social educators subjective life history, they are also in part supported and fostered by the NISE, by its pedagogic focus on the individual and subjective reflection. This strand connects to the domain of social education as a subregion in the field of welfare.

The opposing strand is attached to theoretical academic learning and knowledge, and is ubiquitous in the NISE, after the recent reforms. It connects to a social educator ideal of policy implementation and nation-wide standards on both how to train social educators, and what social educators are to do, and to a classical academic professionalisation strategy. This strand connects to the domain of social educator training as a subregion of the field of education.

These two logics are of course only partially opposed. There are numerous points of connection or sympathy where the strands entwine. But they also reveal a fundamental sociological property of social education; that it is a domain in part dominated by state, and numerous other fields (academic, economic, law) - yet also possess a symbolic strength on in its, which is derived from the caring motherly aspects of daily practice, and the historical origins of social education as a calling, a self-sacrificing endeavour. And this symbolic strength may be what has hitherto allowed the profession to maintain a modicum of autonomy. Whether one or the other is more likely to provide a solid foundation for professionalisation is, however, not the issue here. Rather it is important that the recurring opposition between what within social educational vernacular is spoken of as practice and theory, as academics and culture workers, as theory-subjects and activity-subjects, as generalisation and specialisation and so on - that all these polarisations are understood as aspects of the relation

---

72 Such as the freshly enrolled students’ desire for applicable knowledge (Svejgaard 2006), or the proponents of practical professionalism accepting externally determined practical standards (Goodson 2007).
of dominance and partial autonomy between the two domains, a relation that tints and affects all aspects of social educator practice and training. I believe that this even extends to the structures of research on social education. The majority - by far - of researchers on social education originate in NISE - a smaller fraction teachers colleges. The majority of the research on social education is affiliated, or funded in part, by University Colleges, or by Unions of Social Educators. That research thus originating close to the professionals, funded by professionals, and addressing issues originating with the professionals should emphasise professionals and teachers over students, work practice over NISE classrooms, and professional introspection in interviews over researcher scrutiny in observations is hardly a coincidence. This study attempts to approach the subject of social educator training from a different angle, as was discussed in chapter 2. The first step has been the above synthetic construction of social educator training from a plethora of research on the subject; the next will be the minute construction of the NISE and the students as an object for studying. This is the topic of the next chapter.

---

73 This goes for my research as well.
CHAPTER 4

The National Institutes of Social Education

This chapter is concerned with what the NISE are, what their current situation in the wider field of Danish Education is, and how the selection of respectively the sites of my fieldwork, and the informants that came to make up my two focus groups relates to those conditions.

The NISE - and thus the social educator profession - will be shown to be experience a crisis of reproduction. This is in part an extension of the findings discussed in the previous chapter, on the trends of dwindling recruitment and lowered professional status, but here it will be examined by way of the number of applicants and similar indicators. Methodologically, this is to be seen as a part of the construction of the object of this study.

The NISE selection was hoped to capture both the differences between institutions and certain differences between curricula and training organisation. In contrast, the focus group selection was made with only cursory reference to the actual interaction that I witnessed in the classroom; instead I tried to select informants that would encompass the most important differences population of the data-set inherited from Svejgaard(2006)

This chapter is constructed in the following way. I will initially briefly discuss possible sampling strategies for studies like mine. I will then discuss the recent history of the NISE, and of Social Educator training, in order to construct a background of the relations between NISE, and assess what structural features of the NISE should be considered in relation to sampling. This chapter is concluded by a presentation of how the focus group members were selected. I should point out, already at this point, that I shall return to many of these issues in chapter 8, where I assess the sites and focus groups in relation to the space of SSPSE students trajectories - which is constructed in chapters 5 to 7.
4.1 Sampling

My fieldwork takes place in two NISE: KSEM\textsuperscript{74}, which is located in Copenhagen, and JSEM, located in Jutland. Obtaining \textit{access}\textsuperscript{75} proved quite difficult in Copenhagen. The very fact that KSEM proved willing, and that a gatekeeper (Cf. Atkinson & Hammersley 2005:27) was interested and wanted to facilitate my access was at least as important as the more methodological criteria discussed in this chapter, and I cannot not truthfully claim that my sampling was in fact performed strategically. I will however assess the quality of the sample obtained in relation to possible strategies.

4.1.1 Sample Selection Strategies

One main questions of fieldwork is the sampling choices: who, what, how many, how long. One classical strategy of ethnography is the “theoretical sampling” proposed by Glaser & Strauss(1967). This position proposes that samples should be chosen so that they maximise both the number of \textit{categories}, and the number of \textit{properties of categories} produced, in the end providing a \textit{model} of the material examined\textsuperscript{76}. While Glaser and Strauss are primarily concerned with producing theory from the ground up, so to speak, in order to do so some sort of contextual framework is needed. One cannot maximise differences without ascribing degrees of importance and relevance to the various forms of difference available, which in effect amounts to constructing hypotheses. This is an aspect that grounded theory has been criticised for not being sufficiently aware of (Cf. op.cit. p.59, Silverman 1993:47). In any case, it is necessary to set out explicitly what contextual framework one proceeds from. Theoretical sampling, however, requires an exhaustive research of the field, and this can be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Other strategies often used in place of theoretical sampling include \textit{opportunity} and \textit{snowball}\textsuperscript{77} sampling (Delamont 2002:83), Op-
portunity sampling more or less being the use of random opportunities offered, and snowball sampling being each informant providing access to other informant. Both of these strategies are susceptible to being less random, or less representative than one may assume. The opportunities that present themselves to a researcher are unlikely to be random. The social act of making oneself available as informant may well carry ulterior motives, and the opportunities the researcher encounters while not striving for them, may well reflect the social position of the researcher. The snowball strategy suffers from the same kind of non-randomness. Informants providing access to other informants may mean that the researcher simply explores, one by one, the members of socially related subgroups, and never encounter the informants who are in opposition to those groups.

Delamont details the sampling strategies of two research projects. The first, a project studying PhD students (op.cit. p.85f.) Makes use of a strategy one could call sampling by obligations. The researchers need access to a number of university departments, and they obtain it by contacting other researchers some of whom are familiar, some of whom are involved in the committee funding the project, and some of whom are threatened by funding cuts. All three groups need to, or are obligated to grant access. Either because they are friends with the research team, or because they are involved in funding the project, or because they need an opportunity to speak out against some other threat. While this strategy is quite successful, it is also perhaps ethically dubious. In effect, it consists in choosing sites, that are unable to deny access. While the strategy not necessarily constitutes abuse of personal relations or institutions in economic difficulties, it is quite likely that this may become the case at some point during the fieldwork: Will the researchers expose problems at their friends’ departments? Will the researchers in fact be able to provide threatened institutions with an avenue of complaint? While this method may well provide the researcher with a solid sample, it seems to present a number of difficulties on other fronts.

The second project described by Delamont concerns histories of English girls’ schools (op.cit. p.86f.). The sampling strategy employed here might be termed a shot-gun strategy. Here it turns out to be impossible to account for the number of histories published, and the ones found are dissimilar and difficult to compare for a number of reasons. The approach chosen is to select a set of histories that cover a number of differences that may be important. In other words, by gathering a sample that covers the immediately observable types of

78 I have borrowed the term from the early days of genetic engineering, where researchers would attempt to isolate specific genes by letting an enzyme cut the DNA at random. The resulting strands, were then grown and hopefully one of them, by sheer luck, would turn out to contain the wanted gene. The shot-gun analogy stems from the fact that a shot-gun will hit a large area with little precision, compared to e.g. a rifle.
histories, the researcher hopes to have gotten a sample that covers the entire span of histories available. This approach is perhaps only slightly different from the theoretical sampling strategy of grounded theory because it requires no theoretical assumptions about what constitutes categories and properties. Instead it pragmatically attempts to select sites or informants, that are unlike each other. In a word, this means examining the relations between possible sites or informants, instead of preemptively modelling the entire space of possible sites or informants.

In the capital, and three larger cities, there are several NISE, which are within short distances of each other. Apart from the previously mentioned ways which the NISE may attempt to woo applicants, NISE are also ascribed different status. Age, prestige, and any number of factors may contribute to what status any particular NISE is perceived as having, and no extensive research has to my knowledge been done to map out this hierarchy. A more ambitious approach would have been to reconstruct such a hierarchy between NISE, historically and socially, examining both the origins and recent transformations of the NISE as institutions, and the demography of the changing students populating each NISE. Such an endeavour is beyond the scope of this project, and instead I will be taking a short-cut. I will need to construct a modicum of historical and structural framework within which I can situate the sites, and assess whether and how the ones I choose differ. The short-cut consists in examining the relations of competition between NISE, and assuming that the historical and social relations between them are in fact homologous to the current relations of competition. In the following section I will describe my fieldwork sites and how well they represent the available span of NISE, based on an approach inspired by theoretical sampling and the more pragmatic shot-gun sampling strategy.

4.2 The NISE and Relations Between NISE

The fieldwork sites need to be representative in relation to at least two theoretical contexts. The first context which would need to be well represented is the one constructed by my geometric data analysis of SSPSE students, and the second on that describes the NISE as institutions. This former requires the combination of sites to encompass the span of gender, education, secondary careers, age, geography etc. found in the SSPSE students data set. The second context is less obvious, since the NISE are not particularly well described as institutions by the subsets of the data made up by the students enrolled at each NISE. So,
parameters that allow comparison of the NISE as institutions are needed. The parameters I am going to use are the geographical location, and the degree of competition with other NISE, both of which will be expanded upon shortly. A possible third context would be the day-to-day setting of SSPSE training. Since the NISE in general have seen a decline in enrollment the last several years (see below), many NISE have begun experimenting with the setting and organization of the training, trying to attract more students.

Qualitative operationalization of the Bourdieuan concept of structure poses some difficulties, notably that of the extent to which one can (or will have to) reconstruct the historic origins of the topics of research. The solution suggested was that structures reveal themselves as constraints or impediments in the actual social practice examined. In the following, I will use competition between NISE as a parameter in examining possible fieldwork sites, since competition for student recruitment is a structurally very important feature of the current situation of the NISE.

Graph 4.1: NISE first priority applicants, Index 1996
4.2.1 Structural Changes

The competition between NISE is a product of two concomitant events: a dual crisis of applicants and dropouts on the NISE, and the new public management policies controlling the NISE and their budgets. Such competition embraces both of the two theoretical contexts in that (1) the group of students admitted at each NISE reflects how successfully that NISE competes with other NISE. And (2) the socially pertinent relations between NISE must also to some extent determine such competition. Either because the differences between NISE restrict their competitiveness (e.g. geography), or because the outcome of the competition affects relative status of the NISE (e.g. few enrollers resulting in smaller offering of main subjects). This last example also renders it probable that competition retains the possible third context, differentiation between day-to-day classroom settings and frameworks. In the following I will reconstruct how structural conditions of conducting social educator training has changed in recent years, and what these changes may mean for the classroom setting of NISE and SSPSE.

Whether or not the NISE choose to offer SSPSE depends on the number of applicants the NISE gets, and so what sort of competition the NISE are exposed to. The number of applicants in general has been declining steadily several years. Graph 4.1 depicts the total number of first priority applicants to all NISE in Denmark, all using 1996 as index. The number of applicants in 2008 has shrunk to just above one third (36%) of the applicants in 1996. While the size of youth population declines in this period, at the same time the numbers of students enrolled at both secondary and tertiary education increases, and so the demography cannot directly explain the decreasing number of NISE applicants. For all educational institutions in Denmark, the decrease ends at 84%, and for a comparable profession, schoolteacher, it is 54%. Examining the admission restrictions of NISE, this trend become even more apparent. Admissions restrictions regulate how many applicants are admitted to each NISE, so when there are few applicants, lenient restrictions are applied, or restrictions are lifted altogether. Conversely, when there are many applicants, more severe restrictions are applied. The admission restrictions in general consist in a minimum grade point average in order to enroll, and occasionally a lower grade point average required to obtain stand-by places, guaranteeing enrollment the following year. The statistics publicly available details by year whether each NISE had admission restriction and what kind of restrictions. The three graphs 4.2 - 4.4 show

79 The numbers stem from the yearly statistics produced by The Enrolment Secretariat (www.kot.dk). In the following, where no other source is given, The Enrolment Secretariats yearly statistics have been used.

80 In the analysis below, I have chosen not to examine the numeric value of the grade point averages required, since these quickly become irrelevant, as very few NISE have them.
Graph 4.2: NISE admission restrictions, Provinces

Graph 4.3: NISE admission restrictions, Large cities
the number of NISE\textsuperscript{81} with respectively: Admission restriction on both enrollment and stand-by places, (in blue), Admission restriction on enrollment but not on stand-by places (in purple), No admission restriction (in white), and No admission restriction and vacant places (in cyan).

The three graphs show roughly the same development in both the capital, the large cities, and the provinces - that the severity of admission restriction is reduced, then removed, and finally most NISE end up having vacancies. It seems that this process is faster in the provinces and Copenhagen, than in the larger cities. To a large extent, this is a visual effect only, caused by the relatively small number of NISE in the larger cities. Still, the most severe form of admission restriction persists in the larger cities until 2007, while it is more or less gone by 2001 in both Copenhagen and the provinces. This difference probably reveal different conditions of NISE competition. The large cities probably provide a better ratio of applicants to NISE

\textsuperscript{81} The number of NISE changes several times in the interval examined. While the numbers are constant in Copenhagen (n=11) and the large cities (n=7) throughout, the provinces varies between 15 and 19. For this reason, and for easy comparison, the graphs show percentages.
than both the provinces (due to lower population density) and the capital (due to higher NISE density). The situation depicted by these graphs is one of violent change for the NISE: Over 12 years the number of applicants drop to about a third, and in the same time, the admission restrictions shift from severe to non-existing. Putting it bluntly, the NISE are in a crisis, unable to attract sufficient applicants to even fill the number of places they have been allocated. In 2008 only two NISE had any admission restriction in place, but even with the admission restrictions completely waived, still the number of applicants plummet. While other factors (lower birthrate in certain years, ill-conceived complex admission requirements in 2008) possibly exacerbate this decrease, neither explains it, as can be seen by comparing with other forms of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% admitted</th>
<th>Social educator</th>
<th>School-teachers</th>
<th>Nurse</th>
<th>Health and medical science</th>
<th>Social science</th>
<th>All tertiary education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Admitted applicants, various educations, 1996 and 2008

In 1996, only 59% of the applicants were admitted at NISE. In 2008, 92% of the applicants are admitted. The only other form of education with a comparable shift in the percentage of admitted applicant is teacher training, indicating that the crisis revealed here is one that relates to the entire field of educational professions.

This crisis of enrollment may have several consequences. First, the students admitted to the NISE in 2008 may be quite different from the students admitted in years with more severe admission restrictions. The numbers of students enrolled used in the previous tables and graphs are only the students who have applied to NISE as their first priority. Students whose applications are rejected at any tertiary educational institution are entitled to re-apply to institutions with vacant places, even though they did not apply at these institutions in the first round of applications. As shown above, the number of NISE with vacant places increase dramatically from 2000 and on, and this means an increasing number of students enrolled at NISE, who only chose to apply after having
been rejected at other institutions. The following table\(^{82}\) shows this development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late applicants admitted</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td>21.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Percentage of admitted late applicants at NISE

Whereas NISE in 1996 used to enroll only very few students who had not decided to apply as social educator students as their first choice, such students now make up between a fifth and a quarter of the entire student population. Since 2002, the actual number of students (i.e. including late applicants) admitted to social educator training exceed the number of first priority applicants.

When higher grade point averages were required in the past, the students admitted today most likely possess different scholarly resources on average\(^{83}\). This in turn must task the NISE with adapting to the new students admitted. It is beyond the scope of this study to examine more closely the changes in applicants’ educational background in recent years\(^{84}\). Graph 4.5 can however shed some light on this phenomenon. It depicts the drop-out rate of nurse, school teacher and social educator training, as well as the drop-out rate of all medium cycle college programmes in Denmark\(^{85}\), as percentage of the number enrolled each year. Two programmes show a marked increase in drop-out rates here: Teacher training, which has gone from 16% to 43%, and Social educator training, which has increased from 9% to 23%. These two programmes were (cf. Table 4.1) characterised by having admitted a much larger fraction of the applicants recently, indicating that either the adaption of the programmes to their current student population is not easily accomplished, or that a number of students not motivated for the social educator profession are admitted. In either case, the increase in the rate of drop-out coincide with the decrease in applicants and the increase in the percentage of late applicants enrolled.

The previous pages have established a sequence of changes in the structural conditions under which the NISE exist, which I will characterise as a dual crisis of reproduction. The first aspect of this crisis is the massive decrease in applicants over the last 12 years, which subsequently led to the removal of admission re-

\(^{82}\) Data retrieved from [http://www.uddannelsesstatistik.dk](http://www.uddannelsesstatistik.dk), an online database of educational statistics, maintained by the Danish ministry of Education. Not all years have been included here to avoid a cluttered table. Data for 2006-2008 were unavailable.

\(^{83}\) But it is important to note still that social educator students are a very heterogenous group, and that such assumptions can only be made on averages. (Cf. Gytz Olesen 2004:403).

\(^{84}\) The data are not easily available, and a comparison must make account of how the general educational level etc. has changed in the applicant population.

\(^{85}\) Data retrieved from [http://www.uddannelsesstatistik.dk](http://www.uddannelsesstatistik.dk).
striction, previously restricting what students were enrolled by scholastic merits. The second aspect of the crisis stems from the percentage of applicants admitted has increased to the point where almost all applicants are admitted, yet still most NISE have vacant places. These vacancies are taken up by students who were rejected at their first choice of educational programme, and make up about a fifth of the students enrolled each year. A concomitant increase in the rate of drop-out from one in ten to approximately one in four indicates that the NISE have difficulties embracing the students who are in fact enrolled now. This may either be caused by the students lacking the scholarly skills currently required by the NISE, or by failing motivation of the students. In short, the first aspect of the reproduction crisis consists in applicant numbers shrinking to about a third since 1996, and the second aspect of the reproduction crisis
consists in every fourth students dropping out. The NISE are failing to both attract and keep students.

The last two years - 2009 and 2010 - have seen some developments in the applicant numbers that seem to reverse the trends described above. However, although the number of applicants has increased for all NISE, the effects of the previous 12 years are not going to disappear immediately. There are also complicated aspects of economic, restructuring and admission which combine to make it quite difficult to assess what effects the increased applications numbers may have.

4.2.2 Competition Between NISE

One consequence of the crisis of reproduction is that the NISE try to attract students by offering more than just regular social educator training:
1. Some NISE have attempted to position themselves as specialist NISE, focusing on sports, health, particular pedagogical structures etc.
2. Some NISE attempt to position themselves as catering to particular kinds of students - of other ethnic origin than Danish in particular.
3. Some NISE establish international Social Educator training or courses including foreign students.
4. Several choose to provide various extended services to students - most commonly laptops for all students.

Concurrent with the above development, a number of political changes to public service in general, including education, took place in Denmark. These changes as a whole came to be known as either New Public Management, or the modernisation of the public sector (Cf. Hjort 2002:27). These changes serve to replace professional and institutional definitions of quality in public service, with conceptions of quality conceived in dialogue with the users of the various public services. This in turn decentralises management of public services, so that institutions themselves are now in responsible for a number of organisational and economic decisions, and are exposed to a sort of market economy. The state relinquishes some measure of control, instead employing target and framework management.(op.cit. p.35) As institutions thus become more autonomous, they also need to market themselves, and compete with each other. One important aspect of these changes is the so-called taximeter funding: a direct link between number of students enrolled, and the budget institutions have. Each full-time equivalent student increases the institutions’ value added grant by a specific rate, thus providing obvious incentives for educational institutions to admit many students, and keep them enrolled for a long time. When such con-
ditions of institutional economy coincide with the dual crisis of few applicants and large drop-out described above, the implications for the NISE must be dire.

4.2.3 The SSPSE Availability in 2006

I surveyed the NISE in spring 2006 and the above dimensions appear below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSPSE at all 38 NISE</th>
<th>Copenhagen (10 NISE)</th>
<th>Large cities (6 NISE)</th>
<th>Provinces (22 NISE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not offer SSPSE 2003, 2004 or 2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered SSPSE in 2006, but did not do so in 2003/2004&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered SSPSE in 2003, 2004 and 2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only had classes with 15 or less students&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had classes of more than 15 students enrolled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: SSPSE by NISE 2006<sup>86</sup>

In Copenhagen, where the competition for students is fiercest, all NISE offer SSPSE, but half are only able to attract rather small classes. SSPSE has also recently become available at all SSPSE in the larger cities, but here all are able to attract large classes. In fact the two largest classes of respectively 47 and 51 are located at NISE in large cities. The provincial NISE do not all offer SSPSE, but the number doing so has doubled since 2004, which speaks of a need to enroll other students than what the ordinary social educator training can attract. Most classes here are small, indicating that student pickings may be very slim in these areas.

Virtually all NISE have implemented some e-learning measures, and on the second and third year of the training, this element becomes very important.

<sup>86</sup> The survey consisted in examining the websites of all Danish NISE, and conducting phone surveys with the NISE where the information was unavailable on the web sites. The information has not been presented here in detail, since it is neither complete nor suitable for analysis. Notes for table 4.3:

<sup>a</sup> These NISE were not part of the material examined by Svejgaard(2005a) - which included all students enrolled at the SSPSE in 2003-4.

<sup>b</sup> The distribution of the SSPSE class size is somewhat irregular distributed. The mean is 21, the median 17, and the mode 14. There is a clustering around a class size of 14 and a slight gap between sizes 15 and 17, which is why I have made 15 the demarcation line here.
as the SSPSE on all NISE are part-time at this point. Most combine e-learning tools with weekend classes, many including Fridays, and a few works days in the case of exams.

While most of the above statistics concern only the ordinary social education students, the effects of the crisis of reproduction extends to the SSPSE as well. The SSPSE in particular has been subjected to a great number of experiments. Decreasing enrollment is likely to be more of a concern here, since the older students with families and jobs are less mobile. Experimenting with the organization of the SSPSE is also logistically easier, since most NISE enroll only 15-25 students, compared to the ordinary classes, who often approach 100 students. Thus a number of formal and structural conditions have changed on the NISE examined in the data set:

- Several of the NISE have since 2004 stopped enrolling SSPSE students,
- Many have very small classes currently enrolled,
- The geographical location force some NISE into competition for students and encroaching on each others territories. Yet other NISE are so isolated and far from other NISE that students have no alternative, eliminating competition.

Because the SSPSE lend itself easier to experimentation, it has been subjected to a number of experiments, both concerning the organization of the training, and concerning what activities are located physically at various NISE:

- Several SSPSE programs are mostly online, on various e-learning platforms
- Several NISE only have SSPSE training in weekends
- Some NISE have only SSPSE training in the evening
- Some NISE combines SSPSE and ordinary classes in all or some parts of the training
- Several NISE establish faraway “outposts” offering only the SSPSE in locations where there are no other NISE.

But the effects of the crisis of reproduction to the SSPSE is not restricted to reorganisation. Since students, of all kinds, are a source of income to the NISE, the SSPSE becomes a separate avenue of competition. This both means that the competition between NISE who offer SSPSE may intensify, but also that the process of increasing leniency and lifted restrictions may occur in SSPSE students admission, just like it did in ordinary student admission. That such variation should impinge on classroom life seems likely, yet these variations originates with inter-institutional dynamics. Whether such dynamics in fact determine the re-organisations of day-to-day classroom practices is beyond the scope of this project, and I have chosen to restrict my comparison of the
NISE I have selected, to the two original contexts - that of location in relation to the complete cloud of individuals, and that of the NISE institutional hierarchy. I will discuss the various differences between location, and organisation of the training, as I encounter them, but whether my field work sites are representative of either the variation found organisationally I cannot say.

4.2.4 The Two Sites

I have chosen three dimensions derived from the competition discussion above, whom I use as representations of complex set of variations between NISE competing:

1. The size of classes,
2. The geographical location, and
3. The year when admission restriction was removed.

Both class size and admission restriction express the intensity of the competition - the class size indicating the current, and the year admission restriction was removed indicating whether the NISE only recently was subjected to the crisis. Geography is assumed to distinguish between two different situations of competition - that of many NISE in the same heavily populated region, and that of few NISE in sparsely populated regions. These three dimensions more or less express the same dynamics - the loss of applicants, the consequences of this loss, and the actions the NISE have taken to prevent further loss. The two sites I have ended up doing my fieldwork in were KSEM: A NISE in Copenhagen with a class of more than 15 students, and a recent history of severe admission restrictions, and JSEM, A NISE in the provinces with a class of less than 15 students, and a recent history of lenient admission restrictions.

In the case of KSEM, and JSEM, the province-capital opposition coincides with a number of the various differences that represent the need to compete with other local NISE, as proposed above. KSEM has until recently not needed to recruit students outside of the first priority applicants. JSEM has done this since 2002. KSEM removed admission restrictions in the last years, whereas JSEM has not had it for more than 5 years. KSEM has had a fairly low rate of dropouts, whereas JSEM has had a fairly high rate. JSEM has seen a decline in applicants equal to or greater than that of all NISE, whereas KSEM has successfully staved off part of the dual crisis, and seen a smaller decline (shown in graph 4.1) These phenomena do not coincide completely with geography: Several province NISE have in fact only very recently removed admission restriction. These are all very small, and represent what was earlier described as “outposts”, that is, recently established separate subdepartments, located quite far from the NISE.
they belong to. JSEM is unlike these in that it is neither newly established nor small. This would indicate that my fieldwork spans much of the breadth of the various strategies NISE attempt to position themselves in order to attract students. The class size is an indication of how successful the NISE has been in the competition for students. KSEM has been able to attract many students in the area where competition is at its fiercest, and JSEM has only attracted a few students in the areas where competition is less intense. This should indicate that my fieldwork spans most of the breadth of the various situations or positions in which the NISE are located.

Summing up, the dual crisis, and the competition obtaining between NISE has struck JSEM and KSEM with different intensity. As KSEM has lost both fewer applicants and had a lower drop-out rate, the need for competitive measures has been much smaller there, whereas JSEM is hard pressed by the crisis. This difference will be shown to directly affect the organisation and rationalisation of the classroom activities in Chapter 12.

4.3 The Interviewed Groups

At each NISE, I chose to follow the most recently enrolled class, since the transition from being unskilled labour in the field of social education to become a social educator student is at the centre of my research questions. The first-year students are the ones who spend the most time physically being at the NISE, and so I had the opportunity to follow the students for several weeks at a time. The very first day I visited both KSEM and JSEM, I presented my project briefly. At neither NISE there were any questions immediately, but, as I shall return to in chapter 11, such questions surfaced later on. I then handed out the questionnaire described in Chapter 6 - basically a simplified version of the questionnaire used in Svejgaard(2005). This questionnaire was used to select the students for the two focus groups, as well as for entering the students in the data-set for geometric data-analysis.

4.3.1 The Students at KSEM and JSEM

The two classes I followed differ in a number of ways. The demographics of the two classes I followed are summed up in the table below, along with four

---

87 The questionnaire is found in appendix 5. The simplifications consist in the removal of several questions, that I have not used in my analysis - about employer assent, and other qualifications.
other sets of data for comparison. The columns headed *2005 KSEM* or *2005 JSEM SSPSE students* are the figures for all the students enrolled at resp. KSEM and JSEM in 2005. The column headed *All SSPSE 2003-4* describe the students examined in Svejgaard(2006). *All ordinary SE 2008 students* describe all students admitted to ordinary Social Educator training in 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of students followed&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>KSEM SSPSE students</th>
<th>KSEM SSPSE students</th>
<th>JSEM SSPSE students</th>
<th>JSEM SSPSE students</th>
<th>2005 JSEM SSPSE students</th>
<th>2005 JSEM SSPSE students</th>
<th>All SSPSE 2003-4</th>
<th>All ordinary SE 2008 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>32,54</td>
<td>35,6</td>
<td>40,92</td>
<td>37,9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female %</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General upper secondary exam %, and other&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational exam %</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most experience from Normal Area</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most experience from Special Care</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years social educational work experience, average</td>
<td>8,46</td>
<td>5,73</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Comparison of students followed<sup>88</sup>

Since the numbers of students is quite small, the exact percentages are more or less irrelevant, but comparing the two classes I followed with all students of

---

<sup>88</sup> Notes for Table 4.4:

<sup>a</sup> Data were obtained from Danish ministry of education (www.uddannelsesstatistik.dk), The Enrolments secretariat (www.kot.dk), Svejgaard(2006:44-73) and of course my own questionnaires, found in appendix 5.

<sup>b</sup> In order to compare my data with Svejgaard and the Ministry data, exams have to be lumped together with General upper secondary exams.
2005 from the same NISE, I note only one deviation: the gender distribution in the JSEM class. This deviation is most likely explained by the relatively small size of the JSEM class (n=13).

All other factors examined in the table above exhibit consistent differences between the classes I followed, and all SSPSE students at each NISE; e.g. the KSEM class I followed is younger than the class I followed at JSEM, and this is also the case for all SSPSE students enrolled at these two NISE in 2005. In other words, the data above indicate that the two classes I followed are typical of their NISE.

With the exception of the average social educational work experience, the SSPSE students at JSEM are quite similar to the average SSPSE students profile(Svejgaard 2006). That one difference, however, is noteworthy: When the average age is quite high, it is surprising that the average length of the students social educational career is actually shorter than average. This relationship is inverted in the case of KSEM, where younger students has had an longer than average social educational career.

4.3.2 Willingness

A separate section of the questionnaire asked students whether they would be willing to take part in individual and group interviews lasting between one and two hours each, and if so, to provide email or phone information.

As has already been discussed, the degree of willingness appears to be related to the student careers in at least two ways:

1. students with a qualifying secondary examination were most willing to participate in interviews, and students with vocational training and in particular vocational careers were least willing.

2. the students from JSEM were much more willing to participate than the students from KSEM

Another connection appeared as I got to know the students during my fieldwork: the students who were willing to participate, were generally speaking the ones who were most active discussants in class. To some extent this compounds problems related to my subjective perspective as a teacher at a NISE, since the most active students are the ones my gaze will tend to focus on. But it underlines the necessity of my conscious striving towards focussing attention on ones unwilling to participate in interviews, and reluctant to take part in classroom discussions.

Several students chose to add comments as to whether they would participate or not. One interview-willing expounded on her knowledge of the conditions
for students of other ethnic origin than Danish, and would like to contributed
that experience. Several decliners, on the other hand, underlined the estimate
I had given on how much time the interviews would take. Since my reason for
including time estimates were to avoid informants surprised, and possibly an-
noyed, by the extent of the interviews, this is as it should be. But it is likely that
the educational skewed profile of the interview-willing students was related to
this. An affinity between non-academic secondary education and reluctance to
talk for several hours about one self may also explain this. As I return to the
construction of the focus groups and the sites in chapter 11, I will make a more
extensive examination of the relations between student trajectory, and willing-
ness to participate in interviews.

4.3.3 Interview Group Construction

The sampling strategy employed is roughly the same as the one employed with
the NISE - with the obvious exception that in this case, I have in fact made
strategic selections. The contexts that I have sought to represent in my samples
are respectively the SSPSE population of the two NISE, and the SSPSE popu-
lation in general. On the one hand, this choice was informed by the Bourdieuan
notion of homologous structures: distinctions in social positions correspond
with distinctions in attitudes(cf. Chapter 2), implying that if my sample spans
the diversity of the students, it also spans the diversity of attitudes. It can be
argued (Barbour 2007:59) that too diverse attitudes within the group may cause
problems in the actual interview. Since the students are familiar with each other,
I assume that they will be quite adept at accommodating each other's points of
view.

Apart from selecting students so that both the SSPSE students at KSEM and
JSEM are well represented, some of the research on social education discussed
in chapter 3 also indicates pertinent social characteristics. Gender is most fre-
quently noted as an important distinction (Schmidt 2007, Møller Pedersen 2005,
Baagøe Nielsen 2005, Baagøe Nielsen and Weber 1997). In addition Geography
is discussed as distinctive by Schmidt (Schmidt 2007). Education is examined
exhaustively by Olesen(Olesen 2005), and also in combination with Age plays
a part in Nørregaard-Nielsens correspondence analysis of Social Educators(
Nørregaard-Nielsen 2006). Finally, the evaluation commissioned by the Rectors
Conference of the SSPSE mentions all of the above variables, as well as the
various forms of social educational work experience (Svejgaard 2006). The structure
of Table 4.4 above suggests that in order to retain as much diversity as possible
within the variables discussed by social educational research, I should try to
obtain focus group members of both sexes, both vocational and general upper secondary education, both normal and Special care work experience, and with some age difference in order to represent the latter context. The students from KSEM should be younger, more of them should be male, and more should have General secondary education, compared to the students from JSEM. I added one additional criteria: I wanted to over-represent the special areas, in order to make sure that I did in fact interview students experienced in this. Svejgaard(2006) shows an association between the Special care area, and SSPSE students with complex educational trajectories, and I wanted to make sure that I would be able to interview students with such a career.

The students selected are briefly presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview-groups</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Other career</th>
<th>Special/Normal</th>
<th>Years Social work education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong> Dennis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Health/Care</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong> Signe</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>Health/Care</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Anita</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Shop/Office</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong> Henriette</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Teacher etc.</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong> Anna Louise</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>Health/Care</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong> Albert</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Teacher etc</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Eva</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Health/Care</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong> Jytte</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Arts/Crafts</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Interview group members

One more intuitive parameter involved in the selection for these groups is the dynamics of the group created. Since the main point of using focus groups is to record interaction, the students selected for each group must be able to interact, and thus be neither too familiar nor too opposed to each other. In effect this meant avoiding students who were romantically attached to each other, or who were openly hostile to each other in class.

The secondary career of the SSPSE students can only be compared to the Students in the SSPSE data set, and had not been constructed when I started

Notes for Table 4.5:

a Gen. meaning that the student has obtained a Qualifying upper secondary examination, and Voc. meaning that the student has completed either vocational training or an apprenticeship.

In the biographical interviews, the specific type of education will be discussed in detail, but for comparison the General/Vocational distinctions suffices.
my fieldwork. This meant that I could not completely assess how well it was represented in the classes I followed. However all modalities are represented, with the exception of Craftsman/Artist. As discussed above, students with vocational careers were the least willing to participate, and none of the ones who have actually worked for some time as craftsman have indicated that they were willing to participate in interviews.

4.3.4 Sites and focus groups summary

This chapter has examined the two sites of my fieldwork within the framework of inter-institutional competition. The NISE are currently in the throes of a dual crisis, where both the number of applicants are decreasing drastically, and the number of drop-outs are increasing. The two NISE on which my fieldwork took place are at opposing ends of this crisis. One - KSEM - has managed to stave off the worst of this crisis, as it has lost less applicants and had a smaller number of dropouts, than the average NISE, and has only recently removed admission restriction. The other - JSEM - has seen an above-average decrease in applicants, and more dropouts than most NISE, and removed admission restriction long ago. These two NISE are located in very dissimilar settings, KSEM being located in the heavily populated capital, in proximity to a number of other NISE, whereas JSEM is quite far from other NISE, in a sparsely populated region. Compared to both data on competition between NISE in general, and the geometric data analysis(cf. Chapters 6 and 7), these two NISE seem to represent the variation between NISE well. Comparing the two classes which I have followed with the total SSPSE population at the two NISE and the national population of NISE shows that the two classes are quite typical of their NISE, yet also spans the diversity in the total population. The representation of these two contexts needs to be carried over to the focus groups. The profile of the SSPSE students enrolled at the two sites is quite dissimilar, with the JSEM students being

a. older,
b. more often female,
c. more often vocational trained,
d. more have worked in special care,
e. more experienced in social educational work

than the KSEM students.

The two focus groups are constructed attempt to span the parameters in which the two sites differ, and which have been shown to be distinctive by other research on social educators: Gender, Age, Education, Geography and
social educational work experience. In addition, the previous working careers of SSPSE are quite well represented, with the exception of craftsmen and artists, who proved reluctant to take part in interviews.

In the above discussions I have demonstrated the current crisis of reproduction of social education. This crisis forms the framework of the choice of sites for my fieldwork, in that the crisis imposes the need of geographically differentiated recruitment strategies. And based on this, in the next chapter I will begin the geometric data analysis (the first methodological mode) of the students from the Svejgaard-data set, and the students surveyed during my fieldwork, in order to construct a space of SSPSE student trajectories.
CHAPTER 5

Geometric Data Analysis - Craft and Methodology

The following three chapters address the question of what sort of students enroll in the SSPSE. With reference to the design terms employed in chapter 2. This is thus the beginning of the first methodological mode, geometric data analysis. My intent is to produce a classification of the students based on their social and educational data; a classification that needs to encapsulate as much of the variation present in the entire population of SSPSE students in existence. For that reason, such a classification requires a wider-ranging empirical foundation than what can be produced from fieldwork in two NISE. I have been lucky enough to gain access to a set of data collected on precisely that population. These data were made available to me by the NISE Rectors Conference, for whom an evaluation of the SSPSE was carried out in 2004-2006. The data that form the basis for this chapter were collected for this evaluation.

My approach to examining the students takes leave from the assumption that there are different species of students enrolled in the SSPSE, and that understanding the systems of differences between the students is crucial to understanding the dynamics of the SSPSE training and classroom. It is shown in the original evaluation (Svejgaard 2006, as discussed in chapter 3), that such difference exist, but it is only examined by cross-tabulations and thus limited to examining relations between two variables. I intend to search out more complex and multivariate structures in the data. In order to do that, I employ geometric data analysis - using the tools specific multiple correspondence analysis and ascending hierarchical classification.

In the present chapter, I will discuss the methodology and tradition of geometric data analysis, and introduce the craft involved in conducting such an analysis. In the next chapter, Chapter 6, I briefly discuss the nature of the data and then go on to examine the data by way of a complete specific multiple correspond-
ence analysis, resulting in a construction of the space of SSPSE student trajectories.
In a third chapter, chapter 7, I subsequently conduct a Euclidean classification of the respondents based on the space of SSPSE student trajectories. This chapter concludes with a complete discussion of the entire geometric data analysis.

5.1 The origins of Geometric Data Analysis

Before going on to the actual analysis, I will briefly discuss some practical aspects of geometric data analysis: The theories embedded in both GDA in general, in my analysis’ process of formation, and the practical proceedings of the analysis warrant an extended discussion. This interlude also serves as a brief introduction to the workings and interpretation of GDA, for those readers who are unfamiliar with the topic.

5.1.1 What is Geometric Data analysis?

Geometric data analysis is a school of statistics that originates in the work of Jean-Paul Benzécri and his Analyse des données\(^{90}\) (Benzécri 1973a and 1973b). The fundamentals of his work and the many later expansions that eventually came to make up the toolbox of geometric data analysis have remained the same: tools for examining the relations and structures in a set of data with a large number of nominal variables. The analysis allows the researcher to investigate the relations between individuals and modalities\(^{91}\) through graphical depictions of these relationships. These graphical depictions (or maps, as they are sometimes called) are perhaps the most striking feature of correspondence analysis and the related methods, and have surely contributed enormously to the surge of interest in the methods. The maps depict all modalities, and/or all individuals as they relate to each other. In the case of individuals, those with similar response profiles will be located close to each other, and far apart from individuals with different response profiles. In the case of modalities, the modalities than often appear within the same response profiles of individuals will


\(^{91}\) Modality is used in place of the traditional statistical term category to underline the fact that the different modalities are neither assumed to be ordered nor related in a linear way(Cf. Börjesson 2005: 37 note 87). One can draw parallels to the parallel but unordered nature of musical modes.
be close, and the modalities that rarely appear together will be far apart. Two point should be made at this point: first the maps - and the analysis - is inherently relational: it does not depict the relationships in comparison to any outer concept of normality, or distributional standards, but only in relation to the data set itself. And so when individuals are put in different parts of the map, this reflects the individuals’ relations to other individuals within the data, and nothing more. Second, the maps are in fact projections of two multidimensional spaces constructed by the relations between individuals and modalities. The dimensionality of these two spaces must be reduced by projection in order for them to be visualised, but such projection of course reduces the amount of information contained in the maps. Both this fact and the relational nature of the analysis are important to understand, because interpreting the maps seems very straight-forward, and make for quite persuasive renditions of a very complex analysis - yet the structure of the data may be less straight-forward.

5.1.2 The History and Theoretical Philosophy of GDA

While the first presentations of the method took place in 1963, the method gained a much greater French following as it became the statistical method of choice of Pierre Bourdieu, and as his works - notably La Distinction (Bourdieu (1979, translation 1984)- were translated, the method achieved international renown. Benzécri’s intention was to enable an inductive analysis of statistical data and

“...in place of common sense qualitative notions, [substitute] statistically defined quantities in such a manner that the final construction ... will be independent from arbitrary constructions due to a priori ideas” (Benzécri quoted from van Meter et.al. 1984:128f.).

The ambitions of Benzécri is to literally reveal the essence of the object examined, and thoroughly vet the analysis for any a priori assumptions. While such an endeavour implies an essentialistic epistemology that does not sit well with current sociology (op.cit. p.129), the case put by Benzécri is that “Sous le nom de statistique mathématique, des auteurs ... ont édifié une pompeuse discipline, riche en hypothèses qui ne sont jamais satisfaites dans la pratique” (Benzécri1973b:3)92. This is a point relevant to all statistical research: The use of hypotheses forces researchers to preconstruct the objects of their research, and such preconstructions must be examined carefully. Benzécri proposed the following two principles of Analyse des données: “Statistique n’est pas probabilité”(ibid,) and “Le modèle

92 “Under the banner statistical mathematics, researchers ... have erected a pompous discipline rich in hypotheses that are never satisfied in practice.” My translation.
doit suivre les données, non l’inverse” (op.cit.p.6). A less provocative way of presenting his points would be to say that he devised L’Analyse des données to provide a general view of the structure of a data set, without resorting to neither hypotheses or assumptions about normality, independency, and other distributional characteristics. In classic statistics, the researchers is searching for deviations from normality - In L’analyse des Données no such normality exists, only the characteristics of the data set being examined. This difference in how the theory and empirical data should be related to some extent amounts to saying that L’analyse des Données employs an inductive method, and Anglo-Saxon statistics employ a deductive one, leading to the opposition between Benzécri and Anglo-Saxon statistics on occasion being described as an opposition between descriptive and analytical statistics (van Meter et.al. 1984:135)

The methods devised by Benzécri were expanded and refined by a number of primarily french researchers (Lebart 1994), Rouanet and Le Roux (Le Roux and Rouanet 1998, 2004) and others) and evolved into first multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) and later Geometric Data Analysis (GDA). For most of this time, the methodologies were with few exceptions confined to France both in application and theoretical enhancement. However, the international breakthrough of the work of Pierre Bourdieu with first Distinction and later Homo Academicus (Bourdieu 1984 and 1988 resp.) created interest for the methodology outside of France. The french school of Analyse des données and classical multivariate statistics have been strongly opposed on a number of points, due to different choices of application and mathematical approach, but due also to Benzécris own provocative stance. However, the original opposition (between the classical analytical statistics’ focus on hypotheses and inferences, and the French descriptive approach to examining the overall structure of data without distributional assumptions) while perhaps not completely without merit, has been superceded by less fundamental differences of opinions as to the starting point of statistical analysis. In 2004 the book “Geometric Data Analysis” (Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:6ff.) note some advantageous fundamental ideas of GDA, two of which are:

- GDA is geometrical
- GDA is description-oriented

GDA differs from other multivariate statistical techniques by considering individuals as points in geometrical space, rather than intersections of a set of variables. Geometry, in the words of Le Roux and Rouanet (op.cit. p. ix) sits

---

93 “Statistics is not probability” and “The model must follow the data, not vice versa”, My translation.
94 Later, there was also substantial methodological development in Anglo-American schools of statistics, notably Michael Greenacres’ Joint Correspondence analysis (Greenacre 1994), and the works of Fionn Murtagh and John Gower
95 These discussions can be found described in detail in Van Meter et. al. 1994
between the quantitative and the qualitative domain, describing researched objects by numbers, yet not reducing objects to the unidimensionality of numbers. Geometry is the application of measurability to a multidimensional space in the hope of preserving the complex nature of that space itself. And, being multidimensional, geometry allows for depictions and analyses of relations in more than one dimension.

By focusing on inductively describing the data at hand rather than examining them as a random sample of some larger population, GDA attempts to replace statistical essentialism (be it in the form of theoretical or mathematical *a priori*) with relationism.

**5.2 Bourdieu and GDA in Scandinavia**

In Scandinavia, the use of previous incarnations of geometric data analysis has been heavily tied to the reception and appropriation of the work and theories of Pierre Bourdieu, who was first read and studied in especially the Educational Science researcher communities in Denmark and Sweden. The Swedish research communities in Uppsala and Lund, originally organised by Donald Broady, Mikael Palme and Staf Callewaert were amongst the first Scandinavian researchers to work with the methods, and were visited by both some of the statistical advisors of Bourdieu and some of his sociological collaborators, in particular Monique de Saint-Martin. Amongst other things this resulted in a workpaper on Benzécri (Broady 1988), and a study of Swedish high schools, and earliest of all a partial translation into Danish of *La Reproduction* (Callewaert et.al. 1977). The doctoral dissertation of Donald Broady (Broady 1991) which discusses the relations between French historical epistemology and the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu, does contain an important chapter on statistics and on the work of Benzécri, which was to become the reference of choice when discussing correspondence analysis in Scandinavia. This was quite significant in both addressing the method as sociological, and making the discussion available in Scandinavian. A few years later, Hjellbrekke published a workpaper using the method (Hjellbrekke 1993) and in 1995 Lennart Rosenlund published an article introducing the techniques in Norway (Rosenlund 1995). Both also refer to Bourdieu and *La Distinction* as inspirations for their use of the method.

The method was first used in Danish research communities by K.A. Petersen and M. Munk (1999a) in their studies of nursing and elitist sports. The Swedish and Danish communities were very much related at this time: Both
of these theses were defended in Lund, although the authors both were students of Callewaert who was by then professor of Education in Copenhagen\textsuperscript{96}, and took part in his postgraduate Bourdieusymposia. Apart from the relative paucity of translated methodological literature, the spread of the method was hampered until the mid-nineties because of the shortage of software capable of doing the analysis, and the rather inaccessible nature of the software that was in fact available\textsuperscript{97}. In 1999 came the first Scandinavian comprehensive introduction to the methods (Hjellbrekke 1999) and 5 years later another Danish handbook came out (Høyen 2004). Thus the isolation of the methods in France was to some extent to repeat itself in Scandinavia, as the method was adopted mainly alongside the adopting of Bourdieus work, and restricted to french-speaking research communities. Only recently has the method spread outside of Educational Science in Scandinavia, and has become part of the statistical curriculum of e.g. General Sociology at Danish universities. And it is only in continuation of this latter development, that Multiple Correspondence Analysis has begun to be appreciated as a method in its own rights. All previous researchers using the method in Denmark and Sweden has done so in consequence of their adherence to the theoretical stance of Pierre Bourdieu and/or their relation to Bourdieus foremost Danish and Swedish expounders. For a long time, the GDA methods were only used in connection with the use of Pierre Bourdieus theories, and were also the only statistical method used in connection with Bourdieu.

Since both the establishing of the methods in France, and the trajectory of how the method achieved international renown, and how it specifically permeated Educational Science in Scandinavia hinges intrinsically on the adoption of the work of Pierre Bourdieu, one cannot assess the method without also making at least a partial assessment of those theoretical positions of Bourdieu, that are embedded in the methods.

Benz{é}cri originally proposed his methodology in order to eliminate the use of a priori-assumptions and concepts in statistics. A similar argument presented by Bourdieu is that all statistical techniques embody particular assumptions of

\textsuperscript{96} While not wanting to partake in the current trend of self-socioanalysis, inspired by Bourdieu own “Esquisse pour une auto-socioanalyse”(Bourdieu 2003a) it is perhaps appropriate to mention, that I myself completed my masters degree at this very same institute where Callewaert was tenured.

\textsuperscript{97} Munk (Munk 1999a) and Rosenlund(1995) dedicate extensive passages of their work to detailed descriptions of the procedures of manipulation and interpretation of software used for correspondence analysis. Quite a large number of packages has been available at various times, but most (EyeLID, Analytica, SPAD.N ADDAD and others) were for a long time noncommercial products of the efforts of individual researchers, and thus marred by unreliability, sparse documentation and infrequent updating. Today, at least 4 major statistical packages (SPSS, SAS, SPAD and R) provide extensive and user-friendly tools for correspondence analysis in its various guises.
causality, action and the social. When formally examining hypotheses, one re-
constructs the sociological problems one examines as a causal hypothesis rela-
ting a set of variables, thus distancing one self from both the complexity of the
data in their entirety, and from the individuals whom the data describes. The
social world as reconstructed in the optics of Bourdieu is a system of distinctive
relationships or a social structure of pertinent differences. These assumptions
of what constitutes social reality are very much in agreement with the philoso-
phy of Benzécris original statistical thrust. The use of correspondence analysis
in the work of Bourdieu in general serves to demonstrate the similarities of
separate structured spaces - how relations of dominance in one space reappear
as similar relations of dominance in another space, and argues that the structure
of dominance thus encompasses both spaces - the homologies discussed ex-
tensively in chapter 2. Bourdieus concepts of homology and field relates social
positions to individual dispositions, and thus attempts to overcome the struc-
ture-agency problem. And so, going back to the question of which assumptions
are embedded in various forms of statistics, Bourdieus theory of social space,
as partitioned in fields and traversed by homologies is permeated by the same
assumptions as L’Analyse des Données: one must find “quels courants de lois
traversent l’océan des faits”98 (Benzécri 1973a:v).

5.3 The Construction of the Statistical Object

In principle, a statistical object99 is simply a choice of individuals whose an-
swers to a set of questions one intends to analyse. A statistical method such as
geometric data analysis is used to shed light on some sociological question - and
in moving from a description of a sociological problem to a set of data with a
set of respondents, and an analysis one must translate both the research ques-
tion and the object of research. Both statistical object and statistical methodol-
ogy is embedded in - in this case - a sociological methodology and object.
This is an important methodological feature of geometric data analysis - it de-
mands a clear-cut separation between sociological and statistical construction
and analysis. The statical analysis is embedded in the sociological, so that all
statistical findings must be interpreted sociologically.

98 “What currents of law traverse the ocean of facts”, My translation
99 By statistical object I mean the data analysed, the codification of the data, the model emplo-
yed and the way the analysis proceeds step by step. I use the concept to underline the fact
that a statistical analysis is in itself a construct, the creation of which has entailed a multitude
of decisions and interpretations on the researchers behalf.
In the following, I will briefly discuss what tools the GDA method provides, what requirements the method places on the statistical object, and some of the consequences of trying to meet these requirements, while still trying to keep the analysis simple and comprehensible.

5.3.1 Construction Templates.

The two first steps of constructing any statistical object is the sociological construction, and the statistical construction. The first involves selecting the questions one believe pertinent to the research questions, and defining the assumptions (or, in the case of analytical statistics, the hypotheses) for the analysis. This part of my analysis is conducted and discussed in the initial sections of chapter 6, and I will forego any discussion of them here, as they are unrelated to the procedures of geometric data analysis. The statistical step is concerned with organising and recoding the data, so that they adhere to the analytical model one is deploying. In the following, I will discuss to common templates for such analysis within GDA. The selection of such templates are directed by the research questions posed, but in close counterpoint with the demands placed on data, by the statistical procedures.

I will here only be discussing the demands placed by the two analytical tools I will be using: specific multiple correspondence analysis, and ascending hierarchical classification.

Each question to be used in a multiple correspondence analysis may be either active or supplementary, and each modality can be put as passive or active. Active questions/modalities contribute to the construction of the space examined in the analysis, while passive modalities or supplementary questions do not. The analysis will reveal how a passive modality relates to the active ones, but not how the active ones relate to the passive or supplementary ones. (Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:197 and 204) The immediate selection of active variables must thus reflect the research questions which one hopes to answer by geometric data analysis - but there are two types of analytical templates commonly used. I will term these two types simple and homological analyses. The simple analysis examines what structures exist in the set of data, e.g. what kinds of students exist within the SSPSE? Such analysis is commonly done with simple correspondence analysis, between two variables. One example being Thomsen 2008.

The homological analysis relates the structure of one subset of questions to the structure of another, e.g. how does scholarly achievement relate to opinions about the educational system? One of these sets is put as supplementary
questions, and the analysis will show how opinions about the educational system structures the data, and then superimpose the scholarly achievements on this map, showing how the two structures relate\textsuperscript{101}. As discussed in chapter 2, this is the template of Bourdieu\'s analyses in Distinction\cite{Bourdieu1984} and Homo Academicus\cite{Bourdieu1988}; more recently, Lidegran\cite{Lidegran2009} has shown how differences in educational achievements between Swedish elite students are structured by student gender, by using gender as a supplementary question. The difference between what I have called the simple analysis and the homological analysis is in fact just whether one examines relations between the structure produced by the active questions and other questions. Often simple analyses are the only possibility with data pulled from a data repository. My analysis will be a mixture of the two, since I will mainly examine the structures found in the data. However, my qualitative data affords several possibilities for more advanced homological inquiries, as discussed in chapter 2.

When selecting the questions for analysis, two purely statistical rules of thumb must also be kept in mind: each active modality should preferably have a frequency of at least 5\% \cite[216]{LeRouxRouanet2004} and all active questions should have preferably the same number of modalities.\cite[p.186f.]{op.cit.} This may require that one either recodes questions to fit with these criteria, or discards modalities with low frequencies.

Finally, there are a number of internal interdependencies between active questions one should avoid. These typically reveal themselves in various graphical artefacts - the clouds may split, or take on a distinctive shape. Roughly speaking, one should aim for a uniform cloud, without too many distinctive features, because such features are the product of interdependencies in data. Another example was given in a presentation by Mike Savage\cite[Published as Savage et.al. 2003]{} who, in an examination of relations between social positions and cultural tastes in Great Britain, found that including both yearly income and level of education revealed a very strong correlation, which made all other correspondences in the material so small by comparison, that they contributed very little to the construction of the space investigated. One such very strong dependency thus both makes it difficult to investigate other, smaller dependencies, and also reveal that one of the correlated questions is actually redundant in the analysis, since it can be extrapolated from the question it correlates with.

As can be seen from these considerations, the actual deployment of multiple correspondence analysis is a mixture of scientific rigour and craftsmanship; and a number of less formal deliberations of both statistical and sociological nature take part in shaping the object of analysis. In the process of analysis the

\textsuperscript{101} This is part of what Le Roux and Rouanet terms Structured Data Analysis\cite[cf. Le Roux and Rouanet 2004 p.251ff.]}
variables are recoded several times, and various models of analysis are tried out. Some models are discarded for formal reasons, some because the data reveal complex artefacts when examined graphically, and some because they do not provide answers to the questions posed to the data. This complex of deliberations are often reduced to brief asides or footnotes, yet the researchers apprehension of his object of research is surely no less affected by this growing intimacy with the data, than is the case with qualitative data.

In the case of the analysis presented in this chapter, more than 80 different constructs has been tried out along the way, including the creation and/or calculation of more than 20 new variables, some of which have been discarded again. The statistical object that I present here is the sum total of a long and winding procedure, which has both branched and back-tracked many times. This history of the statistical object is quite difficult to reconstruct, yet affects how I have accumulated knowledge of the data analysed here, and this process being both complex and inscrutable means that any outside evaluation of the validity of the analysis is seriously hampered. This much is perhaps the case with all statistical analysis, but what exacerbates the case of multiple correspondence analysis is the unique combination of advanced statistics and geometry, and the immediately accessible “maps”, that it provides. Such apparent transparency may contribute to disregarding the complexities of the statistics, and the history of development of the statistical objects. There are no easy means of preventing such cursory readings of the analysis but to reiterate the importance of understanding the procedures and calculations that underpin the graphical summarization.

5.3.2 Steps of a Multiple Correspondence Analysis

The literal computational procedures of geometric data analysis would take far to much space to here. But the computational output will be my most important interpretational aid, so this will be presented briefly here. In loose terms, what multiple correspondence analyse does is construct two multidimensional spaces - one of the active modalities of the active questions and one of the individuals in the analysis. Within these spaces, a cloud of points (representing the data set) constitutes the object of analysis. In the space of individuals, each

102 Le Roux & Rouanet (2010) gives a thorough introduction to the computations underpinning the analysis, and a detailed mathematical explanation can be found in Le Roux and Rouanet (2004)

103 The spaces are related in that each modality, e.g. Gender: Male is located as the mean point of all male individuals; and each individual is located at the mean point of all the modalities describing that individual. Some fairly simple transitions formulas translate the coordinates between the space of individuals, and the space of modalities.
point represents a respondent in the data set, whereas each point in the space of modalities represents a modality. These spaces are of a high dimensionality, which make them literally impossible to envision. But nothing prevents us from constructing such a space mathematically, and the next step in the multiple correspondence analysis is then project this space onto a space of fewer dimensions, so that we can examine it visually. The next step is thus to locate the axes of the multidimensional space which best preserve the structure of the cloud. How well each axis preserves the space is expressed by the eigenvalue of the axis, the sum of which is the total variance of the multidimensional space. By selecting the axes with the highest eigenvalues, one constructs - axis by axis - the subspace which best preserves the clouds. The sum of the eigenvalues of the axes selected is used to calculate the rate of the total variance preserved in the subspace constructed, and this is an important measure of the quality of the analysis. Often one must decide whether having explained e.g. 75% of the total variance is sufficient, or one need to include more axes. This is a tricky question, since each axis must be interpreted and examined in relation to the other axes. If one can reasonably restrict the analysis to three axes, one only has to consider three planes (axes 1x2, 1x3 and 2x3). But if it proves necessary to include a fourth axis the number of planes that must be examined increases to 6 (1x2, 1x3,1x4, 2x3, 2x4, 3x4). One such analysis can be found in the thesis of Mikael Börjesson (Börjesson 2005) and while his analysis is both thorough and stringent, it is extremely difficult to envision a four-dimensional space, and properly grasp the relations between the planes. For each axis chosen for further analysis, one can now examine the coordinates and the quality of representation of each of the active modalities and decide what this particular axis says about the structures of the data set.

5.3.3 Interpretational Knacks and Craftsmanship

In a oft-cited passage, Benzecri describes the interpretation of axes as follows "Interpreting an axis amounts to finding out what is similar, on the one hand, between all the elements figuring on the right of the origin, and, on the other hand, between all the elements on the left; and expressing with conciseness and precision, the contrast between the two extremes" (Benzécri cited from Le Roux & Rouanet 1998:205). In order to do so, I will be employing a small number of calculations that facilitate exactly such interpretation. Those calculations and the procedures related to them are the topic of this short interlude. The interpretational procedures I will using in the following lean on the interpretational approaches suggested by Le Roux & Rouanet(1998:203ff. and 2004:49ff.). The first interpretational aid is the vari-
...ance of the clouds, which is the weighted mean of the squared distances between each point and the mean point. Thus one can examine how each point contributes to the total variance of the cloud, and interpret this as a measure of the points importance.

It is possible to examine the contributions of points more specifically, first by examining how they contribute to each axis, and secondly by examining the contributions as they are structured by the design of the questionnaire. When examining what modalities are central to the interpretation of each axis, one examines their contribution to the variance explained by the axis.

Each question consists of a number of modalities, and these modalities make up a subset of the cloud of points. This allows the researcher to both examine the contribution of each modality to the question, and the contribution of the entire question to the entire cloud. One can go even further, as is done in the cited study of French political space (Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:366) and assign separate themes to subsets of questions, so that the set of questions is nested in the set of themes, and then examine the contribution of each theme.

Both when looking at what modalities are important to each axis, and when comparing questions or sets of questions, a threshold of importance is needed, and the one usually suggested is the average contribution (ibid.), although it can be necessary to adopt less severe thresholds, or to apply it cautiously (Le Roux & Rouanet 1998:205) for instance when analysing very homogenous data sets. If all modalities contribute equally to the variance explained by one axis, no one modality can be said to be of greater or smaller importance. Therefore comparing the actual contributions to the average contribution enables one to decide which modalities, questions or themes are central to interpreting the axes.

In order to interpret a multiple correspondence analysis, one proceeds by following the algorithm below:

1. Examine eigenvalues of the axes and calculate the modified rates of variance.
2. Select a sufficient set of axes, so that their accumulated modified rate of variance exceed 80%, and so that the eigenvalue of the last axis interpreted is well separated from the first axis not interpreted.
3. Examine, for each axis, the contribution of all modalities to the specific variance.

Le Roux & Rouanet (1998:205) recommend calculating both the contributions of the modalities to the questions and the contributions of deviations between sets of modalities, which enables one to quantitatively estimate the quality of the oppositions between modalities. These techniques require calculations that are not easily performed within the software (SPAD 6.5) I have used for the analysis. In addition to that practical hindrance, since many of the modalities of my analysis are fairly infrequent, examining particular response patterns is likely to be a futile exercise (Le Roux & Rouanet 1998:206). I will therefore not be calculating the contributions of deviations, and the quality of my analysis must be estimated by other means.
4. Select all modalities contributing to the specific variance of the axis above some threshold of importance - most often the average contribution of modalities.

5. Describe each axis in terms of the unifying characteristics of the contributing modalities located at either end of the axis and what characterises the contrast between the two sides of the origin.

6. Examine the planes produced by the various combinations of axes selected.

7. Describe the modalities and groups of modalities by their position in the planes.

Following these steps one shifts from statistical analysis to sociological analysis when proceeding from step 3 to step 4: While the selection of contributing modalities is a matter of statistically assessing a proper threshold of importance, describing what characterises this collection of modalities is no statistical matter; this latter analysis requires a sociological apprehension of the modalities in question, which no statistical analysis can provide.

The procedure of interpretation may appear very formal. This is because in order to not simply be seduced by the intuitive readings that the planar maps invite to, one must adhere to a stringent procedure. This may not ensure a thorough analysis, but it will at least provide some point where the analysis is evaluated, and where the formalisation may gainsay the hunches and hypotheses of the researcher.
CHAPTER 6.0

The Space of SSPSE Student Trajectories

In this chapter, I conduct the actual construction of the space of SSPSE students, by way of specific multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) (Le Roux & Rouanet 2010). Recapitulating some of the discussions in chapter 2, the MCA constructs a multidimensional space wherein all individuals and modalities of the data set are projected as points. The space thus maps out the different social biographical pathways which led the individuals the SSPSE, and that map provides me with the first layer of the homology between the students’ positions within the SSPSE, and the dispositions yielded from the qualitative analyses in later chapters. This chapter starts out with a presentation and discussion of the data I am analysing, and the manipulations of them that I have performed. Then, the complete specific MCA is presented, and the first three axes are analysed in details. The final part of the chapter turns attention to a number of supplementary elements: Age, gender, geography, exemptions, in order to discuss any structuring effect of these elements.

6.1 The Data

The particular set of data I will be analysing originates from an evaluation ordered and published by the Danish NISE Rectors Conference: “Being a student - takes hold of you” (Svejgaard 2006). The data encompasses 796 students enrolled in SPPSE at 21 different NISE. The data were collected from the enrollment information kept in the archives of these NISE, and covers the entire population of SSPSE students who enrolled in September 2003 and 2004. The data were collected by having enrollment secretaries at these 21 NISE type the data

105 This evaluation consist of three parts and the data I am using here, originates from the first of these. The evaluation in total, including the other two parts were discussed in chapter 3.
from the archives into a spreadsheet provided by the consultant responsible for the evaluation. The secretaries were asked to answer a questionnaire of ten questions for each student by entering the information into the spreadsheet (op. cit. p.111ff.) :

1. Year of enrollment: \{2003, 2004\}
2. Classname\textsuperscript{106}: textfield
3. Gender: \{male, female\}
4. Student year and month of birth: two textfields
5. Has the student’s employer given written assent to educational leave: \{Yes, no\}
6. Education allowing admission: \{ten different , cf. Table 6.2 below\}
7. Has the NISE exempted the student from requirements for enrollment \{Yes, No\}
7a. If yes in question 7, what was the reason for the exemption: Textfield
8. How many months of work experience within these parts of the field of social education does the students have:\{Daycare, nursery/school, SFO\textsuperscript{107}, Special care, Other experience\}
9. Has the student documented other qualifications relevant to admission: \{Yes, No\}
9a. If yes in question nine, what qualifications have been documented: text field
10. Any other comments: text field.

\section*{6.1.1 SSPSE Reconstructed}

What information can in fact be derived from these data, and what ramifications does the manner of data collection (questionnaire and spreadsheets) have for my analysis?

Working with data collected by others - with other research objectives in mind - raise a number of important questions. In the case at hand, before I even examine the actual body of data, there are two specific features of the data collection, which must be discussed further. First the way the purpose and assumptions of the evaluation appear in the questionnaire, secondly the manner in which the data has been collected. In short, the evaluation constructs its object of analysis in a particular way, which must be taken into account in my analysis. The purpose of the evaluation\textsuperscript{108} is to examine “how the students are distributed across the admission requirements and the extent of exemptions from the admission requirements” (op.cit, p.14). The question that the evaluation hopes to answer by analyzing these data are very closely related to the requirements for admission. Thus

\textsuperscript{106} This refers to a code, usually a year and one or more letters(M04, VX03) , used by the NISE for internal administration, scheduling and the like

\textsuperscript{107} SFO is a Danish Abbreviation, which refers to Leisure time Care facilities. I have retained it here, and in the graphs coming, because of the lengthy translated name. It also covers after-school recreation centres

\textsuperscript{108} Strictly speaking, I am talking about the purpose of the statistical part of the evaluation, since the evaluation also examines a number of interviews with current and former SSPSE students.
question six has been formulated very close to the educational requirements specified by executive order (Undervisningsministeriet(1997) §§5, §31, art. 2). Question six lists only the examinations that this order specifically specifies as allowing admission. Effectively these are the secondary schools/high schools, that enable enrolling at tertiary education in Denmark. In the material, there are a number of students with both Danish and foreign university degrees, but these and several other forms of education are not consistently entered and can therefore not be examined in the following analysis.

The executive order also states that a condition of admission is that the applicant has worked for at least five years in social education.(ibid.). This part of the admission requirements is reflected in question eight of the questionnaire. The description of the students work experience is thus restricted first to this question about social educational work experience, and secondly to the five categories given in the questionnaire.

In question eight, the students’ social educational work experience is categorized into five variables, based on type of institution: Daycare, Nursery/Nursery School, SFO, Special care, Other experience. These categories reflect on the one hand a dichotomization in common usage in both the NISE and the social educator profession: normal area versus special areas, and on the other hand the formal division of labour between social educational institutions.

The special-normal dichotomy places social educational work with children in opposition to care of children or adults with mental illnesses, with physical or psychic disabilities, and persons with social problems. The latter are termed the special areas, and the former the normal area. The special areas have a category of its own in the questionnaire, whereas the normal area has three different categories: daycare, Nursery/kindergarten/nursery school and SFO. This reflects the fact that the normal area has a formal division of labour related to the age of the children - in part reflecting the long-lasting dominance of developmental psychology in Danish research of social education and children. No corresponding formal organisation of work exists for the very diverse institutions under the special areas-heading. Finally the question about the extent of exemptions is examined in questions 7, 7a, 9 and 9a of the questionnaire. The students are typically exempted from either the requirement of five years work

109 SFO is the danish abbreviation for Leisure time care facility. Here, it also covers afterschool recreation centers. I often use the heading After-school in the graphs to come, in order to avoid confusion with the educational abbreviations.

110 There are, of course, names and regulations governing this complex mass of institutions, however these are not in use within the NISE. Instead diagnoses are commonly used: Autism, Downs syndrome, coarse diagnoses lumped together (e.g. Late brain damage, psychic or physical disabling and categories of social problems (e.g. criminality, abuse, eating disorders)(Gytz Olesen 2005a).
experience or from the educational requirements. The questionnaire only asks what the reason for the exemption was, not which specific part of the executive order the students was exempt from. Summing up, the very design of the questionnaire reconstructs the SSPSE student individuals with only their secondary education, with social education work experience categorised in accordance with everyday informal categorisations, and particular attention to exemptions related to the executive orders requirements for enrollment.

The choice to collect data by combining the archives of the 21 NISE by way of a spreadsheet means that the actual, irreversible decisions made in coding have been done by (at least) 21 different people. In the question discussed above, about work experience and the normal-special dichotomy, it is readily apparent that the distinctions between areas of experience are quite vague. For instance a number of students have been employed as domestic help for sick, disabled or elderly persons. Are these cases of social educational work? If so, do they belong under special care or normal area? Since 21 different persons has encoded this information, there is no way of knowing neither how such particular choices have been made, nor whether the choices have been made consistently between the 21 different NISE. Things become further complicated by the final category “Other experience”, where a number of jobs vaguely related to social education may conceivably end up: nurse, sports coach, domestic help and so on. The daily routines of domestic helpers and social educators may formally be related to different social and governmental sectors, but in actual daily practice they resemble each other closely. It is not only possible, but even likely, that work experience from jobs such as this has been coded inconsistently, because of the spreadsheet-collection.

In the later chapters, several informants will be presented, with even more complicated social education work biographies: one has worked as a jailor, one has partially completed training as a nurse, one has worked as a social health assistant. There is no way of knowing how these three examples would have been coded, nor whether they have been coded consistently throughout the material.

The 37 students I have been following in my field work, has also been entered in to the data set. In order to do that, it was of course necessary that I myself made these very choices about categorising experience. The actual choices I made, are visible from the coding tables found in appendix 4. In the end, examining the text-fields associated with the “Other” area of experience, and the analytical result this category produces, it appears quite stable as a heading of health and care work positions: nurses, care of elderly etc - but not disabled persons, and for that reason I have kept it in the analysis.
6.1.2 The Main Body of Data

The data handed over to me include 796 individuals\textsuperscript{111} described by 71 variables. Of these 19 are directly coded from the questionnaire, and the remaining 52 are various re-coding and computations based on the questionnaire. An overview of the original 19 variables follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v1</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>Which NISE, 32 modalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year of enrollment, 2003 or 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Classname, text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gender, male or female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp4a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Year of birth, integer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp4b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>month of birth, integer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Employer leave assent, Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education, 12 modalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp6txt</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Details of other education, text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exemptions, Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp7txt</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Exemption reason, text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp8a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Months of maternal daycare experience, integer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp8b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Months nursery / nursery school exp., integer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp8c</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Months SFO exp., integer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp8d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Months Special care exp, integer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp8e</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Months other exp., integer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp8txt</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Details of other exp., text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other qualifications documented, Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp9txt</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>Details of other qualifications, text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other comments, text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Variables derived from Svejgaard’s questionnaire

\textsuperscript{111} In the original materials, there are 796 students. I have however entered the 37 students whom I study into the data-set as well. The tables that follow are based on this modified dataset, with n=833. While including students enrolled respectively two and three years after the original dataset might slightly offset the data, it also means that I will only include the various frequency tables once. I have included several variables that enable sorting my informants from originals informants, in order to compare and validate this inclusion. A discussion of how the students I have entered into the dataset compares to the rest is part of the total analysis later in this chapter
Italics denote variables I have not used, and thus will not comment. 6 variables contain written answers, ranging from short abbreviated educational terms to longer descriptions of e.g. previous employment. In the following I will discuss the variables that I have in fact used more or less directly: gender and education. I will then go on to discuss some derivations Svejgaard makes, how they were derived, and how I use them. Finally, I will present the derivations I have made myself.

**Education**: The first variable which I use is the variable describing the qualifying educational credentials of the students. Table 6.2 below shows the distribution, after some minor modifications to the coding.\(^{112}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Folkeskolen Leaving certificate or equal</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Higher Preparatory Examination (HF)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Foreign exam or Special upper secondary programme for non-Danish speaking pupils (GIF)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Upper Secondary School Leaving examination (STX)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Educational childworker and care assistant exam. (PGU)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Higher Technical or Business Examination (HTX/HHX)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other exam., requiring at least 2 years of training</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Vocational training or education</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>25,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Passed entrance exam for Advanced Social and health studies (SOSU)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt from Education requirements</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Education

The 10 modalities that make up this variable describe the various examinations etc. qualifying students for admission to the SSPSE. Most of these are various secondary school leaving examinations(2,3,4,6), and various forms of vocational training(5, 8, 9). Some students have some other form of training or education, in excess of two years(7) - these include nurses, bachelors in relaxa-

\(^{112}\) The original modalities “Foreign exam” and “Special upper secondary programme for non-Danish speaking pupils” has been combined in the table shown here, as has “Higher Business Examination” and “Higher Technical Examination”.
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tion and psychomotor therapy, occupational therapy and others. Another group has only the mandatory Leaving Certificate from primary and lower secondary school (1). This qualifies the students for admission, if they in addition to this certificate complete two subjects of the Higher Preparatory Examination. Finally there are the students who have been exempted from the educational requirements for some reason.

The most remarkable thing about this variable is, how differentiated the students are educationally. The largest modality - vocational training and education - encompasses more than 30 different vocations, ranging from cabinet makers and plumbers to shop assistants and secretaries. The second and third-largest modalities are not that different, both HF and STX preparing students for tertiary education\textsuperscript{113}, but the fourth and fifth are quite complex as well. Students having been exempted from educational requirements will presumably have a wide range of educational credentials and students with only Folkeskolens Leaving Certificate, yet over the age 25(cf. Table 6.4 below) has 9 years of diverse areas of experience before applying. In short, this variable points to a wide range of different backgrounds of the SSPSE students, both as to educational credentials, but by extension also to other aspects of their social biography. The HF, STX, HHX, HTX and GIF exams prepare for tertiary education, and are occasionally termed Preparatory Secondary training, in contrast to vocational training. This latter term includes Social Health Assistants. The PGU has very recently (2008) been renamed, and reclassified as vocational training. This was not the case when the students in case completed the PGU training, nor when Svejgaard coded the data. This new, reclassified PGU should thus be considered a wholly different examination from the one examined here.

When performing the actual multiple correspondence analysis, the educational data has been re-coded slightly: The modalities 1: Folkeskolens leaving certificate and 7: Other exam requiring at least 2 years of training has been combined as one modality: Primary school/Other exam. When examining the textual data on the students belonging to the two groups, there turned out to be a great deal of similarity - partial training in a social/care-profession (nurse, teacher, social worker or social educator). While the coding retains the formal differentiations

\textsuperscript{113} Differences between HF and STX are admission(Folkeskolens Advanced leaving certificate required for HF), duration (HF is 2 years whereas STX is 3), and history; STX being a traditional secondary school, dating back to church school in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, and HF being a comparatively recent addition to the educational system (1967), in an attempt to recruit a greater part of the population for secondary schooling. The ministry of Education markets HF as “for the older applicants” (www.ug.dk/Vejledningsportal/Elementer/Guide%20til/Artikler.aspx?article_id=univ-elev67hf) which indicates that this recruitment strategy is still in operation.
used within the ministry of education, these differentiations are not necessary the ones socially important\textsuperscript{114}.

**Gender:** Table 6.3 to the right shows the gender distribution of SSPSE students. There is an unsurprising (Cf. Baagøe Nielsen 1998, 2005, and Møller Pedersen 2005:365) but still important disparity between the sexes. For now, suffice to say that the profession of social educator has feminine cultural connotations, and that gender is likely to be an important analytical dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>62,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>37,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Gender

### 6.1.3 Derived variables

The set of data includes a vast amount of *derivations* (in excess of 50 variables). I will be employing several of those in my analysis (Age, Geography, Social Educational Work Experience) and will briefly discuss their coding and calculations here.

**Age:** a variable trivially derived from the variable sp4a. The age calculated is the age at time of enrollment in either 2003 or 2004. Svejgaard continues to examine this in five categories, constructed by partitioning the age span into equal intervals (25-30, 31-35, etc.). There is a notable wide span of student ages, when comparing to most educational settings, in particular one should note that the mode of age categories is 36-40 and that 118 students are above the age of 45 (the oldest being 57), indicating that the SSPSE training is literally part of modern life-encompassing educational systems - lifelong learning, as it were. The students age varies between 25 and 57, with a mean of 37,8 and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>16,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>18,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>29,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>20,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Age

\textsuperscript{114} Also, the two small modalities “Higher Technical or Business examination”, and “Foreign exam or Special upper secondary programme for non-Danish speaking pupils” will both be removed from the analysis (i.e. put as passive elements). Both modalities are below the 5\% rule-of-thumb threshold often used in multiple correspondence analysis, yet cannot sensibly be combined with other modalities.
both median and mode of 38. Since the data encompass the entire population of SSPSE students enrolled in the years 2003-4, they are completely representative. It may be that these two years are in some way different from other years, but no time-series data are available for comparison, excepting the data on the 37 students whom I have studied.

**Geography:** The evaluation partitions the NISE into three geographical categories: the capital, large cities (cities with more than one NISE) and the provinces. Only 21 of the 32 NISE has in fact enrolled SSPSE students in 2003 or 2004, so only these 21 are categorised.

In table 6.5, this categorisation is examined further. While the students are not distributed homogeneously over the three modalities, they are within 9%. As the students population of the capital is much larger than the rest of the country, this seems a representative distribution. This is also reflected in the fact that the capital encompasses almost as many NISE as do the other two modalities. There is a quite substantial difference in how many students each of the NISE contribute to the data, ranging from 1 to 89. One may surmise that this relates to different enrollment procedures, the extent to which the NISE are advertising and actively searching out potential recruits, the organisation of the actual training, and the supportiveness of municipalities. It is, in other words, quite difficult to use the NISE themselves as analytical units, and the above geographical partitioning is the alternative I have chosen to work with instead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large cities</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provinces</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>833</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 Geography

**Social Educational Work Experience:**
In the evaluation data set, these data account for 25 different variables. Five of these are the original raw data: months of work experience within the five categories discussed above: maternal daycare, nursery/school, SFO, special care and other. A sixth variable, Total Social Educational Work Experience is simply a summation of the five previous raw variables, thus providing the total number of months the students has been employed in social educational work. Of the remaining large number of derived variables, most are partial calculations lead-
ing to of a final set of nominal variables, partitioning each of the five raw scalar variables in six modalities, as shown below in table 6.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Daycare</th>
<th>Nursery school</th>
<th>SFO</th>
<th>Special care</th>
<th>Other experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>80,7</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>43,9</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1-2½] year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2½-5] years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5-10] years</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>27,6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10-25] years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6 Social Educational Work Experience

Svejgaard uses this partitioning to construct six clusters of SSPSE students: five clusters comprised of the students, whose social educational work experience is mainly (75% or more) in one area, and students who have no areas of experience above 75%. This classification reduces the social educational experience variable to one dimension, and discards all data on both composition and length of the students’ social educational career. This reduction enables cross-tabulations of social educational work experience. There are however several reasons for not doing so. In order to qualify for admission, the prospective SSPSE student is required to have at least 5 years of social educational work experience. As can be seen from table 6.6 above, a large number of students are in fact below this threshold, if we look at each type of social educational work experience in itself. Addressing only the longest type of experience does not map out the students’ social educational experience trajectories, since this will discard all data about the rest of the students experience. As a matter of fact 478 or 58% of the students have at least one period of employment of less than 5 years. This indicates that a great deal of SSPSE students have social educational work biographies composed of several types of experience, a fact glossed over by the Svejgaard classification. Another reason for retaining the complex compositions of the students biographies is, that there appears to be differences between the various forms of social educational work experience. SFO experience is the most frequent amongst the shorter modalities, and least frequent amongst the longer modalities, whereas Maternal Daycare is in-
frequent amongst the lower modalities, and very frequent amongst the longer modalities. These differences indicates that the various forms of experience serve different biographical purposes, both according to length and experience type. I have chosen to retain some of this complexity in the analysis. I will keep five different variables, one for each type of experience. In order to obtain modalities that contain no less than 5% of the respondents, I first recoded the variables in three categories: No experience, Less than five years of experience and 5 years or more. However, the analyses done with this recoding were quite unstable, due to the large differences in modality weights. In the end, only Nursery/Nursery school proved usable with this coding - the other four variables only yielded stable results, once they had been re-coded as simple binary variables. The final coding is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience, Recoded</th>
<th>Daycare</th>
<th>Nursery school</th>
<th>SFO</th>
<th>Special care</th>
<th>Other experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years of experience</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years of experience</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 Social Educational Work Experience recoded

The distribution of the Nursery experience reveals that this kind of experience is not only the most common one, but is in fact a component of more than half the SSPSE trajectories. For that reason, I shall be paying a particular interest to how nursery experience below five years relates to other kinds of experience.

115 See Section 6.1 above for an explanation of this requirement.
6.1.4 Expanding the Body of Data

I have expanded on the data available from Svejgaard (2006) in two ways: I have added a number of respondents, and I have extrapolated a number of modal variables from the text variables found in Svejgaard. In my fieldwork, I have followed two classes of SSPSE students (for details on their selection etc. see chapter 4 and 8), a total of 37 individuals, 14 from JSEM and 23 from KSEM\(^{116}\). These students were presented with a questionnaire, which was essentially a reconstruction of Svejgaard’s, as discussed above. It is found in appendix 5. It was however expanded with a section asking the students whether they would be willing to participate in interviews, and if so, what email-address and/or cell phone number I could reach them by. This information on the new respondents was entered into the data set by way of three sorting variables covering both the new and the original respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Student:</th>
<th>Observed from KSEM, Observed from JSEM, Original Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview-Willing:</td>
<td>Willing, Unwilling, Original respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewgroup-membership:</td>
<td>JSEM-member, KSEM-member, Not focusgroup-member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since these variables are intended for locating and depicting my 37 additional respondents, they are not immediately statistically interesting.

However, the degree of interview-willingness does appear to vary according to site in a remarkable way, as can be seen in table 6.10 below\(^{117}\). More than half the KSEM students did not wish to take part in any interviews, whereas almost all the JSEM students did.

---

\(^{116}\) KSEM refers to a NISE in Copenhagen, and JSEM refers to one in Jutland. These two sites were, as has been discussed previously (chapter 4) mainly selected because the main distinction found in Svejgaard’s study relates to NISE in the provinces versus those found in larger cities and the capital. This is not to be understood as a consideration of representativity, but rather as an attempt to obtain as great a variety of SSPSE-context as possible. I will return to the differences between the sites of my field work, and the students found in Svejgaard’s data later in this chapter.

\(^{117}\) For reasons of legibility I have omitted the original respondents in this table, and only cross-tabulated the new students. The small numbers involved makes it irrelevant to compared frequencies.
This difference in how the respondents relate to my intrusion is important, and, as I shall return to later in this chapter one component of how geography manifests itself differently in my two sites. I have also done a number of recodings, that enable me to examine the data across several variables.

One is a recalculation of the total length of the students social educational work experience subsequently partitioned into modalities of equal frequency, and a combination of exemption variables, conflating them into one variable describing both whether the students have been exempted on admission, and the nature of their exemption. The mean amount of experience is 7.7, the median is 7 and the mode is six. In other words, the experience length reaches its high point at just over five years of experience. Since 5 years of social educational work experience are the minimum required to qualify for admission to SSPSE training, this is hardly surprising\(^\text{118}\). In short, the students in the data set were admitted with more than the required amount of social educational experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview-willingness</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Respondent</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>95,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8 Interview-willingness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview-groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not member</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>98,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSEM-member</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSEM-member</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9: Interviewgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness by Site</th>
<th>KSEM</th>
<th>JSEM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10 Willingness by site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total experience</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[0;5] years exp</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>25,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] years exp</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>21,94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] years exp</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14,95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8-9] years exp</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10-25] years exp</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>19,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11: Total experience

\(^{118}\) 167 students have exactly the required 5 years of experience, meaning that 37 students are below the required. Only 26 have been exempted from this requirement, however. I can only ascribe this inconsistency to the way the data was obtained, as mentioned earlier.
The exemptions show that while very few students enroll with less than the required five years of experience, almost one in six is not educationally qualified for admission. This may be taken as an indication of the relative importance ascribed to the admission requirements by both students and institutes. While one is readily exempted from the educational requirements, the experience requirements is administered less leniently. The number of students who have been exempted from both requirements for admission is negligible.119

Among the original variables derived directly from the questionnaire, there are five text-variables.120 These have not been analysed by Svejgaard, as they are quite difficult to examine statistically. I believe they do hold important information, as they detail much of the students’ tertiary education, previous employments, voluntary work, and other circumstances that are relevant to the enrollment of the students. These text-fields only lists information for those students that are exempted or in some other way outside of the categories of questions 6 through 10 of the questionnaire. In other words, the information in these fields describe what aspects of the students biography was considered sufficient to replace either education, social educational work experience etc. The textfields detail how the NISE interpret the admission requirements, by telling which alternative qualifications are taken into account when admitting each student. By no means do all such interpretations require exemptions from admission requirements, which make them all the more interesting, since they indicate the grey area between the unarguably qualified and unarguably unqualified applicants. Such an interpretational expansion of what may qualify for admission is one way to observe the aspects of competition between NISE. I have therefore gone manually through them and sorted the information found in these variables, and attempted to retain that information in five extrapolated variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemptions</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social educational Work experience</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>15,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt from both educ. and work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not exempted</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>80,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12: Exemptions

119 Comparing the number of educational exemptions found here with the number found in table 6.2 reveal another inconsistency in the data set. In the variable Education, 106 respondents are recorded as having been exempt from educational requirements, whereas the variable Exemptions shows 135 such exemptions. Careful examination of the data of the 29 additional students does not reveal what caused this inconsistency, and I can only assume that the way the data was obtained is to blame.

120 These are sp6txt, sp7txt, sp8txt, sp9txt and sp10, as listed in table 6.1
Previous careers:
Health/Care, Club/Teacher, Art/Crafts, Commercial/Clerical, None

Admission interview or recommendations by employer:
Binary

Sports coach and other voluntary work:
Binary

Social Educational courses taken previously:
Binary

Stays in Foreign countries, foreign exams, folk high schools:
Binary

These five variables describe dimensions of students biographies, which the NISE in general considered relevant when admitting SSPSE students, which makes it necessary to discuss two questions: first, what the NISE ascription of relevance actually means, and secondly, whether these features accurately describe distinguishing features of the SSPSE population.

Below are tables showing the distribution within these five new variables.

The most striking aspect of these four binary variables is perhaps the relative small fraction of the student population that have stayed in foreign countries, taken courses and so on. These four variables describe students whose trajectories, from the point of view of the NISE, would be insufficient to allow admission, if these courses etc were not included.

This reveal certain interesting aspects of what the NISE, when in need of extended recruitment, deem acceptable qualifications. That social educational courses qualify is obviously sensible, although a more detailed breakdown of what courses are social educational would be interesting. Nor is it remarkable that recommendations from workplaces and admission interviews counts towards allowing admission - although that only 49 students have such recommendations noted in the NISE databases is somewhat remarkable. One might speculate that such recommendations are only considered(and noted) when all other avenues of possible informal qualifications has been considered. These two first variables were quite easy to construct, as courses, recommendations and interviews are quite often mentioned specifically.
We may surmise that work as a sport coach or scout leader etc. is considered a qualification because these activities relate to social groups similar to those social educators work with\(^\text{121}\). This is not trivial: these relations are in fact quite dissimilar to social educational work from another point of view: no trained professionals are involved. In other words, the NISE does not require relations with children et al. to be embedded in a professional context in order to deign that context a social educational experience. This raises a question which I shall return to a number of times: how does a relation come to be described as being social educational? By context, by intent, by constitution or by what other criteria?

The final binary variable above: Foreign stays etc. is perhaps the most indicative of the admission considerations. There is a quite long tradition in Denmark of assuming that foreign stays develop the character og personality of young persons - an aspect of Bildung. That bildung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Educational courses taken previously</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No courses</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>86,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social educ. courses</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.13: Social educ. courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stays in Foreign countries, foreign exams, folk high schools</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Foreign stays etc.</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>86,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Stays.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>13,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.14: Foreign Stays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission interview or recommendations by employer</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>94,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/recommendation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.15: Admission interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports coach and other voluntary work</th>
<th>cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No voluntary work etc</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>90,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary work etc</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.16: Voluntary work

\(^\text{121}\) While this is only an assumption, and no data are available to confirm it, I think arguments can be made for its validity. The voluntary work listed in the data is in general with children, or with marginalized social groups. No political work is listed, nor is any cultural associations listed (amateur theater for instance)
should be an indirect admission criteria means that the focus for the interpre-
tive admission process is the personality, the subject admitted, and not the in-
dividual, as described by the objective qualifications of e.g. educational capital. Based on these considerations, I chose to include folk high schools in this vari-
able as well, as such stays are typically spoken of in a similar personal develop-
ment/Bildung-like way.

The final variable constructed from the textfields is the previous career of the students. By this I mean some form of employment that has been detailed in the textfields. Constructing this variable was a quite massive undertaking, as more than 700 different words are used to de-
scribe the various forms of previous employment of the students. A complete list-
ing of the Danish terms put under each heading is included in appendix 4. I arrived at the five headings by an meticulous inductive construction of similar subgroups, and the successively joining such groups until I reached a man-
geable number of groups. There are two subsets of these groups, one could say: the Teacher/club and Health/Care groups, which are somewhat similar to social educational work, in working conditions and social position, and the Shop/Office and Craftsman/Arts groups, which are quite dissimilar to social education. These two subsets are, as the analysis later on reveals, only similar in certain aspects, and for that reason these groups were the ones I stuck with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Career</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No previous career</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>41,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop/Office</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>20,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Care</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsman/Arts</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Club</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.17: Previous career
6.2 Constructing a Space of SSPSE Student Trajectories

Having now introduced the statistical tools and data, I will now turn to the actual analysis. That analysis is presented in three parts: an introducing discussion of how the research question must be specified (operationalized) so that data, methodology and research questions fit each other. After that, the actual multiple correspondence analysis is performed, and the resulting axes and planes are interpreted. The third and final part of the analysis consists in an Euclidean classification of the data, based on the space constructed in the multiple correspondence analysis. This classification partitions the individuals into five classes, with different characteristics. I shall then relate the sites and the informants to bo the space and the classes, and thereby provide a contextual framework, which will hopefully connect the various empirical aspects of this study.

6.2.1 What Questions Can MCA Apply to These Data?

Multiple Correspondence Analysis is uniquely suited to the analysis of multivariate data, if one subscribes to a relational understanding of the social world, as discussed above. Unlike most multivariate analytical statistics, MCA cannot (immediately) tell the statistician whether certain variables depend on some other variables. Instead, MCA enables the statistician to answer questions of what kind of differences or distinctions characterise the data, or in other words, what relations structure this particular set of individuals. I am attempting to answer the question of how the students have arrived at the SSPSE. Since I am examining students who are already there, the question must be posed as examining the differences in the students who have enrolled: *Which differences do the students’ social biographies*\textsuperscript{122} encompass?

By posing that question, I have of course already restricted myself to the problems that quantitative analysis can answer - and the aspect of the subjective appropriation of the trajectory, and the training as such are relegated to the examination of the student life histories and the classroom studies respectively. The operationalization of the question is severely limited by the nature of the data at hand. As has been discussed above, the data reconstruct the SSPSE with

\textsuperscript{122} Social biography means the part of the students life history which can be described by formalised structural social relationships to institutions and work, whereas life history is the subjective reconstruction of the social biography - in my case, as made available in interviews. Trajectory is a metaphorical synonym for the social biography. - but in the analysis here, the data of course restricts the extent to which the trajectory can be examined in its totality.
primarily a view towards the enrollment criteria, and thus the students as an object of administration and gatekeeping. And so the extent of analysis is further restricted, as the research questions are operationalized as a choice of active questions in the multiple correspondence analysis.

6.2.2 Choice of Active Variables in the Analysis

The question above will be operationalized by analysing the data which can be said to be components of the students social trajectory:

- Education
- Social work experience, Kinds
  - Daycare
  - Nursery
  - After-school
  - Special Care
  - Other Social educational experience
- Other work experience
- Coaching and other voluntary work
- Social Educational courses

These variables do not thoroughly describe neither the students’ histories of education or employment, since the data are restricted to what has been relevant to the NISE, when enrolling the students. The object these variables describe is the work experience and education that has allowed each student to be enrolled. The question above must be specified as follows:

*What different types of educational and employment trajectories has satisfied the admission requirement of the SSPSE?*

As I shall return to extensively in the following chapter, a predominant feature of current social educator training is the necessity of competition between NISE, in order to recruit students. One aspect of this competition is the willingness of NISE to be lenient, or perhaps even creative, when applying the admission requirements to applicants. Apart from a great freedom of interpretation as to what kinds of unskilled labour constitutes social educational work experience, the NISE are also quite willing to exempt students from the requirements, providing additional avenues of recruiting students.

I have chosen to examine a number of variables as structuring factors, for practical reasons: the composition of the students’ educational work experience
more or less determine whether they have been exempted from criteria of enrollment, and whether interviews and recommendations have been used. Of the primarily variables, the following have been put as supplementary elements:

- Stays in Foreign countries, foreign exams, folk high schools
- Age
- Gender
- Geography
- Exemptions
- Enrollment interview/recommendations
- NISE at which the student is enrolled

Not all of these turn out to be pertinent to the analysis performed. They will be discussed to the extent that they have any structuring effects.

In addition, the variables describing the focus-group membership, observed students, and interview-willingness have also been included as supplementary.

The analysis performed is a Specific Multiple Correspondence Analysis, with 9 active questions, and 29 modalities, of which two are put as passive. These are presented below - the passive modalities are italicized and marked with a *.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous career</td>
<td>No prev. Career</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shop/office</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsman/Arts</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health/care</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher/Youth Club</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Courses</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports coach/Scout/Voluntary</td>
<td>Voluntary work etc</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No voluntary</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery/Nursery School</td>
<td>No nursery</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5 nursery</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5+ nursery</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school/SFO</td>
<td>After-school+</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No After-school</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.3 The Analysis and Axis Selection

The specific multiple correspondence analysis initially presents a set of 27 axes and corresponding eigenvalues. Of these, 9 have eigenvalues above the average eigenvalue,\(^{123}\). The eigenvalues of the axes, as well as the modified calculations suggested by Le Roux and Rouanet (ibid.) are shown in table 6.1 below.

---

**Table 6.1: Questions and modalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Care</th>
<th>No Special Care</th>
<th>606</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Care +</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experience</td>
<td>No other Exp</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other exp +</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>No Daycare</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daycare+</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTX/HHX*</td>
<td>26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school/Other</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIF/Foreign*</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social/Health</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care Assist</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper 2nd(STX)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exempt Educ</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Prep(HF)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{123}\) Found through calculating the specific variance of the analysis, divided by the dimensionality of the cloud (that is, the number of active modalities minus the number of questions without passive modalities): 2.00587 / (27-8) = 0.105572.
I will present the numbers in this table informally, so that readers who are not conversant with geometric data analysis understands these important results. The eigenvalue is a measure of the explanatory strength of each axis found. By comparing the eigenvalue of the axes found to the average eigenvalue, the first 9 axes are found to have an eigenvalue above average - they are, so to speak, above average at explaining the structure of the data-set. The modified eigenvalues show the squared distance between each of the 9 above-average axes, and the average eigenvalue. The higher modified eigenvalue, the more important the axis is. The modified rate and cumulated rate simply express the modified eigenvalues as percentage of the total modified eigenvalues, and so the first three axes can be seen to explain 83,5% of the modified eigenvalues. In general terms 83,5 % of the differentiating characteristics of this data-set are explained by the first three axes. Looking at the plot of the eigenvalues in graph 6.1 above, the eigenvalues of show some separation between axes 2 and 3, axes 3 and 4 and axes 5 and 6. For these reasons I have chosen to interpret three axes. I have briefly examined the fourth and fifth axis, and will briefly comment on their importance later on.

In the following, I begin by examining each of the first three axes, and interpret them meaning according to the modalities that contribute above average for each of them. However, axis one and two turn out to be quite closely related. In order to completely examine the meaning of these two axes, I will be looking at them together as well. One short word on notation: Modalities spoken of in the text are put in **this typeface** - enabling me signal when I am referring to vocational training in general, or to the **vocational training** modality active in the analysis.
6.2.4 Axis One: Previous Careers and Indirect Trajectories

One cannot interpret axis one and two entirely separated, as was mentioned above. This inseparability is quite visible, if one plots the modalities which contribute above average to axis one.

As is readily apparent, all the contributing modalities have negative coordinates on axis two. They are thus all positioned in opposition to something on axis two. While axis one is in fact perfectly interpretable on its own, important aspects of the space constructed in this analysis will escape, if the two axes are not considered together. I shall return to this point under the interpretation of axis two. The contributions and the coordinates of the modalities that contribute above average to axis one are as follows:

---

124 It is perhaps vital here to understand the interpretative concept of opposition in geometric data analysis. Each point found in a graph as the ones shown here, achieves its coordinates, and thus its position, because of its relations to other points. The coordinates are not innate attributes of the modalities, they reflect the modalities’ relations to each other. A helpful metaphor is to think not of traditional coordinates (say, income related to age) but to think in terms of attraction and repulsion. Two modalities, that rarely coincide, will appear to “repulse” each other, and obtain opposed positions on the graphs. Modalities that commonly coincide will appear to “attract” each other, thus obtaining positions close to each other. That all modalities in graph 6.2 appear below the origin of axis two is thus not to be understood an attribute these modalities share, but rather as a shared relation to some other modalities, that are positioned in the other end of axis two.

125 Table 6.20 below (and also both 6.21 and 6.22) contains the following information for each modality whose relative contribution to axis one exceeds the average relative contribution: The name of the question (i.e. variable) and of the modality, (i.e. variable category), their relative contribution (that is, the contribution of this modality in percent of all contributions to this axis, abbreviated Ctr), the coordinates of each modality on this axis, and finally the interpretative headings I have chosen for each aspect of this axis. The table has been sorted by coordinates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>CTR</th>
<th>Coord.</th>
<th>Indirect trajectory types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>Teacher/Youth Club</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>Insider careers in trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experience</td>
<td>Other exp +</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>Health/care</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1,12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social educational courses</td>
<td>Soc Educ Courses+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0,99</td>
<td>Outsider careers in trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare experience</td>
<td>Daycare+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>Craftsman/Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>Shop/office</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.20: Contributing modalities on axis 1

Graph 6.2: Axis one, contributing modalities in plane of axis one and two
The overall interpretation of the first axis is that it describes types of indirect trajectories, opposing insiders and outsiders of the field of welfare work (Brodersen 2009).

Since half the modalities contributing to this axis belong to the same question - Previous Careers - this axis is strongly related to that question. On the negative side of the origin, Health/Care careers appear, along with Teacher/Youth Club careers - both careers are similar to the work of a social educator, in that care, social education, and assisting other people characterize them all. In addition, social educational courses appear here as well, showing that the trajectories characterized by this aspect of axis one relate directly to the field of social education. One further modality is present at this aspect of the axis: Other Experience. Examining the students with this experience showed, that this to a large extent means various forms of caring, nursing, working in nursing homes and hospices; work that while not normally considered as social educational work, still exhibits the same kind of similarities as mentions above.

Opposed to these, on the positive side of the origin are two very dissimilar career types: craftsmen/artists and shop/office. Both of these careers more or less require some sort of vocational training, consequently it is no surprise that vocational training appears as closely associated with these career types. Daycare experience is also associated with these types of careers, indicating one important cross-over point for students with careers that have little in common with social educational work.

I interpret this axis as opposing various kinds of indirect trajectories - that is, trajectories that pass through domains of work other that social education before entering the domain of social education. The polarity of the axis can then be described as, on the right hand, trajectories that involve complete abandon of their previous line of work, in order to transition to social education, and on the left hand, trajectories that have simply shifted from other kinds of care work to social education. The latter I will call insiders as their background will provide a great familiarity with a practice similar to social education, whereas the former will be called the outsiders - those, whose previous careers provide no foreknowledge of the practice of social education.

6.2.5 Axis Two: Direct Trajectories

As axis one yielded an opposition between forms of indirect trajectories towards the domain of social education, while at the same time being in its totality in opposition to parts of the second axis, it is no surprise that the second axis is characterized by an opposition between direct and indirect trajectories.
The modalities contributing above average to the second axis are detailed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Ctr</th>
<th>Coord.</th>
<th>Direct/Indirect trajectories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other experience</td>
<td>Other exp +</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous career</td>
<td>Health/care</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous career</td>
<td>Craftsman/Arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>Indirect trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery experience</td>
<td>No nursery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special care experience</td>
<td>(Special care+)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Higher Prep(HF)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>Direct trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Experience</td>
<td>5+ nursery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Care Assist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.21: Contributing modalities on axis 2

The overall interpretation of this axis is that it opposes the indirect trajectories described by the first axis with direct trajectories. The first point of note in table 6.21 is the reoccurrence of many modalities from axis one, on the negative side of axis two. All but two modalities contributed above average to the first axis, underscoring once again the intimate relationship between these two axes. These modalities all characterize some form of indirect trajectory. The two new modalities are no nursery experience, and special care experience. I shall return to the interpretation of these two modalities shortly. First I will turn my attention to the modalities found at the positive end of the second axis. Most prominent here are No previous career, and the More than five years of nursery/nursery school experience. These modalities indicate a direct trajectory towards the domain of social education compared to those described of the first axis - a trajectory that does not include any other fields of employment prior to entering the domain of social education. The two other contributing modalities found in this part of axis two consolidate this interpretation: One trains for Care Assistant mostly as part of employment in nurseries, and as it qualifies directly to admission to the SSPSE, it is commonly taken with that in mind, by students

---

It should be pointed out that “special care experience” in fact does not contribute above average. It is very close to doing so, however - just 0.14% short. No other modality comes this close, and as including it clarifies some of the interpretation, I have chosen to include it. It should be remembered, that all thresholds for interpretation in geometric data analysis are rules of thumb, and not arbitrary, rigid requirements. Here - and in later tables - such inclusion is visible in the tables by italicization and regular parentheses surrounding the modality name.
who have no general preparatory secondary examination. The Higher Preparatory examination (HF) modality is such a general preparatory secondary examination, and appears here in opposition to Vocational training. The positive aspect is thus not educationally associated with any specific vocation. Before returning to the left-over modalities Special care experience and No nursery experience it is necessary to look at the contributing modalities of axis two, in the plane of the first and second axis, of the following page. The modalities suggest a triangular shape, wherein the two kinds of indirect trajectories found on axis one are opposed to the direct trajectories found at the positive aspect of axis two. What, however, is also apparent is that on axis one, the group of direct-trajectory modalities, and the Special Care experience and No nursery experience pair, occupy similar positions close to the origin of axis one, and so these modalities are not described by axis one. These two sets of modalities are simply related to the inherent polarisation of More than five years of nursery experience and No nursery experience. Special care experience and more than five years of nursery experience are thus almost mutually exclusive, and both nursery experience and Special care experience are in opposition to indirect careers.

Graph 6.3: Axis two, contributing modalities in plane of axis one and two
Summing up, the two first axes show an opposition between, on the first axis, insider and outsider trajectories in relation to the field of welfare work, and, on the second axis, an opposition between direct trajectories and indirect trajectories, in relation to the domain of social educational work.

6.2.6 The Third Axis: Trajectory Complexity

The third axis is slightly more complex than the two previous, in that a larger number of modalities contribute above, or just below average. As with the second axis, I will include some of the modalities just below the threshold on average contribution, because they will both aid in interpreting the axis, and because the threshold is a rule of thumb and should not be applied arbitrarily. The table below list the modalities contributing to the third axis127:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Ctr</th>
<th>Coord.</th>
<th>Trajectory complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>Teacher/Youth Club</td>
<td>12,92</td>
<td>-1,53</td>
<td>Complex, Multiple components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Educ Courses</td>
<td>Soc.Educ Courses</td>
<td>19,32</td>
<td>-1,50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Care Assist</td>
<td>5,54</td>
<td>-1,03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Exempt Educ</td>
<td>7,37</td>
<td>-0,94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school experience</td>
<td>After-school+</td>
<td>5,98</td>
<td>-0,80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>Shop/office</td>
<td>4,69</td>
<td>-0,59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Care Experience</td>
<td>(no special care)</td>
<td>2,29</td>
<td>-0,22</td>
<td>Simple, Few components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Experience</td>
<td>(&lt; 5 nursery)</td>
<td>3,48</td>
<td>-0,48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Educ. Courses</td>
<td>(No Courses)</td>
<td>2,91</td>
<td>0,23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Experience</td>
<td>(No nursery)</td>
<td>2,76</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>No prev. Career</td>
<td>3,91</td>
<td>0,38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(Upper 2nd(STX))</td>
<td>2,47</td>
<td>0,54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Career</td>
<td>(Health/ care)</td>
<td>3,17</td>
<td>0,55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Care experience</td>
<td>Special Care +</td>
<td>6,12</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Primary school/ Other</td>
<td>5,38</td>
<td>0,70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Higher Prep(HF)</td>
<td>4,75</td>
<td>0,74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.22: Contributing modalities on the third axis

127 As in table 6.14, the modalities below the threshold have been italicized and put in parentheses.
The third axis opposes complex trajectories, that is, trajectories composed of many components, to simpler trajectories.

On the positive side of the origin on this axis, we find three educational modalities: Upper secondary general exam (STX), Higher Preparatory exam (HF), and Primary school and Other exams requiring two years of training. These all qualify directly for admission to the SSPSE and are combined with two career modalities, No previous career, and Health/care. The examinations associated with Health/care are typically Nurse training, or Social/Health-training, both of which also qualify directly for admission to the SSPSE. If we now turn to the negative side of the origin, two other educational modalities are present - students who have been exempt from the educational admission requirements, and the Care Assistants. While the exemptions can only be described by what they are not (namely, regular secondary education or training), the Care Assistant modality is characteristic in that it is the only form of SSPSE-qualifying training that belongs entirely to the domain of social education. These two modalities of education are here closely related to Social educational courses, and a previous career as Teacher/Youth Club. One first aspect of the opposition on axis three is between
students, whose educational qualifications does not stem from the domain of social education, and students, whose educational qualifications do. There is however more to this axis. Graph 6.4 shows the contributing modalities of the third axis, in the plane of the first and third axis\textsuperscript{128}. Apart from the educational modalities discussed above, there is a number of other modalities: The negative side of the axis contains three modalities related to social educational experience. The close relation of \textit{Less than five years of Nursery/Nursery school experience} and \textit{After-school/SFO experience} indicate that a number of students fulfill the admission requirement of five years of social educational work experience by combining these two areas of work\textsuperscript{129}. As was the case on the second axis, \textit{nursery experience} is opposed to \textit{special care experience}; the latter is closely associated with \textit{Health/Care}. This refines the opposition described by the third axis to be not only between complex and simple educational background, but also between complex and simple social educational work experience.

In short, what this axis shows is an opposition between students whose admission qualifications are composed of multiple components - because they either have several kinds of experience, or because they have educational qualifications that does not immediately qualify for admission, making additional courses and/or exemptions necessary.

It should be noted, that what we see in graph 6.6 at least in part exhibit what is known as a Guttman-effect(Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:220f.), which is to say that the modalities are dispersed along a parabolic shape, indicating that position along the third axis are in some sense dependent upon position along the first axis\textsuperscript{130}. More specifically, almost all modalities contributing above average are located along the insider aspect of the first axis. I believe this simply expresses that insider-careers are much more likely provide students with opportunities to obtain such qualifications as may allow for an exemption: e.g. taking social educational courses cannot be considered independently from whether the student has a career only recently related to the domain of social education, as the outsiders do. Career changes also factor in this axis - as a career change in itself makes for a more complex trajectory, no previous career makes for a simple trajectory. The positions of the 4 Previous career modalities on axis three warrant a short, final comment. The two previous careers \textit{Teacher/Club} and \textit{Shop/Office} are located in the region of the complex trajectories, in opposition to \textit{Health/Care} and \textit{No Previous Career}. These careers all represent the indirect

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{128} The modalities that are included although they contribute below average are underlined and italicized.
  \item \textsuperscript{129} \textit{After-school experience} is remarkable in that almost half the students (44\%, or 53 students out of 120) with this kind of experience have less than the required five years. See table 6.6.
  \item \textsuperscript{130} Specifically, the Guttman effect occurs when there is an approximately quadratic relationship between the principal variables, which is to say that the coordinates on one axis can be derived from the first axis quadratically(Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:220)
\end{itemize}
trajectories of axis two. But as the former two does not per se entail any directly qualifying educational components, they turn out to be more complex than the Health/Care related trajectories. The Health/Care-career is less complex, because of its inherent relation to education, that qualifies directly for admission to the SSPSE.

No Previous Career is apparently closely related to Special care experience on this axis. In the plane of axis one and two, (Graph 6.3) Special Care experience and Nursery experience appeared to be mutually exclusive, even though Special care experience was not part of neither kind of indirect trajectory. Special Care experience appearing here, alongside No Previous Career, Higher Prep. Exam(HF) and Upper Secondary(STX) indicates an additional kind of direct trajectory, involving social educational work experience from special care.

6.2.7 Fourth and Fifth Axis

The fourth and fifth axis will only be briefly discussed here. They do not warrant any extended examination since neither their eigenvalues nor the interpretation show them to be particularly important.

The fourth axis is first and foremost characterized by an opposition between Nursery and Special care social educational work experience. A number of modalities related to this opposition, but this axis mainly reinforces the fact that these two forms of experience are related to direct trajectories, and refines the differences in these direct trajectories. These latter refinements do not provide any clear or simple structures, and so I will stick to the opposition found on axis two between these two kinds of experience.

The fifth axis has only one contributing modality on the negative side - Daycare experience. A number of other modalities are opposed to this, but the main point found here is that Daycare Experience is not a particularly distinguishing feature of the SSPSE student trajectories, since it does not become central before the fifth axis. While this is a rather important point, since many NISE target former daycarers as an important segment of recruitment, it is equally apparent from the absence of Daycare experience in the first three axes.

6.2.8 The Space of SSPSE Trajectories Reconstructed

The interpretations this far provides following characterizations of the three axes analysed.
As is perhaps already apparent, all axes thematically revolve around the same issues, the career, education and experience of the SSPSE students. When one examines the contributions of the questions used in constructing the space, Previous career and education are clearly crucial to the construction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis Name</th>
<th>Main opposing features of the axis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect trajectory types</td>
<td>Field of welfare work insiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field of welfare work outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajectory direction</td>
<td>Indirect trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajectory complexity</td>
<td>Complex - Multiple components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple - Few components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.23: Axis summary

It is however equally important to notice that these two dominating questions always appear in conjunction with other questions, and it is the relationships between specific modalities, that determine the interpretation of each axis.

As seen in the analysis previously, the two first axes produce a triangular shape in the cloud of modalities, and this triangle then extend into a line separating the direct nursery trajectories from the direct special care trajectories. In order to understand the space of SSPSE applicant trajectories spatially I have created an attempt at a three-dimensional illustration below. This is by no means an accurate depiction of how the cloud of modalities looks. It is an attempt to synthesize the most important points found so far, in order to describe, first, what characteristics does in fact make an important difference between the SSPSE trajectories, and secondly, how these characteristics relate
I have plotted all modalities of the Previous career-variable in the illustration, and a few other modalities. They are, by nature of this projected illustration, not accurately positioned, and the reader will also find that their relative position is somewhat ambiguous. I refer to the plots above (Graphs 6.2 through 6.4) for more accurate positions, and also to the plots further on (Graphs 7.5-7.7). The illustration does show us the main relations characterizing the space of trajectories - the oppositions encompassed by the three first axes, and the relations between some of the more prominent kinds of social educational work experience.

The findings of the analysis this far, which will inform all further analysis, are summaries of the main features of the population of SSPSE students, as reconstructed by the data available here:

- This population contains a number of students with indirect trajectories, leading them from outside the field of welfare work to the profession of social educator, or from the inside field of welfare work, to a slighter career change into social education.
- This structure is complemented by opposition between trajectories with both educational and experience qualifications matching requirements by the admission regulations, and those whose qualifications are more com-

---

131 Since this chapter is desperately cluttered by graphs and tables, I have chosen to omit complete plots of the three planes with all contributing modalities. Such plots (Graphs 7.5 through 7.8) will be presented later, when the Euclidean classification has been completed.
plex, composed of several elements allowing the trajectory to qualify for admission, possibly by exemptions.

- All of these trajectories are opposed to the direct and simple trajectories, which involve little career change, straightforward qualifications and an experience from only one kind of social educational work, either nursery or special care.

The sociological implications of this construction of the space relate to inter-NISE competition as a condition of the domain of social education. That the most important difference found in the data is an opposition between Social/Care Insiders and Outsiders shows that the SSPSE as a professional training edges closer to nursing, health, and other care professions, while at the same time SSPSE has become a common career choice for craftsmen et al. who want or require such change. In short, the social educator profession, and both indirect trajectories are in social proximity, even though there would seem to be great cultural differences between them.

The inclusion of opposition between Direct/Indirect and Simple/Complex trajectories may also indicate an expansion of the areas of recruitment for SSPSE. Since the data does not allow a comparison over time, this claim requires confirmation by other data, which I shall return to as I consider the structuring factors.

6.3 Axial Themes Reframed as Capital

The above interpretation of the axial themes relate strictly to the common features of the modalities. I cannot, from this analysis alone, state that any of the differences found in the analysis alone are interpretable as forms of capital in the domain of social educator training, since that would require me being able to discern specific social dominance relations coinciding with the structures of the space of SSPSE student trajectories. However, I propose instead to discuss in the following what species of capital the three first axis might be taken to represent, and in the coming chapters (chapter 10 and 12 specifically) I shall return to see if respectively my interviews and the classroom observations provide supporting evidence that these axes may be understood as representing different composition of capital.

In order to do so, it is important to underscore, that all students share the requirements for enrollment: five years of social educational work experience, and some form of secondary school exam. It is thus the differences in how these
components are made up and combined, that must be considered, in order to discern any possible relevant forms of capital. We may begin by asserting that as all SSPSE students have some sort of work experience, there is a sort practical familiarity with the social educational institutional settings and organizations, which most of them will possess; a familiarity that reveals itself as an ability to address social educational questions from a practical, everyday organizational point of view. Such cultural capital acquired from social educational settings one could possibly term practical social educational capital. While such capital may span a wide range of social educational contexts, there are of course difference between social educational institutions. Keeping this in mind, as well as the fact that the questions Previous Career and Education contribute the most to all three axes analyzed, I will focus on these two latter questions, and mostly disregard the differences stemming from the five questions related to social educational work experience.

6.3.1 Type of Indirect Trajectory, and Cultural Capital of Care.

The first axis, Indirect trajectory types, partitions the student trajectories in Field of welfare work insiders and outsiders, and the outsider aspect of the axis is associated with vocational training, and non-social educational previous careers. The cultural capital acquired in such outsider-settings may be likely to differ from the cultural capital acquired in the insider-setting, which was associated with previous careers in Health/Care and Teacher/club, and social educational courses. These latter students are to a higher degree culturally familiar with social educational institutions and contexts, and have not made a transition from a commercial work-setting to the social educational domain. Specifically, the Insiders have undertaken training aiming at qualifying them for care-related profession, whereas the outsiders have merely worked as unskilled labourers in the social educational domain. As was discussed in chapter 3, Olsen(2007) has shown that while there rarely are strict hierarchies between employees in social educational institutions, unskilled workers in social educational institutions tend to maintain positional relations to the children, rather than personal relations, and thus training does imply differentiations in practices. Thus I propose that if the first axis is associated with a form of cultural capital, it is likely to be related to the common ethos of the caring professions within the field of welfare work. I would also suggest that the position of such a cultural capital of care would be the dominating aspect of this axis; the outsiders are, in effect, making
a transversal (cf. Chapter 2) social movement, requiring them to convert their capital (what might be termed vocational cultural capital).

6.3.2 Trajectory Direction and Educational Capital

The second axis opposed direct trajectories with indirect. The indirect aspect of the second axis is associated with most of the contributing modalities from the first axis, all of which described the two types of indirect trajectories. The direct aspect of the second axis associated with direct trajectories, and modality-wise, this is 5+ years of nursery/nursery school experience, Higher Preparatory Exam, and No previous career. The immediately apparent interpretation of how this axis might be expressed as differences in capital possession is the opposition between vocational educational capital (that is, educational capital either vocational or directly associated with a specific profession) and generalized educational capital - in particular the preparatory secondary education, which is precisely not associated with any specific vocation, but rather prepares for tertiary education of more or less any sort. Going with other studies of cultural capital (Thomsen 2008, Bourdieu 1996, Lidegran 2009) the dominant form of capital along this axis would be the generalized educational capital, being harder to obtain, and providing a wider range of educational opportunities.

6.3.3 Trajectory Complexity: Educational and Social Educator Capital

The third axis opposed complex, multi-component trajectories with simpler trajectories, composed of fewer components. This axis was not completely independent of the first axis, since the opportunity to obtain courses etc. relevant to the domain of social educator training presents itself more often to students with insider-trajectories than to those with outsider trajectories. Based on this connection between insiders and complex trajectories, I propose that the third axis may be associated with the opposition between educational capital, and a form capital obtained from working within social education, but which has no value outside of the domain of social educator training. I will term this social educator capital. The complex trajectories are thus composed in part by components whose value alone (and their acquisition, we may speculate) is derived from the fact that they serve as either stepping stones on the way to training as a social educator, or as a factor in gaining access to the SSPSE. The social educator capital is the cultural capital obtainable through bodily practice in social educational settings, and it thus differs from the cultural capital of care which
encompasses the ethos of the field of welfare work, but not specifically the domain of social education.

I want to stress here, that these are merely ideas about what may possibly be some forms of capital associated with the three first axes of the space of SSPSE student trajectories. It is not shown by the analysis here, nor in the subsequent chapter on agglomerative hierarchical classification, that the differences described by the axes are in fact socially distinctive, and function as capital. That is a task for the qualitative methodological modes.

6.4 Exploring the Space of Trajectories

The space constructed in the preceding pages situate the entire student population in the space of trajectories. While all active questions have been discussed throughout the construction, the multitude of other attributes such as age, gender, geography etc. of the students have not yet been examined. A prominent feature of Geometric Data Analysis is that it allows the researcher to examine whether one set of attributes are structurally similar to other attributes, and such exploration is the topic in the following pages. A few technical and practical aspects of correspondence analysis may need to be resumed briefly first:

Cloud of individuals or modalities: Above I have mostly exclusive examined the cloud of modalities - which in effect shows the relative positions of all modalities. However, the positions of modalities are in fact determined by the positions of all the individuals making up the data-set, and so one can also plot the positions of individuals- the cloud of individuals. A central feature of correspondence analysis is that the space of individuals is spanned by the same principal axes as have been analyzed in the cloud of modalities.

Supplementary questions: The space analyzed was constructed by a set of active questions. But one can also include a number of supplementary questions; supplementary meaning that these questions do not contribute to the construction of the space. The modalities of such supplementary questions can plotted in the space, but their position is determined wholly by how the active modalities relate to the supplementary ones, and not how the supplementary questions relate to the supplementary ones, and the phenomena described.
mentaries relate to the active. A useful metaphor is that the supplementaries are pushed into place by the active modalities, but the supplementaries cannot “push back”, so to speak.

**Structuring factors:** When a supplementary question - say, Age - exhibits a structure, that coincides with some aspect of the space constructed by the active questions, it is called a structuring factor. While this does not imply that e.g. Age explains or causes anything, it means that whatever structure is found between the active questions is also related to Age.

**Concentration ellipses:** When examining the cloud of individuals, the current breed of software (SPAD 6.0 onwards) has implemented a very useful explorative tool: the concentration ellipses. The ellipses show the dispersion of a selected subcloud, that is, of a set of individuals with a certain attribute. Thus, the different dispersion of younger and older students, can be show as a number of ellipses in the space of trajectories. The ellipse visualize a uniform dispersal of the subcloud, maintaining variance. (Le Roux & Rouanet 2010:69) Thus the ellipse visualizes the average distribution of the subcloud, and is thus an aid to interpretation, but not an analytical result in itself.

I will only be presenting the supplementary questions that are, in fact, interesting, either because of their coincidence with the structure of the space of trajectories, or in one case because of the absence of such coincidental structures. Most of these explorations take place in the cloud of individuals, but not all.

### 6.4.1 Age

The age of the SSPSE students span a wide range, and it seems reasonable to assume that there may be some correlations between the aspects of previous work education or career, and the age of the students, simply because the production of some trajectories consumes more time than others.

In Graph 6.6 I have plotted the modalities of the supplementary question age in the cloud of individuals, plane of axis 1 and 2. The modalities (shown here connected in ascending order) show a relation to the second axis, and a less clear one to the first. This is equivalent to saying that younger students are more likely to possess a direct trajectory, and older students a more indirect one. This is consistent with the analysis so far, and also in accordance with the suggested forms of capital proposed above, that younger students should possess a greater amount of generalized educational capital, instead of vocational capital.
A similar relation can be found relating younger students to simple trajectories on the third axis. The slightly parabolic shape in relation to both axes indicate that age is weakly related to the indirect trajectory types, indicating that the very oldest and very youngest students are more likely to possess an insider trajectory, whereas the 36-40 year old are more likely to possess an outsider trajectory.

### 6.4.2 Gender

Gender is an important aspect of social educational work, in many ways, as was discussed briefly in chapter 3. The caring aspect of has both in studies, and more ideological discussions of the work been linked to assumptions about females. However as can be seen from graph 6.7 below in the cloud of individuals, gender turns out to be quite insignificant, which is quite unexpected. There is the slightest possible association with Males towards the Direct aspect of the second axis, and the Simple aspect of the third axis (and thus Females are associated slightly with Indirect and Complex careers), but hardly
enough to bear out any serious interpretations. In appendix 3, a cross-tabulation of gender and previous career can be found, and what it shows is that there is very little correlation between the two, which bears out the conclusion that gender has no structuring effect on the first three axes of the space.\footnote{In fact, no such effect can be discerned on the first 10 axes, with the exception of axis 5 - which, as mentioned above - is very much structured by daycare experience. Daycare employment is very much the domain of women, for traditional and social reasons, and so the only gender-related effect found here is one that is unsurprising, and in fact well-known.} This should be noted, as a caution against accepting gender as an explanatory force under all circumstances, but more importantly perhaps as a warning against assuming that what is pertinent to the social educator profession may not be pertinent to social educator training. There is all the more reason to make further attempts to understand the meaning of gender and explore this divergence from expectation, but statistical data cannot, by their very nature, explain the absence of any one specific correlation.
The absence of any structuring effect of gender is highly remarkable, and need to be explored further. One possible explanation suggests itself, when one considers the gender distribution within the SSPSE compared to the ordinary social educator training. In recent years, the SSPSE nationally recruit a greater percentage of males, and the growth-rate of this percentage is increasing, unlike that of the ordinary training. In other words, it seems SSPSE has managed to expand its recruitment to encompass male trajectories to the extent that gender is no longer a structuring factor of the space of trajectories.

### 6.4.3 Geography (and NISE)

The overall geography of the NISE was described by partitioning the NISE in three modalities: Copenhagen, Large Cities\(^{134}\), and Provinces. This partitioning relates to the second axis of the space of trajectories, as can be seen below in graph 6.9. Students with insider/direct trajectory are predominantly from the NISE near the capital, and conversely the students from the provinces are more likely to possess an indirect trajectory, and also slightly favouring the outsider trajectories. Examining the NISE themselves as structuring factor allow me to explore this and locate some additional intricacies.

---

\(^{134}\) Large Cities defined as simply cities (excepting Copenhagen) with more than one NISE.
Graph 6.10 has the Copenhagen NISE in blue, the Large city NISE in green and the Province NISE in red. Plotted like this, the Copenhagen NISE are somewhat dispersed, although all but one are above the origin on axis two. In the same way all Province NISE are below the origin on axis two, and so are all the Large City NISE located in Jutland, with one exception. This exception, Jysk Pædagogseminarium, is in fact the largest NISE in Denmark, and perhaps has achieved a status that attracts a student population similar to that of the NISE in the capital. If one puts this in the terms of the suggested cultural capital interpretations of the axes, generalized educational capital seems to be more important in Copenhagen than in the larger cities, and even less so in the province. This would also indicate a hierarchy of dominance, along the second axis from direct towards indirect, and to a lesser extent along the third axis, from insider towards outsider.

Plotting the second and third axis (Graph 6.11) - and thus the direct-indirect by simple/complex plane - the separation between capital and province becomes even more remarkable. Again Jysk Pædagogseminarium is closer to the majority of the Copenhagen NISE than to the other Large City NISE, indicating that
the SSPSE student population of Jysk Pædagogseminarium has a number of similarities to those of the Copenhagen NISE.

The separation of the Copenhagen and Province NISE on the second axis has already been discussed above, and it is quite striking from the graph here. The dispersion along the third axis does not lend itself to any immediate interpretation. That the NISE differ in their ability to recruit students with simple or complex trajectories seems the immediate conclusion, and it is to some extent supported by the fact that the NISE geographically situated close to each other are far apart in the graph above. To some extent graph 6.11 depicts of how the NISE compete by recruiting different kinds of students - and perhaps also aspects of the reputation each NISE has required, in different circles of potential applicants. A thorough prosopographical study of the NISE, focusing on their history and current divergent strategies is beyond the possibilities in this study, but some small indicators can be examined.
One difference of possible importance is the NISE history. Until 1992 the NISE were partitioned by what subdivision of social education they catered to. Positioned at either side of the origin on axis two, the two NISE in Aalborg were until 1992 training Nursery Social educators (Skipper Clements, below the origin), and Special Care Social Educators (Aalborg Social pædagogsemi., above the origin). The same is the case for the two NISE located in Århus (Peter Sabroe and Jydsk Pædagogseminarium); however, the former Århusian Special Care Social educator NISE - Peter Sabroe - is above the origin, and Jydsk Pædagogseminarium is below. This rules out the former specialisation as the direct explanation for the dispersion of NISE along axis three, but the different history of the NISE may have resulted in diverse reputations and strategies of recruitment. One can to some extent see this reflected in several remarkable divergences between the geographically close NISE. In graph 6.12 below, I have compared the two NISE in Århus, by examining the variations in the five variables I constructed from the textual data.
Graph 6.12: Comparison of Århus NISE

Peter Sabroe has a noticeably higher frequency of students admitted on the basis of Interviews, Foreign Stays, Voluntary work, a higher percentage of Craftsman/Arts and fewer with no previous career. These differences correspond well with the third axis’ theme of complexity, which is where Peter Sabroe is located in the plot. Putting these differences in the terms proposed as cultural capital interpretation of the axes, would be proposing that Peter Sabroe places a relatively higher value on field-specific cultural capital, and less on generalized educational capital, which in turn would indicate a likely relation of dominance, with Peter Sabros being locally dominated, and Jydsk Pædagog Seminarium being locally dominant. Verifying this latter hypothesis goes beyond the data available in this study, and must remain a mere surmise. The interpretation that the dispersion of the NISE along the third axis relate to how they compete with neighbouring NISE does however seem to fit these data.
Another possible factor is that the practical organization of the training is relevant. Many NISE have - as was discussed in chapter 4 - started using virtual platforms in place of face to face training, or having major part if the training take place in weekends or evenings. It has proven impossible\footnote{In several cases, the class schedules no longer exist, or the relevant persons are no longer employed at the NISE.} to obtain reliable data on exactly how the training which students in the data-set were exposed to took place, and so I am unable to explore this aspect any further. Such didactic data and other both historical, sociological and social educational would need to be collected for a prosopographical study, which would shed much more light on the dynamics of the competition between closely located NISE.

Graph 6.13: Experience Exemptions in plane of axes one and two
6.4.4 Exemptions From Social Educational Work Experience

The data allow for two kinds of exemptions from the admission requirements - exemptions from educational requirements, and exemptions from the requirements of five years of social educational work experience. While the former is incorporated in the question Education, the latter has proven impractical to include in the various experience questions. I will instead examine it as a supplementary element, paying particular attention to its relation to the axis of Direct/Indirect trajectories, and the axis of Simple/Complex trajectories. A plot of Exemptions from experience in the plane of these two axes follows. As can be seen, students exempted from the Experience requirements are located in the negative regions of both the second and third axis, translating to a correlation to the Complex and Indirect trajectories.

This is consistent with the explorations of the space of the trajectories made so far, and hints at a total interpretation of the space, where the Direct and Simple trajectories makeup a “standard” from which the rest of the population deviates. This deviation is not related to the work, nor the social educational proficiency of the students, but rather to their trajectory’s shape compared to the trajectories that fit the admission requirements exactly. The space of trajectories is shaped by the same constructional impetus that shaped the data, as they were collected by Svejgaard: a mapping of how students match the admission requirements. Consequently the space is being structured by how the NISE endeavour to recruit students on the fringes of the domain of social education - and these fringes are revealed in the space of trajectories as the outsiders and insiders, opposed on the plane of first and second axis to the straight ones; the trajectories being both direct and simple.

In the following chapter, the space constructed will form the basis for constructing a set of classes, partitioning the respondents by similarity. The exploration of the cloud of individuals will be part of this analysis.
In the previous chapter, the space of trajectories was constructed, and by analyzing and interpreting the axes, I came to a description of the most important organizing principles of distinction within the space, and suggested a interpretation of the axes as subspecies of cultural capital. Finally I examined some structuring factors, age and geography in particular, showing how the space corresponded to certain age and geographical distributions. Yet I cannot translate these overall principle to a specific description of the individuals present in the data - the axial themes and aspects are rarified constructs, drawing upon sociological abstractions describing the common features of the modalities. One can, in fact, inspect the cloud of individuals, and precisely locate each individual present in the data, and examine how their positions relates to the overall structures of the space of trajectories. And while I will in fact be doing something quite similar (in chapter 10) with regards to the students I have interviewed, I would also like to take this analysis closer to the individuals, in a more general manner than inspecting each, one at a time. Cluster analysis, or classification is simply the sorting of individuals in groups of similar individuals (or, in GDA terms, subclouds) - aiming to create a manageable set of classes with the classes as different as possible, and individuals within classes as similar as possible. In this chapter such an analysis is conducted. Initially, the analysis is conducted, and the hierarchy of classifications is discussed shortly. Subsequently, I compare the classes to each other, and subsequently I explore each class by position and dispersion in the planes of the first three axes. In this analysis, I also make use of the suggested cultural capital-interpretations of the axes, concluding by describing the classes in terms of cultural capital.
7.1 Classification

The purpose of the classification as a part of the first methodological modes, that is, as a component in my geometrical data analysis, is to enable an inspection of the individuals relation to each other. This provides statistical precision in the interpretation of individuals relations (since it is no longer necessary to make use only of the sociological abstraction of the axes) but also a different way of exploring and checking the interpretations made of the axes. If the classes does not express the same distinctions as did the axes, it will be necessary to re-examine the interpretations, and locate the difference. The classification is constructed hierarchically, which means that all classes are nested in an order relating to the relative importance of the differences between them. This means that the classification hierarchy of differences, from the top down, should mirror the axes, beginning with the first axis, and the most important classificatory difference of proceeding to axes of higher dimensionality, and classifications of less importance.

Classification uses the distance between individuals in the *total* space of trajectories as a measure of similarity, allowing me to sort individuals by similarity, and there by explore their specific relation to other trajectories, by way of their class membership. All statistical methods commonly know as clustering or classification strive towards the same goal: Constructing groups of similar individuals. In geometric data-analysis the procedure used is called Agglomerative (or Ascending) Hierarchical Classification (AHC), whereby one initially creates classes corresponding to each individual in the data-set, and then repeatedly joins the two most similar classes, until all individuals belong to the same class. This joining is ordered by an index of similarity between classes - and when using Ward's Index, as I am doing here, the classification is properly termed a Euclidean classification.

7.1.1 The Classification Tree

In the case of my data-set, this means starting with 833 classes, and at each of 832 steps combining the two most similar classes. The classification procedure is termed ascending or agglomerative, referring to the fact that this type classification starts with each individual in a separate class, and joins classes successively, arriving in the end at one all-encompassing class. Since each new class

---

<sup>136</sup> Importance in this case means the amount of variance between two classes: the more variance that shift from between the classes to within the classes, the more distinctive is the separation between the classes. (Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:110)

<sup>137</sup> But, unlike e.g. Latent Class analysis, there is no causal relationship between variables, that one tries to cancel out by creating a set of classes.
is constructed by selecting the two most similar\textsuperscript{138} classes of the previous hierarchical level and joining them, this in turn means that the differences between classes are eliminated by order of importance, starting with the least important differences. The result produced by the algorithm is a hierarchy, or a tree, of classes:

At the root, when the process ended, resides only one class, which on the next level branches into two classes. On the third level, one of these two classes branches into two further classes for a total of three classes. On the next level one of these classes is cleaved in two, leaving us with four classes, and so on, until we reach 833.

Thus each level of the classification tree corresponds to as a set of classes - which will be further subdivided if one descends the tree, and joined if one ascends. Choosing a classification for analysis thus corresponds to selecting a level of the tree, at which to stop examining further subdivisions - often termed cutting the tree. The complete classification tree is shown in graph 7.1, where the thirteen uppermost subdivisions appear. The height of the branches(subdivisions) of classes indicate the aggregation index(specifically, the Ward Index, Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:109f.). This index measures the contribution of the two classes, and thus the classes selected for joining at each level are those which contributes the least to the space. The level at which I shall choose to cut the tree is indicated in graph 7.1 as well.

The relevant levels are depicted in a less precise but hopefully more intuitive manner in graph 7.2 showing only the classes retained after cutting the tree, and their order of joining. In other words, graph 7.2 shows what remains

\textbf{Graph 7.1: Classification tree, with cut and relative aggregation indexes}

\textsuperscript{138} “Similar” statistically translates to into the two classes whose joining leads to the least reduction of between-variance. (Le Roux & Rouanet 2004:105ff.). This similarity is measured by an aggregation index, the two classes joined being the ones with the lowest aggregation index, and thus the most similar. The classification is not restricted to the axes examined in the multiple correspondence analysis; instead the distance between classes are measured on all axes, in order to retain most of the features of the space within the classification. Since the axes are a product of the active variables of the analysis, the differences found between classes will also relate to these, although other variables can of course be crosstabulated with the classification.
of the classification tree from graph 7.1, after the cut is made. The height of
the classes in graph 7.2 serves as mere illustration. I have assigned each level
a number, corresponding to the number of classes existing at that level. The
classes outlined in bold strokes become part of the final classification, while the
others are partitioned further down the tree.

The classification hierarchy, while constructed bottom-up, must be inter-
preted from the top down, starting with the most important differences be-
tween classes, and exploring how the individuals of the analysis are separated
into new sets of classes at each level, and what differences are introduced with
each additional class retained in the classification.

The above features of the classification algorithm means that what separate the
classes are their relations to each other. In other words, the actual relational differ-
ences of the data-set are reconstructed in the classification - rather than classifying
by a set of attributes found in the field\(^\text{139}\).

Graph 7.2: Classification tree, with class description

---

\(^{139}\) As a comparison, a recent massive study of members of the social educators union (BUPL 2006) in
Denmark used position of employment as a classification of their study (head of institution, head of
sub-department, no managerial responsibility). This classification has the disadvantage of being external
to the analysis, unlike the classification used here. If - and only if - managerial responsibility is an im-
portant social difference, it become an important feature of an classification, and thus Euclidean clas-
sification frees the researcher from unqualified use of the categorization in use within the field studied.
In the following, I have classified the individuals according to their position on all 27 axes\textsuperscript{140} created in the multiple correspondence analysis in the previous chapter. I end up classifying the individuals in five classes, numbered C 1/5 through C 5/5 in graph 7.2. I shall briefly explore the five levels of aggregation occurring, and also shortly explain what differences are found between the classes created at each level. I will conclude the classification discussion with a summary of the five classes created.

\textbf{7.1.2 Descending the Classification Tree}

The \textit{first partition} occurring in the classification tree(level 1 in graph 7.2), where there the first two classes are separated, creates two classes:

1. **Insiders**, with social/care-work trajectories\textit{(n=219)} and
2. Those that have no such previous training or career\textit{(n=614)}.

80\% of the Insiders have either a previous career in \textit{Health/Care} or \textit{Teachers/Club} - whereas only 3,5\% of the students in the other class have either of these previous careers\textsuperscript{141}. In short, this is the opposition found on axis one of the multiple correspondence analysis, between welfare field insiders and welfare field outsiders, the latter here incorporating those have no previous careers. This last point is quite remarkable: the separation is not between various kinds of experience, but between those, whose trajectory includes work in the field of welfare work, and those who does not have such work experience, be it because they have no previous career, or because they have an irrelevant previous career.

The \textit{second partition} (Level 2 in graph 7.2) partitions the class of students \textit{without} a welfare field career into two classes, C1/5 (n=333) and C2/5 (n=281). This partition coincides with the Direct/Indirect interpretation of the second axis in the multiple correspondence analysis: The separation here is between

3. **C1/5: The Straight Ones** trajectories that are direct\textit{(87\% have no previous career, 2\% have \textit{Health/Care}-careers, \textit{no} members have \textit{Teacher/Club}-careers and \textit{no} members have vocational training or social/health training) and relate to \textit{Nursery experience}, and

4. **C 2/5: The Outsiders**. trajectories that involve a background of vocational training\textit{(70\% of the members of this class), and a previous career in \textit{Shop/Office} or \textit{Craftsman/Arts}(90\%}

\textsuperscript{140} While it is common (Cf. Börjesson 2005:149) to leave out the last axes, which contribute very little to the analysis, in this case I have found this to make very little difference, and so I have included them.

\textsuperscript{141} Tables of all the characterising modalities of all classes examined, the degree of representativity of these and their significance can be found in appendix 3
of the members of this class). These two classes are both part of the final classification I shall retain, and in accordance with the interpretation of the first and second axis, I have called $C_{1/5}$ *The Straight Ones*, and $C_{2/5}$ *The Outsiders*.\footnote{The classes that end up being included in the final classification, are for reason of clarification, named $C_{1/5}$ *-5 / 5*, and are consistently italicized.}

The *third partition* (level 3 in graph 7.2) partitions the Insiders class into two classes, one of which becomes part of the final classification.

5. **Health/Social Insiders** ($n=150$): In this class, 74% have a previous career in *Health/Care*, and 30% of them has been trained as Social/Health assistants - *none* as Care Assistants.

6. **$C_{5/5}$: Complex Insiders** ($n=69$). This class contains *all* students but one with a previous career in Teacher/Club, and *none* of the members have either *No previous career*, Craftsman/Arts, Shop/Office or Health/Care. 25% of the members are trained as Care Assistants, and *none* are trained as Social/Health Assistants.

The opposition between these two classes is that of a background in Social Education versus on in Health/Care, either by career, training or both. This level of the classification coincides to some extent with the Simple-Complex opposition found on axis three of the multiple correspondence analysis.

The *fourth partition* (level 4 in graph 7.2) partitions the Health/Care Insiders in two classes, both of which become part of the final classification

7. **$C_{3/5}$: Nurses etc** ($n=106$) and

8. **$C_{4/5}$: Social/Health Assistants** ($n=44$).

The central opposition between these two classes is that while *all* the members of the Social/Health Assistants has been trained as such, *none* of the Nurses etc. members have. Conversely, 92% of the Nurses etc. members have a previous career in *Health/Care*, something only 30% of the Social/Health Assistants do. The Nurses etc. class has been named because of the relatively high proportion of members with Primary school/Other educational background, and Other experience - a combination, that when exploring the textual data, turns out to be largely synonymous with (partial) training and/or work as a nurse. The Health/Care Insiders class from level three is here separated according to what kind of health/care training and career they have.
7.1.3 Cutting the Classification Tree.

In order to select a set of classes for analysis - which corresponds to selecting a cutting level of the classification tree - one must both examine the statistical and the sociological properties of the point at which one chooses to cut. I will first be looking sociologically at the fifth level of partitioning (not shown in graph 7.2) - the topmost classified opposition that I have not analyzed, and the first one that, as shown in graph 7.1, occurs below the cut of the tree. It partitions C 2/5: Outsiders into a small subclass of 62 individuals, who all have some After-school/SFO work experience, and who have done some amount of voluntary work, leaving a larger group of Outsiders (n=219) with essentially the same characteristics as C 2/5 - but with neither any voluntary work nor any After-school experience, as it were. This partition is not included since it does not really contribute that much to the analysis, but simply “discards” a small subgroup of outsiders. This subgroup is dissimilar to the greater Outsider class, but not a difference that is readily interpretable. There is thus no pressing sociological advantages to including and interpreting this sixth class in the analysis. If one then examines graph 7.1, it is apparent that the subsequent series of class subdivisions occurs primary as small subsets of C 1/5.

Choosing, from a statistical point of view, where to cut the tree hinges on whether the classification one chooses to analyses is clearly separated from the following ones, in terms of aggregation index. The aggregation index expresses the similarity between classes joined at each level of the classification tree, by measuring the contribution (to the specific variance of the space) of those two classes. Both similarity and contribution are relevant criteria when choosing where to cut. The level at which one chooses to cut the tree will the level below which, one does not consider classificational differences to be important. Thus, if the aggregation indexes of two levels are very close, there is no statistical argument for including one level, but not the other. In other words, the closeness of indexes are a measure of what degrees of similarity one will ignore. The size of the index indicates how much the class separation contributes to the entire specific variance. Similarly to the question of axes in the specific multiple correspondence analysis, it is preferable to have as large a contribution as possible. However, where there were only 27 axes in total in the MCA, there are a total 833 levels of aggregation, which imposes great limits as to how much variance the classification can explain, without demanding an unmanageable number of classes.

In graph 7.3 I have charted the relative aggregation indexes of the first thirty (of 833) branches of the classification tree. In this graph, the bars

---

143 That is aggregation index in percentage of the total sum of indexes. This is the measure most easily available in the software used (SPAD 7.0).
indicating the aggregation index of the five branches above the cut of the tree are green, and the bars of the branches below the cut are blue. The first six branches are quite well separated, whereas the following ones are closer. Thus the similarity criterion would argue for retaining either at most six classes, or ten classes, since this is where the level indexes are well separated.

Going by the size criterion, the six first levels each account for between 5 and 10% of the accumulated aggregation index, and the first five levels for 39.69%. While adding more classes would increase the accumulated aggregation index somewhat, this does not counterbalance the cumbersomeness of having eleven classes. For those reason, I would prefer a cut at either sixth or fifth level of aggregation - the indexes between level ten and level six are not well separated.

In the end, I have chosen to cut after the fifth level of aggregation, since the next class - as discussed above - represent relatively uninteresting sociological aspects.

Summing up, I retain a classification set of five classes:

- **C1/5: The Straight Ones**, (n=333)
- **C2/5: The Outsiders**, (n=281)
- **C 3/5: Nurses etc** (n=106)
- **C 4/5: Social/Health Assistants** (n=44), and
- **C 5/5: Complex Insiders** (n=69).

In the following section, I shall attempt to discuss the relations between these classes, and their dispersal in the space of SSPSE student trajectories, concluding with an interpretation in terms of cultural capital.
### 7.2 Exploring the Relations Between Classes

A first approach to examining the five classes of trajectories now constructed, is to examine the specific oppositions of each class in relation to each of the others. The following table examines the classes two by two, listing the most important deviations (opposed modalities from one question). A complete table of modality frequencies by classes - upon which the table below is based - can be found in appendix 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of classes two by two, by characterizing modalities</th>
<th>Main opposition between classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1/5 Vs. C 2/5</strong></td>
<td>C 1/5: No previous Career, Higher Prep(HF) exam vs. C 2/5: Shop/Office or Craftsman/Arts Career, and vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1/5 Vs. C 3/5</strong></td>
<td>C 1/5: No previous Career, Higher Prep(HF) exam, No Other Exp vs. C 3/5: Health/Care Career, Other Exp., Primary school + other 2nd Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1/5 Vs. C 4/5</strong></td>
<td>C 1/5: No previous Career, Higher Prep(HF) exam vs. C 4/5: Craftsman/Arts Career, Social/Health Assistant Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C1/5 Vs. C 5/5</strong></td>
<td>C 1/5: No previous Career, No Social Educational Courses, No Other Exp. vs. C 5/5: Teacher/Club Career, Social Educational Courses, Other Exp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2/5 Vs. C 3/5</strong></td>
<td>C 2/5: Shop/Office or Craftsman/Arts Career, No Other Exp., and Vocational training vs. C 3/5: Health/Care Career, Other Experience, Primary school + other 2nd Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2/5 Vs. C 4/5</strong></td>
<td>C 2/5: Vocational training vs. C 4/5: Social/Health Assistant Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2/5</td>
<td>C 2/5: Shop/Office or Craftsman/Arts Career, No Other Exp., and Vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5/5</td>
<td>C 5/5: Teacher/Club Career, Other Exp, Care Assistant Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3/5</td>
<td>C 3/5: Health/Care Career, Primary school + other 2nd Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4/5</td>
<td>C 4/5: Craftsman/Arts Career, Social/Health Assistant Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3/5</td>
<td>C 3/5: Health/Care Career, Primary school + other 2nd Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5/5</td>
<td>C 5/5: Teacher/Club Career, Care Assistant Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/5</td>
<td>C 4/5: Craftsman/Arts Career, Social/Health Assistant Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5/5</td>
<td>C 5/5: Teacher/Club Career, Care Assistant Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Class relations two by two.

The relations between classes are mostly characterized by the questions Previous career, and Education. All pairs of classes except one - C 2/5 Vs. C 4/5 - are polarized by the question Previous Career. Similarly, only one pair is not polarized by the question Education, C 1/5 vs. C 5/5. This shows that the relation between careers and education is quite strong, confirming the interpretations made of the axes previously, where this was perhaps a tacit assumption. The two exceptions to this both involve classes that are separated at the first level of classification. This partitioning was related to the first two axes of the multiple correspondence analysis, and as we shall see below, the two classes C 1/5 and C 4/5 are the ones who relate the least to the first axis. These two classes are instead opposed to respectively C 5/5 and C 2/5 on the third axis.

In order to completely explore the characterization of the trajectories produced by this classification, I will continue by examining their position in the space of SSPSE trajectories. The classes are positioned on the first three axes as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Axis 1</th>
<th>Axis 2</th>
<th>Axis 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1 / 5: Straight ones</td>
<td>-0.02569</td>
<td>0.37484</td>
<td>0.15518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2 / 5: Outsiders</td>
<td>0.38878</td>
<td>-0.24130</td>
<td>-0.13724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3 / 5: Nurses etc.</td>
<td>-0.50433</td>
<td>-0.41124</td>
<td>0.24071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4 / 5: Social/Health assistants</td>
<td>0.00725</td>
<td>-0.28332</td>
<td>0.11338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5 / 5: Complex insiders</td>
<td>-0.68919</td>
<td>-0.01391</td>
<td>-0.63211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Classes, Coordinates on axis 1 through 3

This translates, when using the above interpretations of the axes, to the following attributes - The interpretations put in parentheses indicate extremely low coordinates (<0.05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Indirect Trajectory type</th>
<th>Trajectory directness</th>
<th>Trajectory complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1/5: Straight Ones</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2/5: Outsiders</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3/5: Nurses etc</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4/5: Social/Health Assistants</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5/5: Complex Insiders</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>(Indirect)</td>
<td>Complex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Classes, by axis interpretation

The labels used for interpreting the axes and the names of the classes as put in table 7.3 correspond quite well - something that is not entirely self-evident, since the classes have been named by examining the modalities that characterize them. In other words, my interpretation of the classes and of the axes is consistent.

An important feature of geometric data analysis is its relational epistemology. In table 7.1 the descriptions of the oppositions between each set of two classes seem perhaps very simple, because most of them are related to differing characterizing modalities within one or both of the two most important questions. But combining these descriptions (table 7.1) with the axial characterizations of table 7.3 reveal a more complex set of relations, not simply a matter of educational or career-related background.

Some classes, such as C 2/5: Outsiders and C 5/5: Complex Insiders, are opposed within the question Previous Career by the different professional nature of their careers: Social/Health related, or not.

The classes C 1/5: Straight Ones and C 5/5 may also be opposed within the Previous Career Question, but as these classes are in opposite positions on axis...
2 and 3, this opposition has to do with the direction and complexity of their trajectories, rather than just the professional nature of their careers.

The differences in modalities must always be understood as different relations between two groups of modalities.

Using Table 7.2 and 7.3 it is possible to plot a rough three-dimensional graph the relations between the classes, in the space of trajectories.

Such a graph is of course only an illustration of the relations between the classes on the three most important axes, and while it hopefully aids in keeping track of all the classes relative position in the space of trajectories, it is too imprecise and distorted to be used for interpretations. But when considered in combination with graph 7.5 of the entire space of trajectories, it provides a shorthand of the structures found in the data-set so far.

7.2.1 Classification Summary

The classification in five classes of the SSPSE student trajectories essentially recapitulate the results found in the Multiple correspondence analysis. While the Space of SSPSE trajectories was found to be structured by the directness, types of indirectness and complexities of student trajectories, the classes reveal a close association with Previous careers and Education. Of the five classes constructed, two relate directly to specific training (Nurses, Social/Health);
two related to similar sets of careers (Outsiders, Complex Insiders) and one is related to the absence of anything but social educational work and training (Straight Ones). These classes directly reflect the fact that students at the SSPSE are recruited quite far afield, and several of the classes found here are in fact individuals using the SSPSE as a way of implementing or perpetuating a change in career direction, rather than part of further education within their own field. Finally, in graphs 7.5-7.7 are the three first principal planes of the space of SSPSE trajectories, with the class modality points plotted as well. The modalities included are the ones contributing to the axes that span the planes. I will not comment on these graphs of modalities, as they really only show what has already been discussed extensively in the preceding.

In the next, final section five set of smaller graphs show the concentration ellipses\(^{144}\) for each of the classes, in each of the planes. A few comments are relevant for each of the classes concerning their spatial dispersal, and subsequently, I will outline how each of these classes can be interpreted.

---

Graph 7.5: Class centroids, space of modalities first principal plane

\(^{144}\) For readers unfamiliar with the concept of a concentration ellipse, I refer to Section 7.5 a few pages hence, where the concept is explained.
7.3 Cultural Capital and Class Dispersal in the Cloud of Individuals

In the following five short sections, I will inspect the dispersion of the actual members of each of the five classes, and consider how they are associated with each of the three axes analyzed in chapter 6. In chapter 6, I suggested an interpretation of these three axes in terms of cultural capital, interpreting the axes as follows:

- first axis/type of indirect trajectory as cultural capital of care;
- second axis/trajectory direction as generalized versus vocational capital;
- third axis/trajectory complexity as institutionalized versus social educator capital

I shall in the following return to these interpretations and apply them to the classes. I must stress that still the different forms of capital are only conjectures:
An attempt to endow the analysis here with a vocabulary that allows it to establish the first part of a homological analysis. The forms of capital described are thus - as of yet - only real differences in the space of trajectories, and not yet socially distinctive differences. And in order to qualify as a form of capital, this latter requirement must also be satisfied.

Graph 7.7: Class centroids, space of modalities third principal plane
7.3.1: The Straight Ones

The graphs to the right show the dispersal of the members of this class, in first (uppermost graph), second and third (lowermost graph) principal planes.

The ellipses of C1/5 show the sub-cloud of its members to be of a lenticular shape, elongated along the direct aspect of the second axis, slim in relation to the entire first, while widening a bit along the simple aspect of the third axis. In other words, this class only contains members with direct, and simple trajectories. This - unsurprisingly perhaps - translates directly into the generalized and institutionalized forms of educational capital, represented by the second and third axes. That this class does not register much on the first axis is in accordance with the fact that the straight ones possess neither vocational nor care-related cultural capital.
7.3.2 The Outsiders

The graphs to the right show the dispersal of the members of this class, in first (uppermost graph), second and third (lowermost graph) principal planes.

The subcloud of members of C2/5 is quite *spherical*, shifted towards the outsider-aspect of the first axis. In the plane of axis 1x2 it more or less encircles the entire south-eastern region of the plane, combining the outsider aspect of the first axis with the indirect aspect of the second axis. While the subcloud is closer to the complex aspect, very little dispersion of the subcloud occurs on the third axis, indicating that this axis is not particularly pertinent in the description of the members of the C2/5 class. In short, the class of Outsiders possesses what I suggested to be termed vocational cultural capital and some measure of Social educator capital (by virtue of the dispersion along axes 1 and 3) yet lack both generalized nor institutionalized educational capital.
7.3.3 Nurses etc.

The graphs to the right show the dispersal of the members of this class, in first (uppermost graph), second and third (lowermost graph) principal planes.

The subcloud of members of C3/5 unsurprisingly occupies the insider aspect of the first axis, and the indirect aspect of the second axis, and exhibits a quite tightly defined dispersion on these axes. On the third axis, this class is closely associated with the simple aspect, which, as was argued previously, has to do with the relative simple educational background of the members of this class. These positions along the three axes translates to the Nurses etc. class possessing relatively great amount of cultural capital of care (axis one), generalized educational capital (second axis), and institutionalized educational capital on the third axis.
7.3.4 Social/Health Assistants

The graphs to the right show the dispersal of the members of this class, in first (uppermost graph), second and third (lowermost graph) principal planes.

The subcloud of C4/5 in the first principal plane has a similar shape to that of C3/5, but translated towards outsider aspect of the first axis, a great deal more elongated along the second axis and translated towards the complex aspect of the third axis. This sums up the difference between the two classes of Health/care-career trajectories quite clearly. In the terms of capital employed, this means that the social health assistants possess slightly less cultural capital of care (axis one), a greater variation of educational capital (second axis), and slightly more social educator capital (axis three)
7.3.5 Complex Insiders

The graphs to the right show the dispersal of the members of this class, in first (uppermost graph), second and third (lowermost graph) principal planes.

The subcloud of the final class C 5/5 is very closely associated with the insider aspect of the first axis, but encompasses most of the second axis, being neither direct nor indirect to any particular extent. Along the third axis, the subcloud is almost entirely confined to the complex aspect. Altogether this subcloud cloud is lenticular in shape, resembling the subcloud of C 1/5 - The straight Ones, yet shifted to a different portion of the space - specifically towards the complex and indirect aspects of axis 3 and 1. Describing this final class in terms of capital, the first axis thus indicates possession of some cultural capital of care, and the third axis an almost exclusively social educator capital, and a limited amount of institutionalized capital. As the subcloud encompasses most of the second axis, there must be a great variation of educational capital within this class - and compared to the somewhat similar class of Straight Ones, there is a greater amount of vocational educational capital, and a smaller amount of generalized educational capital.

---

145 It should be noted, that as we examine the cloud of individuals, very few individuals are in fact located at the extremely complex end of axis three. One should bear this in mind when interpreting the complex-simple dichotomy; the opposition is rarely extreme.
7.3.6 Class Relation to the Supplementary Questions

As a final examination of the points made this far in the analysis of both axes, classes, and supplementary questions, I will briefly explore how the supplementary modalities characterize the five classes. Much of this will appear slightly repetitious, as the axes and classes fundamentally are two different perspectives on the same phenomena. But the assumptions about relations between trajectories and supplementary questions made in the analyses above can now be examined directly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes by supplementary questions</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Work Exemptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1/5: Straight Ones</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+Copenhagen, -Provinces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2/5: Outsiders</td>
<td>+36-40 years</td>
<td>+Provinces, +Large Cities, -Copenhagen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3/5: Nurses etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+Provinces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4/5: Social/Health</td>
<td>-45+ years</td>
<td>+Copenhagen, -Provinces</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5/5: Complex Insiders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+Copenhagen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.9: Classes by supplementary questions

Modalities marked with a (+) characterize the class by their presence, and modalities marked with a (-) characterize the class by their absence. (Again, these distributions can be found in appendix 3.) The fact that gender does not characterize any of the class further substantiates the claim that the space of trajectories is not gendered. This goes as well for the Work exemption modalities which, while structuring the space to some extent, does not carry on to characterize the classes. To some extent this goes for Age as well, where only two modalities characterize the classes. That these questions do not characterize classes simply means that there are no exceptional distributional differences between classes. That these questions none the less still structure the space of trajectories means that the axes, and the modalities of the structuring factors are related.

A summing up of the relations between the classes and the supplementary questions could be that Geography seems to be the most important structuring factor.

---

146 This does not mean that there are no gender-related structures at work in the field, only that they are not apparent in the space as I have constructed it here. See chapter 9 and 10 for examples of how gender may affect the social educator students’ practice.
factor related to the classes. In the Provinces, the Nurses etc and the Outsiders are predominant, and the latter being the oldest students. In Copenhagen, The Straight Ones and the Complex Insiders are predominant, as well as the Social Health Assistants, who make up the older fraction here. This is in general in accordance with the findings about geography as discussed in the previous chapter, but we can now make the connection between geographical region, NISE, and class of trajectory. That geography and various forms of educational capital are related is no great surprise, as obtaining higher levels of educational credentials necessitates leaving the province, thus diminishing provincial supply of applicants with such a background or heritage.

None of the structuring factors above relate to the first axis (cf. Chapter 6), which also is the source of the opposition found in the first level of the hierarchical classification, indicate another important point: the structurally important difference between Insiders and Outsiders of the field of welfare work is not immediately related to neither gender, age nor geography.

7.4 Conclusions to the Geometric Data Analysis

The previous 3 chapters has ranged widely and a number of quite complex and interrelated propositions has been made, many of them hinging on intricate aspects and attributes of geometric data analysis. This final section attempts to resume the main points of the analysis, and to examine whether any of the complexity and intricacy was unnecessary; could I have arrived at the same points differently, and what would that have entailed.

7.4.1 The Space, The Classes and The Structures - Summary

The space of SSPSE trajectories is structured by three axes of oppositions: types of indirect trajectories, indirect versus direct trajectories, and trajectory complexity. These axes relate closely to educational credentials, as well as previous work, and only to a lesser degree to social educational work experience. The axes indicate that there are several pathways towards the SSPSE, of which some appear to be very straight, or direct, and some very circuitous. Many involve career changes from both areas closely related to social education, and areas highly unrelated.
These pathways are at least in part represented by the classes constructed in the classification. These five classes - all of whom correspond clearly with the axial analysis - provide a set of generalized pathways, by which students may find their way to the SSPSE: three different insider-pathways (Nurses etc, Social/Health Assistants & Complex Insiders), one pathway leading from vocational training and work (Outsiders) and one more or less being the simplest and most direct way of qualifying for enrollment at the SSPSE (Straight Ones).

The supplementary questions explored in the multiple correspondence analysis indicates in particular that different pathways/classes prevail in different regions - and that age and pathways are related in somewhat complex ways. In short, we are seeing a geographically differentiated recruitment to the SSPSE, which corresponds well with the discussions of inter-NISE competition, as discussed in chapter 4.

Throughout the analysis, the dominating questions has been Previous Career and Education. These questions contribute by far the most to the axes, and are the most important ones when considering the relations between classes. In the terms of cultural capital, this implies first of all that the variations in what social educational experience the SSPSE students each possess cannot be explored homologically. If there are different forms of social educational capital to be found in social educational practice, they are not apparent in the material available to me.

Instead, the forms of capital that my attention has turned towards through the geometrical analysis are forms of cultural capital: Educational (vocational, generalized, and institutionalized), social educator capital and cultural capital of care. Examining the classes means assessing indirectly what sort of capital SSPSE applicants amass along the different trajectories, and as was discussed above\textsuperscript{147}, the five classes are quite differentiated in terms of capital.

It is these structures, and the relative positions and relations of my informants within them, that are the first layer of the homological analysis of this study.

7.4.2 A Space Undergoing Changes

Social educational work experience is the one admission requirement that is unique to the SSPSE, and it turns out to be a foundation, shared by all students and thus apparently not distinctive, unlike education. The direct and simple trajectories, which might be thought of as the core recruitment zone of the SSPSE, are being complemented by a number of other trajectories, indicating that the SSPSE serves a multitude of different biographical purposes: from

\textsuperscript{147} Both the comparisons of classes two by two, and the dispersal graphs make this point.
nurse-trainees and carpenters in need of a career change, to social-health assistants or teacher substitutes in need of firmer anchorage in the field. The space can be understood as generally structured by the simple and direct set of trajectories and the numerous deviations from that template. However, even though this structure coincides temporally with a period of crisis and lack of students in the NISE, the two cannot be definitely shown to be causally linked. But when practically no students are refused admission to the ordinary training, and the SSPSE admits students whose background range far from the domain of social education, one may speculate whether the social educator profession is likely to see changes in the near future. The differing suggested forms of capital indicate that changes in recruitment may affect the training, and these changes are unevenly distributed geographically. Thus the SSPSE seems to be not only structurally differentiated (as discussed in chapter 4) but also recruiting very different students, which in the end may mean a highly differentiated profession, geographically. Specifically, there seems to be some emphasis on social educator capital and cultural capital of care, which indicate that other cultural virtues than those embraced by the educational system, are coming to the fore.

7.4.3 Necessary Transitions

The educational background of the students is divided along the direct/simple versus indirect/complex axis, into a core of students with preparatory examinations, and a group with vocation or professional training (The Nurses etc. -class being the only one straddling this division) As the Social educator training has been intensely academized and the demands for scholarly aspects within the training has increased, this divide may be increasingly important. On the one hand the expansion of the recruitment seems to require admitting students with decreasing scholarly skills, on the other, the training places increased emphasis on scholarly skills; how is this polarization contained in the classroom?

Another set of questions is raised by the analysis of the structuring factors. As the age variation of the SSPSE is much greater than at the ordinary training, the classroom must also be able to fathom such diversity.

Of course, the educational diversification hints at another sociologically important distinction: class. As education is closely association with social origin(cf. Thomsen 2008, Skjøtt-Larsen 2008, Harrits 2007), one must assume that the class-wise composition of the students is gravitating downwards. How does this affect the classroom interaction?
As the male students increase in number, the historical association between femininity and social education will be challenged. The difficulties in de-mounting gender as a difference between students are perhaps exacerbated by the large number of students hailing from care and health professions where the feminine association is equally prevalent.

These various dichotomies and polarities are also apparent in the classes constructed. The Straight ones as class is defined by its members’ trajectories lacking of complexity and indirectness - they have proceeded straight to social education. The oppositions between classes were mostly related to education and previous careers, and so as I - in subsequent chapters - examine the informants by class membership, the importance they themselves place on their previous work and educational trajectories will be important to understand.

The geographical NISE differentiation hint at one way the training can fathom the complex groups of students - by a division of labour. That different NISE cater to different student groups, and perhaps also to different subspecies of the social educator profession is a most interesting finding. And while it may both help focus the training on the students enrolled, and of course help NISE compete and recruit rationally, it may also have implications for the profession.

That certain subsets of the students populations rarely meet, that the students are trained to differing external and internal needs may contribute to a partial disintegration of the professional community.

In short, there are a number of differences between students, that may be forcing the training to internally adjust, or the NISE to diversify. These questions remain to be explored in the following chapters. How are these students being educated as social educators? What practical and theoretical transformations will they undergo, before emerging as bachelors of professions? What educational demands are imposed on them? How do they respond? And do the answers to these questions change in response to the different trajectories of the students?

What communities grow from this mélange of careers and trajectories - integrated or emulsive ones? These are the topics of the following chapters’ examination of the interactions of the classroom, and the subjective relations of the students.

7.4.4 Methodological Status

The points made in the previous passages resemble ones made in other, different research or policy-debates. This begs the questions of whether the complex and opaque - at least to the outsider - proceedings in this chapter were
at all necessary: Could this have been said in a different way? What, if anything, would have been lost?

To some extent, both classical statistics and qualitative studies could possibly have come up with more or less identical findings. A number of statistical modelling techniques are able to provide detailed analysis of the relations within a data set. Various forms of regression can provide such studies, and multi-level models can provide a very sophisticated hierarchy of explanations and effects approaching the complexity of geometrical data analysis.

However all of these techniques are analytical statistics, that on one hand require a postulate of normality, of sampling relations and generalizations to external populations, and on the other are based on variables explaining each other, being free or dependent as the researcher can imagine the effective relationships to be.

Examining the textual data I have recoded would also yield many of the same indicators of indirect trajectories and other professional arenas closing in on social education, as would an examination of interviews with the teachers responsible for admission at the NISE. The limitation of such an approach would be that the specific relations of distinction between the various trajectories would be lost, since pure qualitative methodology has no way of rendering such relations specific. An likely example could be the difference found between the two classes with health/care careers, the Nurses etc. and the Social Health assistants. Most likely such a difference is also apparent from purely qualitative data, but the degree of observable specificity found in the class plots (table 7.6 and 7.7) cannot easily be matched, although the analysis and interpretation of this difference is not a quantitative one.

Certain connections between the data and the interpretation are available for inspection and reversal in geometric data analysis, unlike most other analytical tools. The individuals, not the variables, are preserved at the information-bearing units throughout the analysis, and whenever we want to, we can inspect the individuals’ in relation to the interpretations made. The analysis is mainly descriptive: all claims made are found in these data and the precision and durability of these claims stem from the data and not from statistical properties assumed to be present. The analysis is inductive: it does not rely on testing specific hypotheses, nor does it answer only by way of the research questions posed. It both validates and refutes assumptions (here, NISE competition is validated, gender as structuring factor is refuted) but not by significance, or by reduction to a specific quotient or factor. The analysis necessitates some sociological contextualization, granted. But such reconstruction of the object of research is always necessary; my claim is that GDA allows other to examine the relationship be-
tween data and context very closely. Where the modern American school of Mixed Methods and so on must refrain from actually mixing quantitative and qualitative data, gaze and interpretations, this method allows me to minimize the distance between data-forms and methods to a much smaller amount. And finally, the presence of individuals from start to finish means that I can go on and re-examine the data by returning to the individuals in a number of different ways, thus never having to go by only the explanatory relationships found in the analysis. The interviews I have conducted can quite literally be sited in the space constructed here, and the position of informants can be compared to their subjective statements and attitudes. This is of course the entire raison d’être of this analysis: to provide a first layer of a homological analysis.

It can be argued that absence of formal testing of the results means that my statements always require validation by some external resource - theories, other research, national statistical data - I could, for instance, have chosen to characterize the classes by modalities and test values for each modality. This goes to the analytical philosophical position I have adopted; this is the cost of not embedding assumptions and a priori knowledge in the analytical tools themselves.
CHAPTER 8

Sites and Informants in the Space of Trajectories

In a previous chapter (chapter 4) I discussed what one might term the external representativity of my fieldwork sites, comparing them to the total population of NISE by examining the relations of competition that the NISE are embedded in. The geometric data analysis enables me to examine how well my fieldwork sites represent the population of NISE in another way: comparing the population at my fieldwork sites with the total population of the SSPSE data-set.

8.1 Location of Sites

In the plots 8.1 and 8.2, the original data-set population is gray, and the observed students from two fieldwork sites are purple (KSEM) and blue (JSEM) respectively. Concentration ellipses have been added in order to indicate the different subgroups dispersion in the space.

Graphs 8.1 and 8.2 show different things. First, they show that the dispersion of the entire population and the dispersion of the two fieldwork sites, while not completely congruent, is quite close. A sliver to the far right of the first axis in graph 8.1 is not covered, something I shall return to shortly. Secondly, these graphs show us that each of the two fieldwork sites occupy different positions, both from each other, and from the data-set population entire. This is in fact the geographical structuring effect that of course also occurs in the relation between my two fieldwork sites, as they belong in respectively Copenhagen and the Provinces. But not only do the sites differ in position, the shape of the dispersion is also quite different, in particular on the third axis, as can be seen in graph 8.2. Roughly speaking, the JSEM subcloud encompasses almost all
of the variation described by axis 3, but only the indirect side of axis 2. The KSEM subcloud encompasses only some of the complex side of axis 3, all of the direct side of axis two and some of the indirect part.

In other words, the position these two NISE occupy in the space of trajectories seems to span most of the variation found in the data-set - and still the two NISE are clearly different, representing one of the most prominent structural features of the space, the geographical differences. The ability to not only locate, but compare positions, dispersions and relations is a quite powerful tool, and one that I intend to use to contextualize the fieldwork data throughout this study. But the two previous graphs also reveal something else: the differences in recruitment “footprints” of the two NISE. The two NISE can literally be seen to exploit different avenues of recruitment her - with JSEM recruitment reaching farther into the Indirect and Insider regions of the space than KSEM recruitment. Whether these differ-

Graph 8.1 Fieldwork sites in first principal plane

Graph 8.2 Fieldwork sites in third principal plane
ences can be explained by recruitment strategies or by recruitment potential in the geographical areas is less certain, and determining this would require very detailed data on the potential social educator students in the regions.

8.2 Location of Informants

In exactly the same way as the populations of the two fieldwork sites was plotted above, I am able to plot the location and dispersion of the members of my focus-groups. As can be seen in graph 8.1, the sliver of the plane of the first and second axis, which were un-represented in the student population widens to an entire half of the plane, when the focus-group dispersion is plotted. This is a problem that, unfortunately cannot be helped, the reasons for which I shall return to shortly. The quite densely populated Outsider-Indirect section of the plane in graph 8.3 is simply not represented in the focus-groups. It will be necessary to consider whether it is at all possible to compensate for this skewing, but equally important, I will need to examine the causes and implications of this omission. I will do so in section 8.4 below.

In graph 8.4, another crescent of the space - that of the most direct and simplest trajectories - is also unrepresented in the focus-groups. Since this region is less populated, and both the di-
rect and the simple dimensions of the two axes are represented separately in the groups, this omission is less grave than the one discussed above. In both graphs shown here, the two focus groups differ in both shape and position preserving the differences between the two NISE populations, as seen in the previous graphs; of course excepting the absent outsider aspect of the first axis.

The ellipses of graphs 8.3 and 8.4 provide an estimate of the dispersal of the informants, and what empirical data I can derive from these informants; a sort of rough visual representativity measurement. But with reference to the methodological discussions in chapter 2, the space of trajectories can also be used to relate the informants to each other. The three graphs 8.5-8.7 show the relations between all nine interviewed informants, in the three first planes of the space of trajectories. I will not be making any analysis of these positions for now, as it would be either a repetition of what was said in chapter 6 about the axial aspects, or anticipating points from the analyses of biographies or educational strategies. The three graphs 8.5 to 8.7 are meant as an tool for visual comparison of the individuals’ position, in relation to other empirical analyses. For instance, similarities between informants who are also in close proximity may - but by no means must - be characteristic of individuals within that region of the space of trajectories. Conversely, if some agents far apart in the plots are highly dissimilar, those dissimilarities may - but by no means must - be related to the axes in relation to which the a far apart. In order for such similarities or dissimilarities to
be related to the structures, they must be shown to relate to the sociological interpretation made of the axis or axes in question. The reason for this is that the positions of the graphs shown here relates only to a limited part of the specific variance of the cloud of individuals. Making deductions based on simply the spatial proximity disregards the relations between agents in proximity on all other axes. In short, proximity on one axis does not rule out separation on other axes, and thus similarities must be related to the modalities contributing to the specific axis, and not just to the individuals. Conversely, any social similarity between individuals need not relate to the structure of the space of trajectories - similarities must be shown to in fact relate to the questions in fact put as active in the analysis, otherwise the similarities may well prove unrelated to the space of trajectories. For these reasons, my attempts to construct homologies between position in the space of trajectories and analyses made in the next methodological modes will be based on the classes constructed in chapter 7, rather than the positions in the space of trajectories. The classes were constructed based on all the axes of the cloud of individuals, and thus the similarities between individuals within classes are related to all axes. But similarities between individuals must still be shown to relate sociologically to the active questions of the analysis, that is: to the aspects of the axes. Nonetheless, I have included a table below, showing the positions of all the informants, by axis aspects, in order to provide a simpler guide for initial comparison than the planar plot above. - The parentheses mark out the informants whom the axis does not describe to any important degree, and whose position on the axis is almost at the centre.
### Table 8.1 Informants by axis aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Type of indirect trajectory</th>
<th>Trajectory direction</th>
<th>Trajectory composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anita (Outsider)</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signe, Jytte</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henriette, Albert</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>(Simple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Louise, Eva</td>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Complex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Interview-willingness

One reason for the lack of representation of the outsider aspect of the first axis can be found in the willingness of the students to participate in focus-groups. In graphs 8.8 to 8.10 I have depicted all students in the two fieldwork sites, this time showing their response to whether they wanted to participate in interviews and focus-groups, red indicating those declining to participate in interviews, and green indicating those willing to participate. The majority of the interview-willing students are located to the left of the origin on the first axis. Of the five who are in fact located to the right of the origin, only one does take part in the interviews. In short, it would appear that interview-willingness is structurally related to the space of trajectories - in particular axis one. Before I dis-
cuss this relation sociologically, I would like to discuss how it came about. At the time where the focus-groups members at KSEM were approached, the space of trajectories had not yet been analyzed completely, and so I made my choices based on cross-tabulations of the data, rather than on the construction presented here. This led me to focus on representing age, gender, various forms of experience, and both preparatory and vocational secondary education. As it turns out, the various kinds of experience are less central to the analysis, and the previous careers, on the other hand, turn out to be vitally important, but were not considered so at the time of focus-group construction. Had I found more willing informants with vocational training, I would probably have gotten a better representation of the first axis, but students with this educational background unfortunately proved very reluctant to participate in interviews.
8.4 Absent Outsiders

The subset of trajectories that I have no informants representing I will be terming the *Absent Outsiders*. There are, as is shown in the table 8.2 below, several informants who belong to the Outsider class, but who must be seen as not typical of the entire outsider class.

The Absent Outsiders appear to be predominantly male, vocationally trained, older than 30 and younger than 40, and has a previous career as Craftsman/arts, or within Shop/office. There is thus little institutionalized nor generalized educational capital. Thus, we may wonder whether there may be some relation between this educational background and the *willingness* to discuss education in a research context. Since students with a preparatory secondary examination are quite willing to participate in interviews, and students with vocation training are not, there is ample reason to surmise that their subjective experience of education may render them respectively confident or apprehensive as to discussing their current educational experiences. The educational background of students, when considered in relation to the classroom interactions (cf. chapter 12) lends some credibility to this hypothesis. And finally, as will be discussed extensively in the next chapter, it turns out that I am both behaving, thinking and perceiving the NISE from an implicit teacher position. Cognisant of this, the students most likely *all* recognize my relations to them as what I will in the next chapter term *implicit teacher-student relations* - but the Absent Outsiders are perhaps the ones least comfortable with both the educational context, and also the ones whose arrival in the domain of social education entails abandoning a very dissimilar career. For these reasons their trajectory disposes them for declining interviews with researchers.
8.5 Informants and Classes

One final aspect of the fieldwork should be assessed here - the distribution of focus-group members in on the classes constructed. In the table below, the focus-group members are listed by the class assignments they receive in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>KSEM members</th>
<th>JSEM members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1/5 - Straight Ones</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2/5 - Outsiders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jytte, Anna Louise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3/5 - Nurses etc.</td>
<td>Signe</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4/5 - Social/Health Assistants</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Eva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5/5 - Complex Insiders</td>
<td>Henriette, Jonas</td>
<td>Albert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2: Interview-group members by classification

While there is a serious omission, when one considers the spatial dispersion of the focus-groups compared to the axes of the multiple correspondence analysis, the classes seem well represented by the focus-groups. The ability to examine the positions enunciated by each of these informants, and then place these positions literally as positions in the space of trajectories provide an extensive context for comparing and relating them to each other, and for constructing homologies.
Six students who were part of the focus-groups have also been interviewed biographically. The geometrical data analysis maps the trajectories of the entire population of SSPSE students, but only from the point of view of the researcher, objectifying the highly subjective processes of job and career change, social educational work experience and the multitude of different social conditions under which these trajectories have unfolded. The purpose of the biographical cases are to explore these aspects, and to some extent ameliorate the sociological myopia induced by the statistical perspective. Many studies of social dynamics omit the perspective of how individuals actually come to terms with available opportunities and imposed limitations - in the words of Daniel Bertaux: "What people do with what has been done with them" (Bertaux 2003, 2008)

The biographical analysis or the second methodological mode of the study (cf. Chapter 2) relates to the first and second research questions:
1. What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?
2. How are these biographies related to educational strategies?

This chapter first discusses some general positions on life-stories and biographies, concluding with the methodology of the interviews conducted in this chapter. This is followed by a presentation of the six cases, and the interview-setup. The six cases are presented one at a time, with a brief description of the interview, and résumé of the narrative, and some initial analytical considerations. The present chapter will stick to analyzing the biographical narratives, attempting to describe the sociological characteristics of the pathways upon which these six informants have set out, by relating them to the classes constructed in the previous chapter. In the following chapter, I will go on to con-
struct some overall headings of educational strategies, and examine their relation to the biographies and trajectories.

9.1 Biographical methodologies

Biographical, or life history, research comes in a multitude of flavours. According to many proponents (Wengraf 2001:6ff.), the usage of methods focussing on informants life narratives in their entirety have come to the fore in qualitative methodology in recent years (Chamberlayne et.al. 2000), as an attempt to grasp those aspects of social processes, that are not easily accessible to the interviewee’s understanding of him or herself. One such position is that taken by Kirsten Weber and others, in the Life History Research Project conducted at RU since the nineties. This position stresses the importance of the subjective dimensions of experience, and the impact of societal and historical dynamics on subjects’ perception of their own lives. Another such position is represented by Daniel Bertaux, who has attempted to replace the longitudinal tradition of social mobility studies by one of biographical and genealogical studies\(^\text{147}\) (Bertaux 1977). Both of these positions provide analytical and methodological tool-sets for biographical research, which this part of the chapter will discuss, and attempt to select and reconcile aspects of both positions in order to answer the questions related to learner subjectivity posed by my research project.

9.1.1 The Purpose of the Biographies

My purpose with this biographical substudy is twofold: primarily, they are meant to illustrate a specific sociological interest: what pathways lead to the SSPSE, so to speak - and by that metaphor, I am proceeding my analysis from the constructions in chapter 7: that there are, in fact, a specific limited set of pathways, indicating similarities between a number of subsets of students, and that these pathways are adequately reconstructed as the five classes: Outsiders, Straight Ones, Nurses etc, Social-Health Assistants and Complex Insiders. My other interest in biographies can at most be said to microsociological: the subjective structures of meaning that connect the pathways to the educational domain; the subjective meaning students constructs as they apprehend their position as students of the SSPSE. Such structures of meaning I take to encompass both the decision to enroll (and thereby the meaning ascribed to the domain, the institu-

\(^{147}\) Genealogical meaning literally studying several related generations, not to be confused with the better known, but completely unrelated concept of genealogy employed by Michel Foucault.
tion, and the profession), and the work of transformation necessary, in order
to become a legitimate (in the opinion of one self and others) occupant of the
student position. The transition from practitioner without diploma to student
involves a substantial subjective shift, a transformation of the experience. Were
I to examine such a transformation thoroughly, this would require a theoretical
sensitivity to subjective, emotional et. al. aspects of the informant’s psychol-
ogy, and devising an equally sensitive rigorous methodology conducting and
analyzing interviews. Such work exceeds the limits of this study, both in scope
and time required. I have chosen instead to follow the methodological ground
prepared by Camilla Schmidt in her thesis “From Social Educator Student to
Social Educator” (Schmidt 2007). Her methodology combines a biographical
approach with an in-depth hermeneutical one, minutely staking out the inter-
connectedness and overlaps of the two, to create a cohesive two-dimensional
analytical framework. While my ambitions are much more modest, I attempt a
similar two-dimensional manoeuver by combining the theoretical perspectives
of Pierre Bourdieu and Daniel Bertaux, and while closely related, they have
violently diverging views on the nature of empirical data obtained through bio-
graphical interviews, and in particular on their analysis.

The underlying assumption in the above two interests mirrors the homological
relationship between positions and dispositions: the various pathways taken by
students to the SSPSE are influential in how the students make sense of their
student positions.

9.1.2 Bertaux: Flares, Fireworks, and Genealogies

Life stories relate to social structures in complex ways, and the theoretical
reconstructions of these fall in one of two categories, according to Daniel
Bertaux(cf. Bertaux 2003): ethnosociological and more hermeneutical ones. The
central hypothesis of the ethno-sociological perspective is that:

“...les logiques qui régissent l'ensemble d'un monde social ou mésocosme
sont également à l'oeuvre dans chacun des microcosme qui le composent:
en observant de façon approfondie un seul, ou mieux quelques-uns de ces
derniers, et pour peu qu'on parvienne à identifier les logiques d'action,
[...] on devrait pouvoir saisir au moins des logiques sociales du mésocosme
 lui-même.”149 (Bertaux 1997:14)

148 A heading under which Bertaux puts numerous different approaches. I will not go much into what
common features these have, as the main point of Bertaux is to illustrate the use of biographies as a
sociological tool.
149 “The logics that control an entire social world, or mesocosmos, are the same that work in all of the
microcosms of which it is composed: when observing in depth one, or better, several of the latter, if
In other words, the structures that organize the individual biography reflect the structures that organize the entire social world in question - more or less a restatement of the homological principle, in different terms. The social world is regulated by structures, which in Bertaux’ optics means social constraints and opportunities, but the social world is also social-historical - the structures being complemented by “agency, action [and] courses of situated action” (Bertaux 2003:3). Bertaux’ central methodological claim is that life stories are eminently well suited to map out such courses of action and the constraint- and opportunity-structures from which they arise, if these life stories are collected from socially coherent spaces: Social worlds and categories of social situations.

In Bertaux’ terminology, social worlds [des mondes sociaux] are sections of the entire social universe - sections which are wholly structured by a given activity, that may be both formal (education) or informal (mountain bikers), secretive (heroin addicts) or openly accessible (social organisations) (ibid. and Bertaux 1997). This translates according to Bertaux himself into the Bourdieuan term field150: “tout ‘champ’ est un monde social ; mais beaucoup des mondes sociaux ne sont pas des ‘champs’...” (Bertaux 2005:19) Bertaux furthermore complements the term of social world with catégories de situation, a term that includes people who are similarly socially situated, yet not actually connected e.g. Algerian immigrants in France.

Bertaux’ reasoning for using narrative interviews draws upon a claim of similarity between narratives and actions (op.cit. p.23, p.73). The purpose of the ethno-sociological paradigm is to grasp situated logic of action, and so Bertaux urges the researcher of social practice to collect narrated practice, as a unique source of knowledge of such practices.

In the work, where Bertaux puts forth the distinction between ethno-sociological and more hermeneutical methods, he is attempting to justify the former against the latter. He does not expand on the attributes of these latter, save by caricature. Some fronting references given for this position is the BNIM of Tom Wengraf (e.g. Wengraf 2001) and also work done by Apitzsch and Inowlocki (i.e. Apitzsch and Inowlocki 2000). The description Bertaux gives is that the methodology of such studies takes as it point of analysis, the trajectory of the individual per se and not the social context and conditions that presumably influence this trajectory. It is the inner logic and the marvel of the individual trajectory, that these studies take as their object. This Bertaux illustrates by one half of a much-cited analogy: the hermeneutical biography researchers are one is successful in identifying the logics of action (...) one will be able to at least grasp the social logics of the mesocosmos it self.”

150 Bourdieus term field [champ] has in Danish educational science been taken to mean several quite different things. Bertaux’ term social world is falls under a “soft” understanding of field where a field corresponds roughly to my usage of domain, but definitely not the “hard” definition of Callewaert. (1994)
studying fireworks: marvelling at the display of each trajectory, and the finesse and craft of each particular narrative trajectory (Bertaux 2003)

In contrast, the epistemology of Bertaux is “résolument objectiviste” (Bertaux 2005:12) in the meaning that the narrative of one agent is in no way different from any other source of data on any one social object, and for that reason the task Bertaux’ put himself to is not to understand why one informant narrates his biography as he does, but rather to try to discover what features the biographies have in common, what differentiates them and in the end what logic of action organizes the social situation or world being studied. This latter aspect is what the second part of his analogy describes as studying flares: The flare, when launched, illuminates the terrain hitherto shrouded in darkness, revealing previously obscured features for the researcher to see, yet the flare in it self is only a means to an end, and the flare interests only the researcher in so far as it allows him to discern new features of the social terrain, or confirm the presences of features so far only glimpsed(Bertaux 2003). As metaphors go, this is both quite eloquent and succinct. Yet it glaringly omits, as has been pointed out by Kirsten Weber, that in order to recognize features of the terrain, some sphere of reference is required. Recognizing salient features of the informants biographies requires an a priori theoretical framework determining what might constitute such features. As Bertaux himself shares Benzecri’s previously discussed aversion of hypotheses, this appears problematic. In his work Bertaux appears to gloss over this contradiction, declaring his adherence to the work of Pierre Bourdieu(Bertaux 2008), yet disregarding the stance of Bourdieu on what constitutes empirical data, and his discussions of their production. Bertaux’ position is resolutely objectivistic, in the sense that his approach to analysis is an inductive or grounded one. One danger of grounded qualitative approaches such as this is that the relatively small sample of informants studied are universalized - understood by the researcher as the entire span of variations available, the specific social conditions the sample represents ignored. By generalising in this way, Bertaux risks forgetting history (Bourdieu 2006:43) - and as was be discussed in chapter 4 on sampling strategies the snowball sampling methods in fact risks blinding the researcher somewhat to the social situatedness of his sample. This aspect of Bertaux’ position is one I will be considering from a different theoretical perspective, in an attempt to remedy the problems of generalisation.

The term used here by Bertaus is in fact le récit which literally translates as “a storytelling”(Bertaux 1997, 2005). I have chosen to translate this by using both a verb - narrate - and a noun - biography - in order both to maintain the close connection between telling and stories, which the french word contains, but also to stick to employing terms recognisable as specific theoretical concepts, of which Bertaux uses narrative and biography in his english publications.
9.1.3 Bertaux’ Analytical Toolset

Bertaux outlines in “Le Récit de vie” (Bertaux 2005) the analytical frameworks he employs. While the outline, which I will be summarising below, may seem very rigid, Bertaux’ use of it is in fact both mostly unstated, and quite lax, and one must bear this in mind when reading the following 152.

When examining the flow of events, that make up a biographical narrative, it makes sense to separately consider the various contextual layers that the events have played out in. Initially, Bertaux refers to three levels of meaning, which must be considered. The first two are respectively the subjective level, which he likens to Bourdieus concept of habitus, and the structural level, which he likens to Bourdieus concept of field 153. The third level is the strong intersubjective relations, situated between the subjective and the structural level - a part of the social relations not often explored separately, but both Bertaux and Schütze emphasize its importance, and develops separate concept for it. Bertaux has in particular drawn attention to the effect of family ties and debt, in both literal and metaphorical sense.(Bertaux 1995)

The analysis now examines the narrative of the informant as a sequence of states on each of these three levels. At each particular moment in the informant life story, he is in a particular state on each of the subjective, intersubjective and structural levels. External conditions, other people or the informant himself may cause one of the states to change, and this is what Bertaux terms an event. Events may come about as the results of strong desires or aspirations of the informant her- or himself, as results of emotional bonds to family or others, or by external forces impinging upon the life of the informant. Whenever the informant attempts to cause one of these states to change, Bertaux terms it action, and of course on all three levels, states can be caused to change by events not consciously planned out to do so. Events are rarely restricted to cause changes on only one level, yet separating the three levels analytically draws attention to the interplay of the various levels. In one analysis of artisanal bakers(Bertaux & Bertaux-Wiame 1981), an informant conflates the date of his marriage with the date of his becoming self-employed, showing that the significance of marriage as event includes the structural level, and the analysis goes on to reveal marriage as a keystone event in how artisanal bakers establish themselves as self-employed, and thus an example of how all three levels are affected by the marital event.

152 The following draws on Chapter 5 “L’analyse d’un récit de vie” in Bertaux 2005
153 It is important to note that these levels are part of Bertaux’ analytical craftsmanship, and that Bertaux does not appear to disagree on the conceptual level, with the Bourdieuan notions of field and habitus as such. The three levels are interconnected and are neither independent on the conceptual level, nor in social practice. Yet as an analytical knack, it makes sense to consider them separately as the relations informants has to respectively themselves, their families and the institutions of society.
Bertaux explores the situational logic by exploring what I will term the *transmission* and *transformation* of states on the three levels. The initial transmission of all three states occurs when the agent is born into a family. This provides the agent with specific social conditions; being brought up in a specific social context equates having specific symbolic meanings and ascription inculcated, producing an initial habitus, and by extension, initial subjective, intersubjective and structural states. As the informant goes about trying to change his station in life, his relations to significant others, this is understood as *acting to transform* one or more of the three states. The analysis of the biographical narrative thus attempts to examine the agents’ perspective on how and why their trajectory unfolded as it did, while still retaining the structural events, which impeded or made possible the actions that make up the narrative\textsuperscript{154}. This is very similar to Bourdieu's concept of transversal social mobility (Cf. Chapter 2), as Bertaux also attempts to grasps more complex social dynamics of mobility, than simply class ascension. I shall now go on to discuss the details of how Bourdieu's social theories and Bertaux’ analysis fits together.

### 9.1.4 Biographical Illusions and Homologies

In an early article, Bourdieu forcefully makes the point that biographies are fundamentally delusional (Bourdieu 1994b): The agent comfortably seated across from the researcher is literally not the person who experienced the events he is narrating, and the shape, content, filtering and emphasis of the narrative reflects the social conditions under which his life currently unfolds. The very idea of a narrated life story implies that there is coherence, a consistent unity through the life course: the specific agent. As Bourdieu claims that all socially pertinent qualities are *relational*, this unity is effectively dissolved, replaced by a succession of evolving positions, once occupied by the agent, each of them embedded in different sets of relations. The fractured incoherent trajectory, when made the topic of an interview, is actively recast into a sensible narrative, by a narrator who holds a specific social position at a specific point in time on this trajectory, it is *made sense of*. The sense that can be made being an explanation of why the trajectory led to the specific point from which it is being told. Bourdieu likens this to an attempt to describe a trip on the metro, without accounting for the network of tracks and stations that structure such trips. In short, the life story, as described by Bourdieu here must be seen as an account reflecting only the

\[\text{154} \quad \text{It has been claimed that Bertaux assumes that all social phenomena originates in subjective opinion, and that the agent thus always creates himself free of all social constraints (Callewaert 2007a). This reading of Bertaux seems superficial, and fails to take into account the intersubjective and structural levels of Bertaux’ analyses.}\]
current social embedding of the agent telling the story, and as a story which by
necessity ignores the social structures that, forcibly or imperceptibly, has guided
and impeded the agent in his choices and possibilities.
Bourdieu concludes this article by pointing out that one must understand the
biographical events as a process of sociological aging: “a number of placings and
replacings” (op.cit. p. 87) dependant on the set of successive states of the field(s)
in which the agents was situated at the time. By constructing the full set of rela-
tions that the individual was embedded in, his social surface can be analysed - and
this is the daunting task set forth by Bourdieu for the biographical analyst.
In combining Bertaux’ methodology with Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of the
social space, I thus need to relate the resolute objectivism that Bertaux’ ap-
plies to his interview data with Bourdieus complete distrust of the narrator. I
believe this contradiction can be resolved due to the fact that Bourdieu does
acknowledge the relevance of the narrative to the position currently occupied by
the agent. This is explored in depth in the various methodological and episte-
omological chapter in the most famous interview study by Bourdieu: La Misère
du Monde or The Weight of the World(Bourdieu 1999). Bourdieus analytical
provisos here are that understanding and explanation cannot be separated - the
researcher has understood neither the social position or the narrative, unless he
also understand how the position makes the narrative sensible and the narra-
tive makes sense of the position; how social conditions condition, yet also how
conditions can be narrated as experience.
In other words, the narration of the biography reproduces the current situation
of the agent, not as a random distortion of the sequence of events, but rather
one distorted specifically by the context of meaning relating to the position the
agent currently occupies. When considering the narratives of the individuals,
one should thus consider both how this story contributes to maintaining the
logic of the agent’s current position, and how that logic contributes to shaping
the narrative of the agent. A sketch of that logic was drawn from the previous
research of social educator training in chapter 3.
I previously (section 9.1.1) described the object of the biographical sub-study
as the subjective structures of meaning that connect the pathways to the do-
main of social educator training; the subjective meaning students constructs
as they apprehend their position as students of the SSPSE. In the light of the
above theoretical discussion, this comes to mean that I am trying to exam-

---

155 This study is not a study of life stories, and does not claim to be, yet it is often spoken of as such.
Rather, Bourdieu and his numerous collaborators set out to examine contemporary social suffering by
examining the space of points of view(Bourdieu 1999:3), by interviewing the “disenfranchised” or “mar-
ginalised” : That is, the points of view of those whose point of view is at such odds with the dominant
world-view, that the only labels or categories available to us are ones that describes them by negation, by
naming that, which they are not.

242
ine the biographical narratives of the informants by relating the way they narrate their trajectories to both the total space of trajectories of SSPSE students, and the logic of the social educator training context. The latter two being my approximation of structural level, or field, the conditions of which structure the space of positions, which is the context that the narrated trajectories must be analyzed in. The analysis must attempt to reconstruct how the narration of the trajectories mediates between the position in the space of trajectories, and the practical logic of the social educator training.

One common-sense question one might pose to this position, is how we can determine what actually constitutes structures when working with biographical narratives? To some extent, the very narration of the life histories provide some possible insight. Weber (Weber 1999:10ff.) refers to the analyses of Schütze, the general trust of which are as follows: The individual is embedded in certain cultural practices, and such practices generate and are (in part) generated by narratives. Thus, the cultural practices to some extent take control of the narratives, in some instances making the informant relate more than he or she intended, in others less. The structure of the narrative thus reproduce the culture in which the individual is and has been living, beyond the intentions of the informants. The historical production of the biographical object is to some extent present in the structure of the narrative. The attention thus turns quite naturally to the structure of the life history narrative, and one could tentative describe the analytical strategy proposed by Schütze as longitudinal, following the temporal structure of the interview texts, rather than the thematic. The question of how to explicate structures from interview texts is equally pertinent to my project: Although the geometric data analyses provides a backscreen of the student population, these structures require validation within the interview text, if they are to be more than illustrative context. E.g., the distinction between insiders and outsiders was shown to be consistent throughout the geometric data analysis, but if it is shifted wholesale into the analysis of the interviews, it makes the analysis of the interviews quite deterministic. The question is whether the themes of the geometric data analysis are theoretical constructs, that have no semblance to what structures the consciousness of the informants, or if some affinities can be found. More simply put, the biographies can explore the extent to which my constructs coincide with the preconstructions of the students, and where the two differ. Before going on to the actual analysis however, I will brief

---

156 It is a common misconception that such a strategy prevents the uses of code-and-retrieve computer-based analytical tools. While such tools do allow for complete disregard of the temporal order of text segments, most also provide various graphical overviews of the texts both longitudinal and others. No matter what theoretical layer of abstractions one use (taxonomies of narrative devices, formal sets of codes, or phenomelogical meaning condensations), the order of the abstractions should be studied independently from the application of abstractions.
draw upon the interpretational practices used by Schmidt(2007), because while Bertaux’ analytical tools are quite effective for separating the layers of context within the interviews, the actual analysis of subjective meaning remains somewhat underexposed.

9.1.5 Story and Subject - Interpretational Knacks

This section will briefly discuss the combined methodology adopted by Camilla Schmidt and Kirsten Weber and draw first certain provisos for the combinations of methodologies, and secondly draw a number of analytical and interpretational knacks for the analysis in general, in order to sensitize the analytical approach to the subjective nature of the narratives.

As Bourdieu argues that the narration of the biography relates to the successive social inscription of the narrator, and that there is thus no subjective core throughout the life course, an analysis focussing on individual ascription of meaning is hampered somewhat. This is also evident from the absence of learning as an analytical term in most Bourdieu-inspired work. While I disagree with seeing this as a shortcoming of his theory, I do believe it can cause analytical difficulties, because it requires a historical reconstruction of the habitus accruing symbolic meaning from all the social contexts through which the agent has passed, in order to arrive at a point where it becomes possible to examine what actual social meaning constitutes learning in a specific context.

Kirsten Weber has suggested sociology needs to shift towards biographical methods in order to focus on concrete, sensuous and subjective dimensions of experience. When examining the topic of lifelong learning, such aspects are especially important, since

“...the contradictions in crucial situations in the life course and in everyday life produce subjective ambivalence, tolerance against ambivalence and resistance towards societal afflictions.” (Weber 1999:13)

Enrolling at an educational institution is one such crucial situation, and requires a substantial self-transformative effort by the student. Studying how these transformations embed themselves in consciousness and structures of meaning requires methodological tools sensitive to not only the subjective perspective, but to the relationship between subjectivity and societal structures. Or, in a less strict parlance, such methodology must retain what separates and distinguishes occupants of similar positions rather than what the similarities consist in.

Such methodology is the very point of the thesis of Camilla Schmidt (Schmidt 2007), whose research concerns social educators albeit with a completely different perspective than mine:”How do social educators students come to
acquire the dynamics of social educational work, and ascribe subjective significance to them through understanding and representing themselves?" (op. cit. p. 13) One aspect of this study is the discourses at work in the field of social education. The other aspect is an intricate life story analysis examining social educators students’ work experiences and how they experienced working related to social reality and contemporary discourses. This aspect of the study is carried out by the combination of two life story methodologies, and it is to the preliminary discussions of this dual methodology I will now turn my attention.

As Schmidt attempts to understand how discourses are acquired, she needs to examine the inner life of the students - actions are only meaningful in the light of both what came before and what comes after. Schmidt chooses to combine the biographical methodology of Schütze (Schütze 2005, Andersen & Larsen 2005) with one inspired by critical theory used by a community of researchers at Roskilde University, the later termed in-depth hermeneutical analysis. The discussion of the differences and analytical proceedings of these two positions take up three chapters of her thesis and will not be summarised here. The points I will summarize are certain propositions made by Schmidt along the way, about the interpretational aspects of this combination.

Schmidt’s use of the Schützean methodology (Schmidt 2007:43ff) takes leave from Schützes proposition that narratives are organised in processual narrative segments - coherent event sequences. Such processual segments are organised into cohesive sequences, both within the segments of events and between separate segments. This cohesion both establishes the narrative structure, and the experiences the narrator draws from the processual segments. There is a quite limited set of different experience-interpretations of processual segments - the four process-structures. The important, and recurring, theme here is sequenti-ality. The ordering of events is both a narrative structure, and an expression of how these events are being interpreted.

The other methodological thrust of Schmidt’s analysis draws upon critical theory and psycho-analysis for an in-depth hermeneutical analysis (Leithauser and Volmerg, cf. Schmidt 2007). While the focus of biographical methodology, such as Bertaux and Schütze, according to Schmidt leans towards life as a reality being retold as the agent is able to conceive it, this methodology attempts

157 They are: biographical action, where the sequence of events are set in motion by the intentions of the narrator; institutional course-patterns, where the sequence of events are the results of the narrators actions coming into contact with the framework of institutions; trajectories where the sequence of events take the narrator by surprise, such as disease; and finally transformative processes where the narrator experiences substantial change within himself. I will not make use of this taxonomi, since they are very close to the analytical model of Bertaux, and add little to my perspective. Schütze focus on sequences are however much more subtle than Bertaux, who more or less only refers to sequenti-ality as a way of establishing causality (Bertaux 2005:74ff.)
to discover what is being left out of the overall narrative order, discarded as unorderly or repressed, yet which is still present emotionally or bodily. Such an endeavour requires numerous psychological considerations in order to be reliable and feasible, beyond the limited time and space available to me. Yet the interpretational considerations are quite general and are not intrinsically linked to psychoanalysis (op.cit.p.77) These most importantly concern using one own subjective reactions to the interviews for guidance in the interpretation. In an extensive example, Schmidt demonstrates the use of her own reactions to the interview transcript (op.cit. p.82ff.), when minutely examining her own reactions in an interview-segment, relation to the work practice of one of her informants. A first layer relates to the initial frustration Schmidt experiences, having difficulties following the expoundings of her informant. In the interviews, this takes the form of Schmidt interjecting in support, something which both stimulates the informant to continue, yet also suggests that the informant might want to reflect on her narration. Yet closer inspection reveal further layers in the interaction between Schmidt and her informant: Schmidt relates to the disjunct and “stumbling” narration as an indication of fragility, yet Schmidt’s relation to this fragility does not come in the form of affirmation(op. cit. p.84). This absence of affirmation from the interviewer Schmidt explains by two societal aspects impinging on how she relates to the narrative: first, the informant’s narrative at this points concerns some of the difficulties in a career change for a single mother. The informant is thus drawing on a societal concept of retraining, which is thought to be commendable and necessary making it less acceptable for Schmidt to point out how difficult such retraining may be. Yet these difficulties are also ones Schmidt can relate to personally, being a mother herself, adding a final layer to the interpretation. The way these intrasubjective dynamics to some extent can be reconstructed by the researcher examining her subjective reactions to the texts I have found to be extremely inspiring, and equally applicable to interview-transcripts and field notes. Throughout the biographical analyses in sections 6.3 I will thus put forward my impressions as I recorded them in my interview notes, and subsequently re-examine them in the light of my biographical analysis.

9.1.6 Analytical Procedures

Making use of the above theories on life stories and biographies, I will in this section detail the analytical procedures, and the interview preparation.

I make use of Bertaux’ methodology as it represents a sensible cut-off point between the in-depth narrative and hermeneutical analysis of Weber or
Schmidt (cf. Above), and the loss of subjective perspectives when comparing the trajectories found in the geometric data analysis. It is necessary to strike a balance between an internal perspective on the informants, where learning and experience are pivotal, and an external perspective, where comparison between trajectories and biographies are the point of focus. I am not attempting to reconstruct the actual learning, that has taken place during the life history of the informants, but rather how the students currently relate to their past, in light of the current positions as student at the SSPSE. And so it seems an adequate compromise to study the narration of logics of action versus structural impediments to action, as Bertaux does, employing the biographies as flares over the social landscape made up by the space of SSPSE student trajectories.

I thus chose to prepare for the interviews in general by composing an initial interview question, and some outlines of other questions. This was done drawing upon the Single Question Inducing Narrative (SQIN) templates (Wengraf 2001:123) but with some important modifications I chose to underscore the themes of family, spare-time, career and education. While Wengraf explores systems of meaning within the narrative without any formal reference to outside data, in order to relate the narrative to the space of trajectories, and operationalize this comparison by way of Bertaux’ analytical three-level scheme. In order to do this I found it necessary to emphasize the biographical events that interested me - the themes that proved important in the geometric data analysis: education, and work (social educational and otherwise), and finally family, in order to address the Bertauxean notion of transmission. I thus prepared a template with a number of subheadings, which organized my notes. The headings were basically the predictable building blocks of a random biography, with regards to my research interest. Headings included:

- Parents (job, education)
- primary school
- other school
- secondary school
- job
- social educational job

and a number of unlabeled boxes. My intention was to register as many biographical events as possible during the interview, make notes of each and then return to some of them. There was no strict criterion that would warrant a return, but in general I either returned when some peculiar turn of phrase or omission piqued my interest, when something was mentioned en passant, and of course, whenever the themes differentiating classes came up.

158 The interview guide is included in appendix 6
I also did some specific preparations for each interview, by examining the questionnaires filled out by the students selected and draw up at list of what differentiated them from each other. The preparation was done like this, because it enabled me during the interview to begin examining biographical events in relation to the three layers.

Finally, I decided to include some themes at the end of the interview about the informants current experience and opinion of the training. While these themes were to be central in the group interviews, I was curious as to see what differences might show up, when similar questions were discussed individually. The themes were very loosely prepared, as mainly questions of the students opinion of recent courses, and at KSEM the recently completed work practice period.

I left each interview with a set of notes relating to the biographical events, and once the interviews were transcribed, the next step was typing up these notes, and comparing them with the interviews text, still roughly ordering the events by the levels. This provided me with a reconstructed biography, from a Bertauxean point of view. These notes are also a way of reflexively examining my part in the production of empirical data. All notes from the interview have thus been treated as empirical products with completely the same status as the interview transcripts.

When starting the analytical work, I was also making notes of what points in the transcripts I reacted to myself, and then examining them closer. While I at no point attempt the sort of thorough and minute analysis performed by Schmidt, I made note of the indications of how I related to the interviewee, and these were subsequently compared to the notes I made before and after the interviews. Later on, in this chapter (9.3) I will go into how I have chosen to present these subjective impressions.

The interpretation is summed up in the form of an overall reading of the narrative structure of the life story. What does it hinge upon, how is this told, what experiences does the informant draw from it? This very loosely draws on Schmidt and Weber, and in part Schütze, primarily the assumptions that narrative practices relate to cultural practices.

The overall ambition of my analysis was an attempt to re-read the narratives as structured by relations between education/social origin/geography/gender/etc. and subjective experiences of the various social contexts encountered along the life course. This operationally corresponds to comparing the overall narrative structure and significance ascribed to biographical events with these social characteristics of the informants. For reasons of legibility, I have in the end

---

159 In practice, this was done using the MaxQDA 2007 software package - and using a multitude of codes, while at the same time maintaining a set of notes of the biographical events. The codes were only used as way of indexing and searching the texts. The complete codetree is included as appendix 22
decided to present these analyses in two parts - in this chapter a biographical analysis that rarely stray from the shape and sequence of the actual narratives, and in the following chapter an analysis of the students’ educational strategies, which also encompasses the other students who participated in the group interviews. I will now present the selection of informants in greater detail, and the setup and transcription of the interviews, before presenting the biographical analysis.

9.2 Selection and Setup

The exact selection of which students participated in the focus groups was discussed in chapter 4 and 8 and will not be taken up again here. Of the nine focus-group members, only six were interviewed biographically. They are thus not meant to satisfy any traditional requirements of representativity as individuals. However, I do attempt to select the interviewees so that I thematically exhaust the space of trajectories. This by no means equates that the space itself is fully explored, only that the themes (i.e. questions) which are active in constructing the space are all represented. I will briefly reconstruct these selection criteria, and describe which students they relate to, and then show the situation of the biographical informants in the space of trajectories.

9.2.1 Criteria

Originally my plan was to restrict my fieldwork to one NISE. Thus the members of the first Interview group, that of KSEM, were all to be interviewed biographically. As my work progressed, working on the geometric data analysis in parallel with the fieldwork at KSEM, I came to realize that there were important differences between Copenhagen and Jutland that I would like to explore - in particular the remarkable absence of the vocationally trained older students in KSEM. As will be discussed in chapter 11 this proved much simpler than getting access to KSEM, and so I visited the NISE, handed out the questionnaire discussed in chapter 5, and began approaching students for interviews. This was quite late in the process, and for that reason I decided to do only one biographical interview at JSEM. When I did the group interview with JSEM students, I asked them a bit more about their work and educational background for applying to the SSPSE, and based on that I approached Anna Louise for a
biographical interview. So, the proper way to examine my selection criteria must be to examine how Anna Louise complements the KSEM selection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The KSEM biographies contained</th>
<th>Anna Louise is a woman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 men, 3 women</td>
<td>Anna Louise is the oldest informant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 younger(&lt;30), 2 older students</td>
<td>Anna Louise is vocationally trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vocationally trained, 3 with preparatory exams</td>
<td>Anna Louise has daycare experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special care, Nursery, SFO and other experience</td>
<td>Anna Louise has 6 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One student with small children</td>
<td>Anna Louise has trained and worked as a shop assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No students with Shop/Office careers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from the obvious geographical expansion of the sample that is inherent in the shift to JSEM, Anna Louise was selected to expand the ground covered by the sample in most areas: Age, social educational work experience, previous career and family situation. This latter criteria was only available to me since, because the KSEM biographical interviews had already been conducted. As I showed in chapter 7, the SSPSE appear to have begun recruiting students from wider ranges of age, gender and previous career than both the ordinary Social Educator training and the SSPSE did previously. The subjective perspectives of these students are then of particular interest to me, and the biographical interview with Anna Louise provides wider access to such perspectives than did the KSEM sample alone.

9.2.2 Situation of Informants in the Space of Trajectories

A brief look at the situation of the informants in the space of trajectories show them to be quite dispersed, although the outsider vocational informants are of course still absent, as discussed in chapter 8. When looking at table 8.1, one should not attempt to reconcile the actual trajectories of each subject with the interpretations of the axes made in chapter 6. The individuals have not been positioned according to the axes; the attributes of the individuals is what structures the space, and the axes are a way of interpreting that space. If one compares, say, the modalities that led to the insider-outsider interpretation of the first axis with the actual response profile of Anna Louise, one would expect her to be situated as an outsider. But this is not the case. Instead of wondering

160 For reasons of space preservation, I will not repeat the information on informant positions here - it can be found in tables 8.1 and 8.2.
161 A table showing the response profiles of all interviewed students can be found in appendix 2.
how to explain this by other aspects of the space constructed, I will examine how she relates to herself as an SSPSE students, and examine if and how she appraises the insider/outsider polarity herself.\textsuperscript{162} The geometric data analysis is not a deterministic complete and exhaustive sorting of all individuals, since the axes preserve an overall order of the space, not a complete mapping of all individuals.

The biographical subjects come to belong to different classes, as was discussed in chapter 7. As the biographical analysis will show, these classes are very fitting descriptions of the individuals, compared to a common-sense interpretation of their response profiles; whereas Anna Louise was not situated as an outsider, she is classified as one.

9.2.3 Setting Up the Interviews

I approached the interviewees in breaks at their NISE, and told them I was interested in interviewing them, and asked whether they were still willing. I then made appointments for interviews, letting the interviewees decide whether the interview could take place in their home, or somewhere else. Two students elected that the interviews should take place in their home, the last four for differing reasons preferred it to take place at their NISE. As will be apparent below, the way this choice affects the conduction of the interview is quite complex. The two students who invited me to their homes chose to handle the role of host in quite different ways one (Henriette) setting up an elaborate and cosy situation, the other (Jonas) a much more getting-down-to-business context, where initial chatting is confusing and unwelcome. The other four students adapt to the interviews in the NISE setting by more or less abandoning any hosting role (and conversely, I embrace it). Instead they relate to me as students, who have been set a task: e.g. selecting the location at the NISE comes to be my job, my unfamiliarity with the place nonewithstanding. While the interviews are of course something the students participate in at my behest - making it logical that I make the set-up decision - it also does serve to highlight the relative asymmetrical relationship embodied in the interview. No matter whether interviews take place in interviewees homes - the least hostile context imaginable - or in the more neutral setting of the NISE, the relation constructed is tinged with the symbolic dominance of the researcher versus the student.

\textsuperscript{162} This decision is an attempt to allow the knowledge and dispositions of the students to break with my analytical constructs. Were I instead to attempt some painstaking examination of each informants position in the space, in order to validate my interpretation of the axes I would most likely just cut myself off from some fruitful explorations of the interviews. In short, the seeming divergence between individual and total interpretations should be explored rather than explained.
9.2.4 Transcription

The transcription of the interviews has been done by three student assistants. My complete guideline on transcribing is included in appendix 17, but some brief points should be mentioned here. The transcription guideline requires breaks and silence to be transcribed, as (.) for silence of less than a second and (x) for x seconds of silence. This does not imply that I consider the relation between transcript and recording to have some degree of objectivity. It does imply that I think silence is an important part of the interview, and it needs to be visible to the reader, and in particular to myself as reader, when attempting to examine subjective reactions to the interview (Cf. Schmidt and the analytical procedure in Section 9.1.6 above). The transcriptions are verbatim, including self-corrections, hesitations, breaks, stutters and so on. While this means that the transcripts are less legible and transcription required greater effort, it also enables the reader to examine my interpretations of the text in greater details. Transcripts are by no means less constructed or more objective than my later interpretations. But in these, the active conscious filtering of stuttering and noise, and the way the audible impression is shifted by breaks and hesitation are both available for comparison with my readings and interpretations.

My transcription guideline also specifies that words which are audibly emphasized should be underscored in the transcript. I have been quite uncertain about this use, since I believe that such transcripts acquire an unequivocal air. I chose to include it after transcribing parts of some interviews myself, and being frustrated by the distance between how the transcript read, and how I heard the recordings. These hearings are not objective either, but again, here they are at least available for inspection and assessment by the reader. In other words, such emphasis may be as much keeping track of me, as analyst, as they are keeping track of the interview.

Time restrictions necessitated the use of students assistants for transcribing, but comparing my own transcriptions to those of the three assistants, I notice that each of us do things differently. All transcriptions that I did not do myself, I read while listening to the recording, and made notes of where my interpretation diverged from that of the assistants. In all but a few cases, these divergencies relate to terminology of social educator training, such as the names of various NISE, of the subjects of the training, and so on. In a few cases, where the informants speak fast, interrupts themselves or speak inaudibly, the divergencies between my interpretations of the recordings and those of the student assistants transcribing cannot be settled. In these cases one should avoid assuming that a completely unequivocal transcription is possible. Rather the fact that the recording leaves the listeners in doubt as to what is being said should
be noted as a prominent feature of that particular exchange, and interpreted
as an aspect of how the informant comes to present him- or herself. When re-
listening does not clear up whether one informant is saying that she was "happy"
or “unhappy” with her place of work practice, this could be taken to mean that
the informant possibly harbors some ambivalence on that point herself.

9.3 Biographies

In the following, I will examine the 6 biographical informants. The following
short sections on each informant each contains three parts: an introduction to
the informant and the interview, a biographical résumé and an analytical consid-
eration of how the informants have structured their narrative.

The introduction describe the setting of the interview, and my experience
of the interview situation, and the immediate impressions I had afterwards. I
also characterise the interview text, as it comes across when read, and what
kind of narrative it presents. The résumé provides a general description of their
trajectories and demographic data, and resums some of their own characterizations of themselves, using quotes from the interview to illustrate the tone of
voice used. All of these parts are written with the explicit purpose of taking the
reader close to my impressions and reconstructions of each of the informants,
and in all cases I re-examine these impressions in light of the other interpreta-
tions I make from the interview. This allows for a reflexive examination of my
interpretations, I believe.

There are three aspects of this that I wish to discuss before I do go on to
introducing the informants. These points are: that the informants are being
reconstructed, how I attempt to allow the reader to access and assess the process of
reconstruction, and a final discussion of whether this procedure seduces the reader
into my point of view or not.

As in the case of the humanities scientists examined in Bourdieu’s Homo Aca-
demicus (Bourdieu 1988), the informants are reconstructions. What the inform-
ants think themselves to be, or indeed what they think each other to be, outside
of the context of the space of SSPSE trajectories, is neither the object of this
chapter, nor of my research. Rather the attempt is to examine the point of view,
not of a specific agent, but from a position, reconstructed as part of a specific
field - a specific space of points of view(Bourdieu 1999).

To what extent can these constructions, produced by my at most semi-transparent research practice, then be checked and validated as reasonable reconstruc-
tions? By way of an answer, I have chosen to make available the impressions I got during the interviews, in setting up the interviews, and my reactions upon reading the transcript in the introduction to each informant. I put here my own thoughts and initial analyses of how the context of the interviews was shaped by the informants. These impressions form an equally important part of empirical data, but more pressingly, they necessarily contribute to the analytical reconstructions I make, as whatever impression I get relating to an informant indelibly shape that relation. The text here is based on the notes I made before and shortly after the interviews. One example which will be discussed below is the radically different ways in which two of my informants (Dennis and Anita) handle being delayed for our appointment. These differences form part of my impression of them, and by describing it here, it allows the reader to trace in part how my relation to these informants came about. Perhaps allowing for an assessment of the subjective aspects I bring into the relation. Kvale(1997) argues vehemently that interviewing is a craft, and this may well be. But the craftsmanship of interviewing is intertwined with the relative positions of the interviewer and interviewee, and that aspect of the interview cannot be under conscious control of the interviewer. Thus minute descriptions of careful conscious-reflexive wording of questions etc. miss the point entirely. The relation between the students and me is under the influence of so many different social and structural factors before even a word has been uttered, that any one specific wording cannot be the determining factor on the relation one way or another - and what effect it may have is even less likely to be predictable. Rather, wording should be read afterwards as traces providing a way of gaining insight into how the relation in fact played out. The Bourdieuan solution commonly cited(Bourdieu 1999); to minimize the social distance between researcher and informant; is thus an attempt to take account of this unaccountable aspect of the interview. Such an approach is beyond the scope of this study, but instead, I attempt to examine the thoughts I did have in the situation, and the way I react to the material, when re-encountering it in the form of transcripts.

The approach described above is inspired by the work of in particular Schmidt(2007), but also by Bereswill (Bereswill 2004) and Hollway & Jefferson(Hollway & Jefferson 2000). The subjective descriptions and reflections noted in the introductions that follows, are my attempt at allowing the reader to examine the subjective aspects of the production of empirical data, as well as how I attempt to make sense of them myself - in short inviting the reader to participate in a (partial) interpretive triangulation (cf. Chapter 2)

The final issue warranting discussion is then whether such a presentation is in fact dishonestly seductive? By this I mean that the introduction to the informants is
so much an insider’s story, that the reader by necessity come to subscribe to the researchers perception of the informants. As I present my impressions of the informants, along with my analysis of their narratives, there is perhaps a danger of *my narration* becoming cohesive to the point of being impenetrable? While I do believe this to be a real danger, I also think that it is an ever present danger of qualitative interpretations. Whenever subjective impressions are kept from the reader, a superficial impression may be that the constructions are thoroughly vetted for any researcher subjectivism. However, this is a contrivance of objectivist methodology. Any data, qualitative or quantitative, are equally subjectively produced, and leaving the production out in writing does not change the way they were produced. I attempt to leave in indicators of how the data were produced, and where the impressions I by necessity formed, came from. This is likely to make readers more sympathetic towards the constructions I do arrive at in the end, but were I to leave out these impressions, I would be skirting deception.

9.3.1 Signe

The first informant, Signe, is a female 31 years old student at KSEM, who have primarily worked in Special Care, and has trained as a nurse previous to enrolling at the SSPSE. The interview with her was conducted during the second week of my fieldwork at KSEM, and took place at the KSEM building. Both the place and time was suggested by Signe herself, because of a busy work schedule in general. On the day of the interview, Signe were to turn in a paper at the NISE, and suggested we meet shortly afterwards. As I arrive at the KSEM, Signe shows up immediately, saying that she has “kept an eye out for me”, in case I was unable to find her. She leads the way to a small room adjacent to the central students cafeteria, asks if this an appropriate place for the interview. I agree and set up my recording equipment, note kit and some mineral water for the both of us.

As the interviews progresses, it turns out to be an unsuitable interview location, as a number of students pop in to see if the rooms available (although it is labeled as in use), and outside noise is quite audible. Nonetheless I decide not to move, and later on the interruptions cease and the noise subsides, possibly as students return to classes.

The interview with Signe is very laid-back. Signe seems comfortable with the setting, and with the task, and answers freely and at length - she does not ask me to clarify my questions, but interprets them on her own, and does not ex-
hibit doubt as to whether she is answering correctly$^{163}$. To me, in the situation, she seems both eloquent and enthusiastic, and it is rarely necessary for me to prompt her. This is just as well, since she responds remarkably conscientious towards my questions, remembering all suggestions and possible topics, and making sure to cover them all. As such my attempts to turn over the reins of the interviews to Signe are generally unsuccessful, or short-lasting. Once she feels she has reached the end of one topic, she either asks me what else I want to hear about, or recalls another topic I have mentioned previously, and proceeds to elaborate on that. When initially giving an overview of her life, it is both chronologically and thematically structured, and all but complete, with few later corrections or additions. Her narrative sticks almost exclusively to educational and work-related biographical events, only at one point mentioning briefly a failed romantic relationship, and then only as an aside in explaining her drop-out from nurse training. In general she speaks fast and does not hesitate when answering. While I do not press any more personal issues, I do note this during the interview.

This all leaves me with an impression of a questionnaire-like situation, where I am being given the facts and just the facts in a thorough but impersonal fashion. The interview lasts for 1 hour 37 minutes, and consists of 766 segments. The transcript does not reflect the impression of control I had during the interview, as described above. Signe talk for quite long periods of time, and has quite a lot to say about most of the topics. The general impression of a very structured and thorough first presentation of her life history is less clear in the transcript. This is in part because while the theme education dominates the transcript, this theme also serves as the general temporal framework of her story. Almost all other important events are located temporally in relation to her educational trajectory. Structural and intersubjective biographical events are all related to education, and to the extent that Signe narrates subjective events, these are also related to education. Thus the factual and impersonal style of the interview stems from Signe adhering to a structure, that coincides with my interview-guide: We are both particularly interested in educational capital, albeit for different reasons.

---

163 As I shall return to, when discussing the interview with Jonas, some interviewees wants me to confirm that what they are saying is in fact what I want them to say. While certain themes are of course of lesser interest to me than others, in general there are no themes that must be examined thoroughly. I interpret these confirmation-requests as related to the situation and the desire to be a good informant - but also to some extent as an attempt to emphasize my participation in the interview. Consequently, I respond to them by listening and supporting the narration actively.
Signe is 31 years old, and starts off the interview by saying that she grew up in a regular boring nuclear family with an older sister, in a northern suburb of Copenhagen, both her parents being employed by the county in administration/office positions. She is the first in her family to obtain an Upper Secondary School Leaving examination and will - once she completes social educator training - be the first in her family to obtain tertiary education, something she seems quite proud of. She went to a private school which she expounds on in detail, as she is quite happy, proud even, about having been there. The private school was very progressive in introducing advanced courses in addition to the mandatory levels, as well as additional languages and various extracurricular activities. The school also introduced grades and testing early - around 4th form, as Signe recalls. Yet she narrates her affiliation with this private school as a serendipitous biographical event; the only reason it came about is that her sisters already went there. Yet this reveals that her perception of educational relates to her parents, and their choices on her behalf.

As the interview progresses, her happiness with the school is tinted by Signe’s strong unease at the class of pupils whom she met at the school. As part of extracurricular courses at the private school, Signe went to United Kingdom for a brief stint before enrolling in upper secondary school. The upper secondary school program she enrolls in is one maintained by Team Danmark, a youth elite sports program, which allows her to spend one additional year obtaining an Upper 2nd school leaving exam in modern languages, while at the same time playing tennis at a more or less professional level. Her sports career (which hardly can have been insignificant, as she was enrolled in the Team Danmark program) is only mentioned as an aside in explaining the biographical event of her upper secondary school enrollment. Choosing to go for the Upper Secondary School Leaving examination is an important biographical event to Signe - as mentioned she states that the first in her family to obtain one. Yet narratively it is taken for granted, and not explained.

Upon completing this exam, she went back to United Kingdom for nine months as au pair, studying English in her spare time. When Signe returned, her father demanded that she either enrolled at some form of education, or got a job.

“...and then (1) I was presented with an ultimatum by my father that [...] either I got myself a job and or else I had to apply to some education

---

164 Just a note of clarification here. In these biographical résumés I will need to state a number of facts, and whenever such statements appear, they should be read as noting a statement made by the informant in question, not as my evaluation of his or her opinions. So, whenever I write that “Signe was happy about this” it should be taken to mean that this is in fact what she says.
‘cause I wasn’t going to hang around doing nothing(’) and one thing led to another (’). So I got one of those grandma-to-grandkid chats and she was very convinced I should become a nurse” [Signe: 46-50]

And so Signe duly applied and was admitted to Nurse training. She does not dwell upon her own considerations as to enrolling, citing only these strong intersubjective relations: her fathers demand and her grandmothers suggestion as reasons for enrolling.

While training to become a nurse, she became involved in the Danish Nurses’ Organisation and the nurse training reforms, which aimed at granting completed nurse training status of Professional Bachelor’s degree. However, at the same time Signe bought a house together with a boyfriend in a small town south of Copenhagen: “But we weren’t meant to be...”[Signe:52] As consequence of the breakup, Signe moved back to Copenhagen, and dropped out of Nurses’ Training, only the final Bachelor Project short of completing her training. While this would seem important subjective and intersubjective biographical events, Signe did not go very deeply into her nurse training dropout, nor her relationship failing at any point during the interview.

While training as a nurse she had also done some weekend temp work in a large special care institution complex, for persons with severe physical and psychical disabilities, and now she shifted to doing this full-time. Signe realised that “Wow, girl, you’re actually damn good at this”[Signe:412], and decided that this was her calling, and that she wanted to train as a social educator. To some extent working in special care allowed her to make use of her partial nurse’s training, and this seemed very attractive to Signe. This event becomes an important turning point in her narrative, because while the previous biographical events are generally narrated without any specifications of Signe’s own motivation and reactions, from hereon the narrative centres on her decision to become a social educator. All subsequent biographical events relate to this project.

Signe’s current place of work was very close to where her parents lived, but as Signe moved back to Copenhagen, she started looking for a job closer to her home. She wanted to try out other kinds of special care social educational work, and after some time she found a job working with persons with autism spectrum disorders, and got employed as a full-time substitute after dropping out of nurses’ training.

She originally enrolled in ordinary social educator training, and was not then aware of the SSPSE at all. The municipality had offered her an arrangement, where she would receive economic support equal to unemployment benefit. For the first time providing me with a direct example of what cultural capital of care may consist in: a practical and mental familiarity with welfare work.
since she was not entitled to students grants for the entire training, nor would she be able to support herself on the relatively small students grant. However, this economic support arrangement fell through only two weeks before the first term began. Signe desperately contacted KSEM’s Student Guidance Service, and they arranged for her to switch to SSPSE at the last minute. However, expecting to study full-time, Signe had quit her job at the autism care facility, and now needed to find a new job quickly. She contacted the special care facility for the disabled where she previously had worked, and immediately was offered a job as a substitute for the next year.

Studying at the SSPSE has only confirmed her in that wanting to work as a social educator, although she wants to try out different jobs, and areas of the social educational domain, and “will never celebrate 25 years jubilee in one place” [Signe: 448]. In her spare time, she has completed and successfully defended her Nurses’ bachelors project, and thus qualified as a nurse.

Biographical analysis
As mentioned above, Signe structures her biographical narrative along her educational trajectory, and most of her narrative consists of biographical events relating to her educational trajectory. The latter part of the interview, where I ask about more detailed description of different components of her trajectory, consists of a number of reflections on her relations to other pupils and classmates, and how these relations are coloured by her current educational settings and how she feels about them. As mentioned above, her pride in the advanced level of her private schooling is tinged by the unease, bordering on antipathy, she feels towards the other students, whom she met in this school. To Signe, the economy of her classmates’ families was violently different from her own, and so her academic achievements became a way of counterbalancing her economic inferiority. At one point she lauds the efforts of the school as it attempted to introduce school uniforms, to suppress the students competing about fashionable clothes, in effect supporting efforts to replace the dominant economical capital with cultural capital. These reflections underscore that for Signe structural, subjective and intersubjective aspects of the biographical events are all permeated by education. There are hints in her narrative of paternal emphasis on the need to get educated; her father demands that she either get a job or start an education, and her choice of tertiary education is made by way of an investigative talk with her grandmother. Her parent’s comparatively poor economic background and her father’s insistence that she get an education causes ambivalence in Signe’s subjective biographical states. It is not until she decides that she is to be a social educator, that this ambivalence disappears from her narration.
of the educational events in her biography, and thus her initial emphasis of educational capital over economic also comes to embrace cultural capital of care.

Signe’s narrative focus on education is expressed both as comparisons: between herself and other students, between nurses’ training and social educator training, between Denmark and United Kingdom and so on, but also as *choices* between one or the other. Having chosen to train as a social educator, Signe wonders why anyone would choose as she has, and *then* not read the assigned literature, or participate in the task assigned, as part of that training? In this Signe resembles the students interviewed in Kampmann (1998b), as she scorns those of her fellow students who do not share her complete commitment to the training. To Signe, the biographical event of *choosing* to train as a social educator entails a loyalty extending to the entire package of ethos and values embedded in social educator training, and not just to the end goal of qualifying as a social educator. In Signe’s narrative there is little doubt or randomness once the choice of social educator training is made - from then on it is all about purpose and decision. Thus it is very important to her, that three different persons in her life has uttered suspicions that Signe might be a good social educator, long before she herself has that idea. To Signe, these utterings bear witness to qualifications of hers, that she may have taken a long time noticing herself, but which were there all along.

Signe’s narrative can be said to be one of *discovering* what her vocation is. In the Bertauxean terms, this is a narrative of a successful transformation event. Her educational experiences are narrated, juxtaposing an inherited emphasis on the value and importance of education with a subjective unease at being poor compared to her classmates. Academic success is a way of reestablishing her right to be a pupil at the private school, a struggle in a hostile environment. The biographical event of beginning social educator training transforms this struggle into a project, where the educational setting reinforces her purpose, rather than the opposite. The inherited importance of becoming educated is reproduced in Signe’s narrative, demonstrating how acquisition of capital relevant to her current position contributes to shaping her narrative. Signe displays an strong sense of loyalty to her chosen education institution(s) and accedes to most demands it imposes on her, recalling (Cf. Chapter 10) the teachers studied by Muel-Dreyfus (1983). In this, Signe shows an investment in the training different from that found by both the previously discussed studies on SSPSE-students (Svejgaard 2006, Ahrenkiel 1998, cf. Chapter 3). In part, Signe represents a kind of student different from those interviewed by Ahrenkiel - Signe has no kids, no family, and limited economic commitments, but she has completed 2nd education, and clearly values education as something else than a vali-
dation of the work experiences she possesses. This should also be chalked up as a way of administrating her gender and her educational ambitions, a point I shall return to in the end of this chapter.

It is this sense of loyalty towards the concept of education that shapes her relation to me as well. Only when teachers are unprepared, and so indicates a less serious attitude towards the training than Signe herself, is she dissatisfied with the SSPSE. As I pose questions regarding her choice of the training, she puts me under the same heading as her NISE teachers. Thus she endeavours to respond faithfully and factually to my questions, and treat my enquiry as an opportunity to both demonstrate this loyalty and to vent her frustrations with both teachers and students who do not exhibit a similar attitude towards the training. This is how my impression of her as a factual yet verbose informant comes about, and also why it proves futile for me to attempt to delve into the subjective level; the relation within the interview is an implicit teacher-student-relation, in part determined by Signe’s relation to education in general, making subjective aspects of biographical largely irrelevant from her point of view.

9.3.2 Henriette

Henriette is a 41 year old female student, who have worked for more than 20 years in social education, with some breaks studying. She has trained as a Care Assistant, and has worked in numerous voluntary solidarity/political organisations.

The interview with Henriette takes place in her home. When I arrive, Henriette has prepared both coffee and tea, and set a table with cups, biscuits and so on. The interview takes place in a quite relaxed and pleasant mood, and Henriette seems quite comfortable with being interviewed, neither impatient nor insecure. When the interviews is disturbed by the phone at one point, Henriette says herself that she will not answer it, and immediately picks up her story once the phone has stopped ringing.

The interview as such is also characterised by the frankness of Henriette. Her life story touches upon a number of intimate and personal topics, all of which Henriette relates in a neither hesitant nor reserved manner. However, this interview also displays the disorderly fashion of reconstructed chronology (Bertaux 2005:74). As interviewer, I am quite unable to keep track of the numerous places of employment, and Henriette’s multitude of political and organizational affiliations. While this seems unimportant to Henriette, and she herself points out that she cannot keep track of when she was associated with which organisation, my inability to take stock of the overall course of biographical events irks
me. For this reason I ask several clarifying questions along the way, and these contribute to giving the final part of the interview a more factual tone, compared to Henriette’s initial narration. My need, in the situation, to understand what sort of work or what organization Henriette is referring to, results in Henriette supplying more factual details (year, place, and so on) and less subjective information. As her initial narration mentions several important subjective biographical events, this shift into a more factual relation is somewhat unfortunate and possibly explains why Henriette herself does not scrutinize these subjectively important events during the interview.

Biographical résumé of Henriette’s narrative
Henriette is 41 years old at the time of the interview, and grew up in a “regular nuclear family” [Henriette 34] with a two year younger sister, in a western suburb of Copenhagen. Her father was a self-taught shop-worker, and later leader in an large opticians workshop, and her mother has worked part time as an office assistant. When she was nine, her parents divorced, and she moved with her mother and sister to the western part of central Copenhagen, seeing only her father every other weekend. “So there we were, three girls” [Henriette:46] is her comment to these biographical events. The new place was where Henriette lived while completing primary school, her mother being unemployed full-time housewife for several years. On completion, Henriette was urged by her teachers to enter upper secondary school, and “didn’t really get round to asking myself, if, if this was what I ought to do?” [Henriette: 50]. Henriette explains that she treated her own ideas with disregard because after the divorce of her parents she became an “incredibly sweet and nice girl” [Henriette: 52] and thus she did not really question the suggestions of her teachers at the time. She does not state why this biographical event on the intersubjective level - the divorce - prompted this particular subjective change, and led to eagerness to please teachers and family.

About halfway through upper secondary school, things went very badly, grades plummeted and Henriette was becoming very depressed and cut classes. She explains that this had to do with the extensive competition between students, which led to mistrust and a culture of unhelpfulness. Her teachers intervened and helped her complete upper 2nd school but Henriette did so reluctantly, and ended up with a less than mediocre Upper 2nd School Leaving exam. She then felt that she ought to put this exam to some use, and enrolled at Roskilde University. Although Henriette was very fond of RU and repeated states that the values and culture of the places suited her much better than upper 2nd school, she dropped out after half a year. Initially after enrolling, Henriette join a number of political forums at RU and was very happy, but
her experiences in upper secondary school had left her “incredibly tired with schools”[Henriette:95] and after half a year of university her mental health deteriorated, and she decided to drop out. Henriette is here indicating an ambivalent relation to education similar to that displayed Signe, in that she was dissatisfied with upper 2nd school, yet still felt obliged to put her upper 2nd exam to use.

When she dropped out from RU, Henriette was living with friends from upper 2nd school and from political activism in a commune, and through friends of her parents she got an offer to go to USA as au pair and participate in social work in a Street People Centre in Princeton. Working at the Street People Centre turned out to be completely overwhelming for her, involving extreme drug abuse and clients dying. Henriette felt that the family she was stationed with as au pair and the other au pair friends she had were unable to understand her experiences. After a phone conversation with her father, who was very concerned about her well-being, she abruptly headed home.

These experiences left Henriette with a feeling of great anger and frustration, which was what motivated her to enter into political activism, when she returned to Denmark: “Cause I felt like (.) well maybe I’m not able to work at a centre like this ‘cause I’m only 19 but then I can(1) do something else, right” [Henriette:170].

Henriette had started work as nursery assistant in a nursery school, first as a temp, but shortly full-time employed. Through this job she came into contact with the Danish Union of Nursery and Childcare Assistants and very quickly became a member of several subcommittees, and later sat on the board of the union. Having been part of students organizations in both primary school and upper 2nd school, this was no big change for her, and after half a year of work in the nursery school, she also joined Danish political party VS\textsuperscript{166}. This was in 1985, and Henriette’s work in the Danish Union of Nursery and Childcare Assistants involved her in some current workplace conflicts and strikes. And so Henriette continued working as a nursery assistant, while in her spare time becoming involved in a large number of left wing organisations, ranging from Third World solidarity initiatives to Critical Psychoanalytical workshops. Many of these activities took place in a building rented by a group of sundry left-wing organizations in Copenhagen, and this place which became a very important hang-out for Henriette. The various shifts in Henriette’s activities are quite difficult to follow, and it seems that specific affiliations are not especially important to Henriette; to her, the overall project was homogenous. Her experiences

\textsuperscript{166} VS - the Left Socialist Party - spun off from Socialists Peoples Party in 1967 due to internal disagreements about parliamentary strategies. The party came to be seen as the intellectuals’ and academics’ left wing party in Denmark, although the intent with founding VS was an alliance between workers and intellectuals. The history of VS is a long and immensely complex series of internal disputes about strategies and socialist positions between an equally immense number of fractions. VS lost parliamentary representation in 1987.
in the USA gave rise to a decision to become politically active and subsequent activities constitute one coherent biographical pattern of events in Henriette’s narrative, even if they took place in over a dozen different organizations. In 1990, Henriette decided to leave her job and enroll at a course leading to Higher Preparatory Exam, in order to get an exam that she was actually satisfied with herself. She applied in secrecy, and only told her family about it shortly before actually starting the course. Initially she put together a Higher Preparatory course which included a lot of natural science, even though this was precisely where she had the greatest difficulties in upper secondary school.

“...but really I think maybe that it was continuing everything that really happened all the way back to 9th form, right (.) That I, I never felt I’d finished it off properly (1) [...] whereas I though that (.) now (.) now I’m getting that certificate, right [...]and is has to be Higher Prep (.) So I think that really it was sort of a, a (.) Something about it not being finished(1) um (3) I think (1)” [Henriette: 257-260]

She tuned down her participation in political work while studying at the Higher Preparatory Course and obtained a complete Higher Preparatory Exam. Henriette recalls this event as a very positive and motivating experience, and she discovered that she was actually very happy with theories and the intellectuality of the humanities. Completing this course, and her decision to become politically active on her return from the USA are the two only biographical events where Henriette herself narrates as facing a choice, made a decision, and following it through; here, she narrates herself as the acting protagonist of her life.

Henriette next acted upon her newfound joy of humanities, and went on to enroll at the University, studying Danish. However, she dropped out of this after a year, and returned to work as a nursery assistant. Then she enrolled at Teachers College, but dropped out after a year here as well, again returning to work as a nursery assistant. Through her work with a leftist critical psychoanalysis workshop, she got interested in psychology, and then enrolled at psychology at the university of Copenhagen, but here she also dropped out after about a year, and began working as childcare assistant. She points out herself that there is an obvious pattern here, and actually voices fear that she may lose interest in her current education (social educator training) once she has been here for a year. She neither narrates these three dropouts nor the original decision to apply to either of them as decisions on her part, but rather as a course of inescapable events, caused by external forces.

During her time as a nursery assistant, Henriette became shop steward for the nursery assistants in several different institutions. As she found work as a nursery assistant after having dropped out of Psychology at the university, she fell in
love with newly employed female coworker, and within a year they were married and living together, something which she describes as being completely uncomplicated, even if her newfound sexual orientation surprised her.

At this time she was urged to enroll at Educational childworker and care assistant training by the municipality employing her. This she did, and completed the one year training with straight A’s, and left “thinking well okay (.) Maybe this isn’t that bad.” [Henriette:484]. Her return to her workplace was marred by a number of difficulties with new leadership, and as shop steward Henriette was very much involved in this. In the end, she got ill, and quit her job, becoming unemployed. After a few months, she got a job at a recently established nursery, where she was part of all the initial starting-up procedures. After a few months, however, her work as a shop steward here led to her becoming entangled in co-operative difficulties and was on sick leave for three months. Returning from sick leave, a new leader had been employed, and things worked out much better for Henriette. While these biographical events would presumably be quite important on all levels, what changes they instigate often eludes me. Henriette describes them mostly at changes within her relations to co-workers, and neither makes much of structural nor subjective aspects.

Yet one structural event is put forward: it frustrated Henriette that, being an assistant, she was not allowed to participate in meetings with the municipality and parents, where social educations decisions were being made about children that Henriette was in fact closest to. Her wife asked her at this point “but is it social educator training still forbidden words?”[Henriette:540]. Until then very firmly considering herself an assistant, Henriette warmed to the idea of enrolling as a social educator student, and she decided to apply for the SSPSE, where she would not be much older than her co-students.

Biographical analysis
As is readily apparent from the long resume above, the narrative of Henriette is quite complex, both in composition and narration. The narrative is only very vaguely structured by chronology, and when examining the text, the various political affiliations, positions of work, and her several educational attempts interweave to an extent where it becomes very difficult to point to where she stops talking about her work with for instance the critical psychology workshop, and starts talking about her stint at teacher training. She comments on this herself, saying that she eclectically sampled from the various contexts she was in “this bit’s what’s important to me, that’s why I’ll do that, and it’s be sorta been something like surfing around, and bop! there was something” [Henriette: 387] In short, she considers her politically activities as just as much an education as what she learned
at university or teachers college. And it is in fact not a particularly farfetched thought, that there should be a close affinity between educational capital stemming from the humanities and what I might term left-wing political cultural capital (Bourdieu 1988), yet that association comes about because of the homology between these relatively dominated academic and political positions. This independent and unimpressed approach to becoming educated, however, is contrasted by other aspects of the interview. Throughout her narrative she rarely refers to herself as the one who decided or chose something. Rather she drifts into, got involved in, ended up in, landed in or was urged to - enrolling at the Upper 2nd school, at RU and in the Childcare assistant training is always at the urging of others. It seems all the more remarkable when reading the interviews, since she appears to have no difficulties finding work as a nursery assistant on numerous occasions. Yet these situations are not described as active choices, but more as if Henriette is returning to being an nursery assistant. She is in fact not returning, but rather obtaining similar employment to what she had previous to her educational stints. Perhaps her relation to her social education work is being tainted by the fact that she comes to it each time from a failed attempt at something (an externally biographical event enforcing her drop-out, in her narration), be it universities or teacher training. In a similar way she narrates her extensive political career within the Nursery Assistants Union as if she did not choose or struggle for it, but just somehow ended up on the board of the Union without having done anything herself. Yet the ease with which she repeatedly gains employment, and ascends the union hierarchy indicates that she does possess some capacity that enables her to navigate this field to her own positional advantage. This indicates the effect of social educator capital, and that the assumption of such a form of capital is not without merits. Yet, it also indicates that such capital may in fact not be closely associated with education. I shall return to the point in the next chapter, when discussing educational strategies.

Henriette’s narrative is one where she relates to herself more as an object to forces beyond her control, than a subject making decisions. The events making up her biography are either beyond her control, or just happened without any cause. The most noticeable exceptions to this are her enrollment in secrecy as a students at a Higher Preparatory course, and her decision to act politically after having been to Princeton. But still, her narrative contrasts her actual career in social education with a number of crises, and failures at various educations. At no point does Henriette come to the realization that Signe came to: This is what I am good at, this is what I will do. Her narrative is structured around coming to accept that this is what she should stick to - she does not see herself as having chosen, but rather as being bereft of other options. In terms of capital, Signe’s
cultural capital of care endows her with a pride in her educational investment, whereas Henriette’s social educator capital is closely wound up with the domain of her investment, and her educational aspirations have been related to the educational field. Henriette’s investment in the training is closely related to her work and she hopes becoming a social educator will allow her to improve her position at work, and so this investment must be understood in terms of the domain of social education. In this she closely resembles the SSPSE students interviewed by Ahrenkiel (1998), for whom learning in itself was not particularly important, and who primary invested in the training because of the possible effect on their working-life or home-life.

9.3.3 Dennis

Dennis is a 28 year old man, who has worked mostly in leisure time care facilities. He originally trained as a Social Health Assistant, although he did not complete the apprenticeship associated with this training. The interview with Dennis takes place at KSEM one afternoon. When I made the appointment for the interview, I suggested that it could take place at his home. Dennis seemed hesitant at this suggestion, which is why I then suggested meeting at the NISE. The appointment was made two weeks previously, and I left a message on Dennis answering service, confirming the appointment two days ago. Dennis does not have classes on the day the interview was conducted, but said that it took him no time at all to get here from work. However, when I arrived, I was unable to locate him. I went to the cafeteria and waited for him, but 30 minutes after our appointment I decided to call him. It turned out he has forgotten the interview, and I suggested we make another appointment. He declines, and says he will come right away. When he arrives he excuses profusely, and is both somewhat confused and exhausted, and skipped lunch in order to come. We sit down, chat and have a cup of coffee, before finding a place for the interview. The interview ends up taking place in an open space in a remote corner of KSEM. The interview with Dennis is by far the longest of the biographical interviews, lasting for almost precisely 2 hours. During the interview, my feeling was that the interview were moving slowly, and Dennis was not particularly forthcoming. This was in contrast to his obvious embarrassment at having for-

167 This procedure of me confirming appointments was more or less observed with all interviews, although I was not always able to reach all informants. When informants are delayed, or as is the case here, have forgotten the appointment, the interview interaction between researcher and informant can easily strained to a point where the interview becomes difficult. Compare the situation with Dennis here, to the situation with Anita later on for some examples of this. I found it quite difficult to ameliorate this situation with Dennis, because of his obvious embarrassment, whereas the situation with Anita was much more easily defused, due to her proactivity towards her delay.
gotten the interview, which made him appear very eager to please me initially. As the interview went on, this initial tension dissipates, in particular after Dennis begins expounding on his hobbies. Still my feeling after having conducted the interview was that the interviews was not particularly well-executed on my part, and that it was thin on biographical details. However, when reading the transcript, and discussing the interview with the student assistant who transcribed it, I got a completely different impression. The interview contains a plethora of details and opinions much beyond what I recalled from the interview situation. As my analysis of this interview progressed, it became apparent to me that this divergence relates to the relation between me and Dennis, and specifically the way that I relate him. I recognize him as having a working class social origin, and does so with the gaze of the former social educator teacher. Conversely, Dennis’ embarrassment at having forgotten our appointment and urgency at making it nonetheless, indicates important features of his relation to me. He is, reminiscent of Signe, striving at being a good student, perceiving me in the same mold as he does his teachers at the NISE. Yet, he is doing so from a culturally less dominant position than Signe, which lead me to perceiving his participation in the interview in overly dominant way, recreating the implicit teacher-student relation.

Biographical résumé of Dennis’ narrative
Dennis is 28 at the time of the interview. He grew up living on Amager (an island that is part of central Copenhagen, and has until recently been an unfashionable workers’ neighborhood) and has in fact lived here his whole life. His friends and most of his family still lives here, and so Dennis cannot imagine moving. He grew up living with his parents, and has two sisters, one older and one younger. His father was a driving instructor in Dennis’ childhood, but when this business failed, he became unemployed for some time. He later found employment as handyman at various public companies. Dennis’ mother was a factory-worker for many years, but is currently substituting as a school caretakers assistant. Dennis’ older sister is training as a nurse, and his younger sister has worked her way up to customer relations in a bank. When Dennis was a small child, his mother worked part-time, and his father worked very odd hours, so all three kids were at home. Later on, both his parents had to get full-time jobs, and Dennis and his sister started going to a nursery, and After-school recreation centre. Dennis says he was always very physically active as a child, but was neither into sports nor any other organised leisure activities. He instead spent a lot of time at local building playground, and in the interview, he draws
a direct connection between his times here, and his later vocational choice to work in health and social education.

Dennis was dyslexic, and was not able to read until 5th form. His parents were kept asking his teachers if there were any ways they could help him at home, and even though Dennis’ teachers dismissed this, in the end Dennis claims that he learned to read, write and spell because his parents trained this with him every day from 5th to 9th form. Originally, Dennis was enrolled at a local public municipal school, but after 3rd form moved to a special school. He was here for 2 years and when asked, does not really recall that much about the special school: “I must admit all I recall I that there was a cooking day out there andum so you cooked you didn’t do school but but basically that’s about it[...]I do remember you sat reading or doing maths but (2) it didn’t strike me as a big deal” [Dennis 609-611]. This is the first set of events described in Dennis’ narrative, which until this has mostly evoked his close relation to his family, and the neighborhood where he grew up. The special school was designated to last for two years, and so Dennis began 6th form at a different public municipal school close to his home. He was not completely happy with this place, because he was part of a small group of outsiders, who were bullied for most of his time here. While he stresses that he was not particularly frustrated by being bullied himself, he was very angered at his friends being bullied - something that in part was caused by them being friends with Dennis. He felt that the teachers were not reacting properly to the bullying, and confronted both teachers and the headmaster, which in the end led to the bullies being told off somehow (Dennis does not in fact say much about the bullies). Still, he did not want to switch schools for the fourth time, and so he completed primary school here. This event, and the subjective state of outrage on the behalf of someone else that Dennis relates to it, is a recurring pattern in Dennis’ narration of his educational career.

After completing primary school, Dennis’ originally planned to work as a domestic help for elderly people, and then train as a social health assistant, and work his way up to qualifying as a nurse. And so he started work as a domestic help for some time, and was very fond of the elderly people he was helping, fascinated by their vast experience with e.g. both world wars, and numerous other historical events “… and a lot of them has lived through I dunno how many thousand (. ) things um that, that I won’t ever come near.” [Dennis:489] Although Dennis was happy with the job, he had to leave due to conscription. He did not, however, do regular military service, but was instead a conscientious objector, working in an After-school recreation centre, an event that later turned out to be pivotal in his biography.
He returned to start an apprenticeship as a social health assistant at a hospital, and discovered that he was in fact not very happy working with ill people. He explains that he felt it was not very satisfying to work with people for only 6 months and then see them leave, and not get to know whether they did in fact get better. His decision to leave the apprenticeship came about after a negative apprenticeship evaluation, expressing concerns about his abilities as social/health assistant. This event in turn made Dennis himself question whether this was in fact what he wanted to do, and he had a long conversation with his parents, concluding that perhaps this evaluation hints at something he was already aware of, that this was not the sort of work he wanted to do. In particular, Dennis mentions the lack of time with patients, and the tight management of how much time various task were supposed to take, as reasons he were dissatisfied with this career. This event should be noted for two reasons - first, Dennis again evokes outrage on others’ behalf, and secondly he draws on his family relations in order to handle this biographical event. The external pressure of the negative evaluation was taken back to his family, which he says in turn made him aware of his own dissatisfaction with the working conditions.

He realized that he had in fact been very happy working with the kids at the After-school recreation centre where he had been as a conscientious objector, so he returned there, and this is in fact where he is employed today, having worked there for a little over five years. He lives alone, and “... couldn’t really imagine living together with anyone, to be honest...” [Dennis: 46] because “I thinks it’s nice that you can shut your door and go well (.). Now nobody will come here and so on (.), and you can’t do that if you’re living with someone(2)” [Dennis: 48]. During the interview, Dennis makes no mention of any past or present romantic relationships.

A longer part of the interview concerns Dennis’ work practice. For those three months, Dennis worked at special care housing for children from age 5 to 16, with social problems. This was an urgent temporary housing service, where children were housed for a number of reasons. The examples Dennis gives all concern their parents - arrested parents, parents fighting, parents’ sudden death and others. In the interview I comment that this sounds like a challenging place to work, which Dennis to some extent concedes, but he then says: “...but because you really at first when [you] arrive and the things areum actually passed on in all kinds of papers or by, byum verbal kinda um information it’s not really that bad...” [Dennis 369].

As Dennis continues relating his experiences during his work practice, he explains that he did get very upset about some other facets of the place: the formal regulations of the kids housed there. Again Dennis’ outrage is on the behalf of others, at least in the beginning of this section of the interview. On
several occasions, one girl left for days on end, out of reach of the staff, and yet the only regulatory tool at theirs - and Dennis’ - disposal was to talk to the children:

“and then you, you just have, have to trust in that the talks you had with the kid well that it, they sorta paid off and said no but try to think about it um [...] but in the beginning it was bloody unpleasant to know well (2) this is it right” [Dennis 338-340]

Dennis would have liked to be able to do something more, and what frustrates him even more was the lack of structure and systems in the place. There were apparent rules about when the children’s rooms were to be cleaned, when the children were to wash their clothes, yet apparently none of these rules were really expected to be observed. Dennis describes in details [Dennis 390-472] one episode: some children were playing in the office, where they were not allowed to be. Another employee asks them to leave, and when the children do not do so, Dennis enforces the rule. This results in the other employee telling Dennis off, which completely surprises, and angers Dennis. On one level he is personally angered by being told off for enforcing what his colleague just asked the children, and on another he is frustrated that rules apparently are not rules. And he also points out that the underlying problem is with the staff, who could “...stop sitting in the office, [and] move it out in the common room, so that it would look like a home [...] I can completely see why the kids were drawn to the office (.) that was where everybody else were.” [Dennis 445] Here, Dennis’ frustration stems both from being told off and from outrage on the behalf of the kids who were caught between the contradictory rules and actions by the employees. Dennis is told off in what he interprets as completely similar contradiction between rules and practice, and so his solidarity with the children possibly originates in feeling equally dominated and thus in a homologous position to that of the children. However, one should also note that Dennis’ insistence that rules should be followed and be transparent reiterates the points made in chapter 2 on how unskilled workers in social educational institutions relate to clients on a more positional basis, whereas the social educators relate more personally(Olsen 2007). It is this apparent contradiction - that personal relations cause exemptions from rules - that frustrates Dennis, and at the same time reveals which aspects of the professional ethos he has not yet incorporated. In other words Dennis (having worked at only one social educational institution previously) has little social educator capital, and thus lacks the capacity for habitual adaption in the new setting that is his place of work practice.

The last part of the interview with Dennis is taken up by his assessment of the SPSSE training at KSEM. While Dennis initially expresses general content,
he is quick to point out aspects of the training where he feels his time is being wasted. He finds that the various subjects and tasks does not engage him, if he cannot see what purpose a particular aspect of the training serves. This does not include exams, where he feels that everything has been fair, although he has not done all that well at them. Rather his discontent concerns the more free and practical activities:

“um (.) whereas I sometimes think that they’ve been scraping the bottom and some of the things we’ve done I couldn’t really see why they’ve made time for (.) Like um (.) So you’ve got twelve classes of arts and crafts (1) twelve hours yeah so you’re going [...] to do some art(,) um some self-portraits and that sort of thing where you sit (.) Where I sorta sat and thought well okay that’s really a waste of time [...] I think it’s okay that you have to try something but (2) I can’t see the point and [...] it seems kinda silly to me” [Dennis 723-725]

As a matter of fact, the discussion of the SSPSE training and Dennis’ experience of it, turns into 20 minutes of quite detailed and sincere criticism of what the students are expected to learn, and how the teachers relate to students. Dennis thinks much of what he is being exposed to is too easy, too simple. He gets the experience that it is not meant seriously. This includes the exams, and when on one occasion Dennis confronts his teacher with his experience that this exam is pointless, the teacher completely agrees. But Dennis did find some of the exams both challenging and sensible. This is particularly the case with the Health Studies exam, which was a fifteen-hour-exam. This means fifteen hours after the exam tasks are handed out, the exam paper must be handed in. Dennis says that what he likes about this kind of exam is that the short deadline pushed him further than other exams: ”... it was more satisfying in some way that [I] was forced to work a bit harder”[Dennis 804]

**Biographical analysis**

The narrative of Dennis is characterized between an opposition by the content tone of his childhood, and neighborhood narratives, and the quite conflicted narratives of his work practice, his apprenticeship as a social/health assistant, and his current relation to SSPSE training. The latter three all revolve about Dennis’ frustrations with the formal structures and demands of educational institutions: the rules and relations to the children’s attitude towards adults, rules and authorities in the case of his work practice; the time allocated to each task, in the case of the social/health assistant apprenticeship; and the lack of purposefulness of parts of the SSPSE training. As shown above, Dennis’ frustrations relate to contradictions between *clear positions* and *fluid personal relations*, and
he is outraged by what he perceives as inconsistency and randomness. I should like to emphasize here, that Dennis does not narrate the frustration as an inability to adhere to the formal rules or structures - but rather an inability to discern when and why leniency or strictness is the adequate response. This would seem to be all but a narrative of subjective disintegration - a repeating story of not being able to fit in with the social framework surrounding him. Dennis himself formulates part of this, when he talks about how he has difficulties meeting the demands of the training: 

“I’m just not that (.)good at repressing my own like (1) theories that I’m not good enough at repressing what’s it things (2) my own personality enough to say Okay(,) that isn’t what they want they want this (1) and that’s just something I’ll have to work on” [Dennis 871]

Dennis’ narrative is structured in part by this succession of unsuccessful transformations; he considers himself unable to discern precise how he is expected to adapt to the contexts of respectively the SSPSE, the social health assistant apprenticeship, and the work-practice. His attempts at adaption hinge on taking the formal requirements literal. In the case of the work practice, he assumes that his job is to maintain a specific homely order, just as described by Olsen(2007) and in the case of the SSPSE he requests explicit relations between the actual activities in class, and the professional tasks he will be confronting once training is complete. Drawing upon the work of Elizabeth Hultqvist, as cited in chapter 3, Dennis relates to the training in a way very reminiscent of the pupil in “I think it’s too lax”. Mistaking implicit demands for randomness and absence of demands, Dennis literally cannot make out what is being asked of him here, and so he is searching for explicitation.

There is thus an important class aspect of this, indicating that the repeating story of maladaptation is not just an aspect of the psychology of Dennis, but rather an aspect of his working class-origin, and the cultural contexts he enters into on these three occasions. Dennis’ trajectory and class origin avails him little capital of any sort(patrimonie), and thus he has little capacity for producing opinions recognized as legitimate within the training. This is, unfortunately, also the immediate appraisal I make of him in the interview, possibly making the interview a display of symbolic dominance, rather than a negation thereof. Yet, the above interpretation both reveals this, and perhaps highlights that my usage of the entire interview situation as part of the empirical product allows for an objectification of my own position as researcher within that interview.
9.3.4 Anita

Anita is a 26 year old female student, who has moved to Copenhagen from far northwestern Jutland. She has worked briefly in a nursery school, but mostly in special care facilities, working with physically and psychically disabled. The interview with Anita takes place at KSEM on a Saturday early afternoon. The location was selected by Anita, who rents half an apartment, and felt that using her place for the interview would inconvenience said roommate/landlord. There is no tuition going on at KSEM on the day of the interview, and I arrive at a locked-up building. On my way there, I have received numerous text-messages from Anita, who has been slightly delayed at work. I respond by telling her that she does not need to hurry for my sake. She keeps me updated on when she thinks she get there, and where I should wait for her, since she can only unlock certain doors with her student’s ID. I wait for about half an hour, and as I wait, it starts raining violently. When Anita arrives, I am struck by her appearance, as she is dressed very fashionably, wearing recently applied make-up. She appears to have dressed up very smartly for the interview, and has arrived directly, and speedily from work biking through pouring rain, yet does not look completely drenched. As this interview takes places shortly after the interview with Dennis described above, the way Anita arrives at the interview, and manages her delay contrasts strikingly to how Dennis managed having forgotten the interview. Anita is very much in control of the situation, and is neither embarrassed nor distracted by the delay. This also becomes apparent in the interview, where I am less in charge. In the case of Dennis, my experience of the flow within the interview was that I was the driving force of the interview, and Dennis made himself available but did not himself press any one subject until late in the interview. When conducting the interview with Anita, the conscious need for me to drive the interview on is hardly ever present, replaced by the flow of what feels like a more authentic conversation. My perception of the interview with Dennis was directed by way of an implicit teacher-student relation and appraisal of Dennis as a student, and something similar seems to be the case here, only - as shall be discussed below - Anita performs quite differently as a student.

The interview with Anita takes 1 hour 48 minutes, and at the end, my experience of something similar to a friendly conversation is mirrored by Anita, who thanks me for the opportunity to reflect on her life, and feels that the interview has left her with a lot to think about. While this is by no means an uncommon experience after being interviewed biographically (Wengraf 2001), it still serves to outline how Anita herself experienced - as well as managed - this interview.
Biographical résumé of Anita’s narrative

Anita grew up in a small town in the north-western part of Jutland, in what she terms a working class-family, with medium income level. She has a brother, two years older than her. Her father has always worked much, originally when establishing his own firm, which went bankrupt. This left him with in large debts, and so he has had to work even more to get out of this debt. Anita’s mother was a housewife and did not work when Anita was very young. When Anita was about three or four, she was enrolled at a nursery school, and her mother started working. She went to school in a small village school and was quite happy with this, but when Anita reached 10th form\textsuperscript{168}, it turned out that her school would not be providing 10th form, and she would instead be sent to a different school. Anita still wanted to take 10th form, but decided that if she were to switch schools in any case, she would prefer switching to a continuation school. The continuation school she went to focussed on physical education, which suited Anita quite well. She played badminton through all her childhood, and liked being physically active in general - but equally attractive was the opportunity to move away from her parents, and live on her own. In fact Anita points out that once she started at the continuation school, she did in fact skip a lot of the physical education classes, in particular gymnastics, and stopped playing badminton switching her interest to boys instead.

While living at the continuation school, she did not go home on weekends very often, seldom more than once every month. Anita frequently mentions throughout the interview, that she has never been very close with her parents, and that she has been the black sheep in relation to her family, and in particular to her brother:

\textit{“[I’ve] sorta got used to my parents they exp, yeah they probably expected so much from me things I maybe didn’t really live up to <inaudible> I haven’t exactly been the nice girl (.) I’ve done lots and lots (.) lots of shit <laughs> I was the black sheep [...] a bit rebellious ” [Anita 247]}

When Anita went to continuation school, her rebelliousness resulted in a number of disciplinary measures, ranging from having to go for penalty runs during lunch breaks, to being sent to her room for entire evenings. But her rebelliousness was already very much present when she went to primary school, and her thoughts of rebelling are related to her family life then. That is, she thinks her rebellious acts meant she became a black sheep in her parents eyes, by comparison to her brother. In the following quote she tells of how she felt had to hide a number of things from her parents, but does so in present tense:

\footnote{\textsuperscript{168} Danish 10th form is a voluntary extension of primary school, not required in order to enroll at any secondary education.}
“well, but I’ve always done a lotta you know (.) There’s a lotta stuff they don’t know right (2) they don’t know either that um [...] damn I always wanted to try smoking grass and things like that and that, my parents don’t know anything about that either” [Anita 372]

Anita puts truancy, drinking beer and smoking in the same breath - things she did regularly and that were to be kept hidden from her parents, and which she hesitates to reveal in the interview. Her parents frequently caught and disciplined her, being grounded or banned from using the phone. On one hand, Anita is clearly apologetic and feels she has let her parents down; the entire black-sheep-sequence above springs from a reflection that she disappointed her parents. The continuation school is an important biographical event, but apparently mainly on the intersubjective level, as it allows Anita some distance to her parents. Anita’s relation to her parents comes up again later in the interview, and I will resume this thread at that point in the résumé.

When Anita had finished continuation school “I had this idea that I was in fact going to be a realtor” [Anita 42] and so she chose to go to Higher Business school for her secondary education. While studying for her Higher Business Exam, she started temping as a Domestic Help for the elderly, and realized that she was very happy with that line of work. While studying here, Anita got a boyfriend, and their relationship became very serious, to the point where, according to Anita “everybody was taking about us Anita and Paul, it’ll be one of those (.) They’ll get married and ooh and aah and [...] it was really totally pink” [Anita 477].

And then her boyfriend was killed in an accident. This was very difficult for Anita, who got very angry at her surroundings. Anita felt that neither friends nor parents were able to relate to her, and did not understand what she was going through. Anita lost a number of very close friends during this period. In the end Anita finished her Higher Business Exam, with great difficulties and a less than mediocre result. By then, she had in fact realized that she did not want to be a realtor, but after the loss of her boyfriend she felt that not completing the Higher Business Exam would be a failure. This course of events is surely important, as the loss of her boyfriend impinges on all three biographical levels: subjectively as her expectations and plans for her life must now

169 What now follows is narrated twice during the interview, the second time adding some personally traumatic aspects. I will relate the events in the order Anita relates them occurring, combining the two sub-narratives, but I should expound on how the two narratives differ. In the first version neither the first nor the second boyfriend were mentioned, nor the difficulties that led to Anita leaving the first boyfriend. In short, the first time round Anita narrates her time at the Higher Business School, and her move from the home town as decisions occasioned by her realizing that her jobs aspirations had changed, and the second time round, a much more complex thread of relationships, sorrow, and crisis is interweaved into the first narrative. The dual narration ends after Anita moves back to the town of her parents.
change; Intersubjectively, as her relations to friends and family are affected; and structurally, as her business education suddenly has little value for her. About a year and a half after the death of her boyfriend, Anita got a new boyfriend and moved to another small town in western Jutland. She got a job working with physically and psychically disable persons. But a year after they had moved together in the new town, the new boyfriend began getting jealous of Anita’s relations to the parents of her deceased boyfriend and forbid her to have contact with them, and Anita describes the period that followed as a difficult one, where she came to realize she was living with a manipulative boyfriend, in a town where she did not know many people. Anita was quite distraught by her situation, and a year later left her boyfriend and her job, moving back to the town of her parents. Anita quickly found that moving back frustrated her. She felt she knew everybody in the town, there were no new people, and each day was just like the one before. So Anita decided to move to Copenhagen, and in two week she quit her job and terminated the lease on her apartment, and prepared to move to Copenhagen, although she had no job and no place to live there. Just a week before moving a friend of hers offered that Anita could live with her for a while, and simultaneously she got a job as a nursery assistant at a nursery school in a more well-to-do neighborhood of central Copenhagen. Although subsequent events proved difficult for Anita, her narrative leaves no doubt that this move is a most important subjective biographical event upon which her entire self-understanding hinges. She describes her new place of employment place as a posh and proper place, and she did not fit in very well: “...a very very proper place (.) a very proper place (.) and (1) um (.) Parents who were well off and um (.) I couldn’t bloody do it (.) It it didn’t suit me right (.) not at all” [Anita 47] Having worked there for a short while, Anita went on sick leave, and was crying often for no reason. After three months she felt better, but did not wants to stay in her job. She was let go, and started working with disabled children. She was very happy with this job, and worked there for almost three years. A notable aside: Anita applied for a number of jobs, both when moving to Copenhagen, and when she was let go. She was offered almost all positions she applied for, even when there had been a quite high number of applicants in several cases. About a year later, she contacted a psychotherapist and realized that she had in fact been well on her way to a depression. She found that part of her state of mind related to her deceased boyfriend and took the advice of the psychotherapist, and got back in touch with the parents of her deceased boyfriend.

170 The word used in Danish is [pæn] and literally means nice but also implies something clean, proper and perhaps a bit boring. Anita’s use of the word is slightly derogatory.
Other more complex issues were also part the reason for her contact with the psychotherapist. She describes this as follows:

“... it's a lotta things about (.) my parents and so on um (.) where I grew up (.) and always felt that(,) I didn’t belong there um [...] now I’ve moved and all that (.) I know that I should live here (.) I shouldn’t live in Jutland [...] Yeah and all that stuff with my parents and so on (.) it’s something that’s been worked with afterwards and um one’s gotten hold of them oneself and um my parents has been drinking a lot [...] maybe it’s called dipsomania” [Anita 51]

Talking of her parents later, Anita speaks of her brother: “Well my big brother he’s always done the right things (.) Or not the right things [...] but he’s always (.) He behaved well damn and did what my parents told him” [Anita 360-362]. Anita is both very fond of her brother and quite dependant on him, and her relation to him is the only thing related to Jutland that she speaks fondly of. Anita does not visit her parents much, nor does she want to, but she is happy about visiting her brother. When she does so, they go out together for a night on the town, and she believes that her brother is in fact bothered by not being as wild as Anita has been, and never partying all night as she did and still does. This difference in turn is related to her life in Copenhagen and his in Jutland: “but again I think that’s because well (.) they live in Jutland and there you’ll get kids and a house and stuff you’ll get it early and then you get married, right” [Anita 799]. Anita thus more or less conflates her brother’s establishing of a family, and his proper lifestyle with his living in Jutland - three strands of opposition between her choices and those of her brother. As the quote above shows, this opposition also encapsulates her relation to her parents: her parents’ approval of her brothers choice implies their disapproval of her own.

After moving to Copenhagen, Anita applied to the ordinary social educator training, and was admitted, but on second thought the education grant was not sufficient for her lifestyle, so instead she started saving, while working with the disabled children. And so after almost three years, she applied for the SSPSE at KSEM and was admitted. While living in Copenhagen, Anita has found a number of new friends, through a part-time job a waitress, and has a very active social life, and is part of a large and stable circle of friends. Enrolling at the SSPSE has introduced her to a number of other students whom she now sees regularly as well. Currently Anita rents rooms in an apartment owned by another girl, and is single, which she is very happy with, and explicitly says she currently has no wish to enter a relationship. She also states that one of the things she enjoys about Copenhagen is her anonymity; she is not constantly
meeting people she has known all her life, she is not being recognised, and approached by everyone she meets, something she disliked about living in Jutland.

**Biographical analysis**

Anita’s narrative is very much a before/after-story, the keystone biographical event being her move to Copenhagen. Her move to Copenhagen starts off with a crisis which she only comes to understand later on, but which she relates to a number of things that were difficult for her in Jutland: Family, the death of her boyfriend, her unsupportive friends, her relationship to a manipulative boyfriend. In stark contrast to these experiences in Jutland, she is quite happy with her life in Copenhagen both in relation to her study and her social life. The changes produced by her move permeates all aspects of her life, and the clincher is that her most important outcome of her sessions with the psychotherapist is the realization that “I know that I should live here (.) I shouldn’t live in Jutland” [Anita 51]. The opposition Jutland:Copenhagen comes to encapsulate all the changes Anita desired in her life on all biographical levels, as described above in relation to her brother.

In the Bertauxean terms Anita’s narrative does not consist in a complete rejection of all that was transmitted to her, by her parents. She does both describe and understand herself using the terms of her parents - Black sheep, rebellious, etc. But her acquisition of these terms is tinged with irony, and in the case of her assessment of her relationship to her brother, regret. She comes to describe herself as rebellious as part of the reason why she should not live in Jutland, thus transforming the black sheep-label from stigma to standard. Her move to Copenhagen accomplishes a change of states on all three levels: subjectively she becomes anonymous, inter-subjectively she distances herself from her parents, and more or less all other important persons and friends from her previous life. The structural level is a little more vague, but one could perhaps put it as a change in youth cultural contexts, from a context where urban youth culture, single-life and parties are remarkable, to one where it is not. Svejgaard(2006) stated that the SSPSE serves different educational needs in different regions, and Anita demonstrates, in extremis, what these differences are about. Her age and life history is much more similar to the types of student Svejgaard found predominant in the Copenhagen NISE, and this is where Anita has moved. Similar to Signe, Anita thus differs from the students found in Ahrenkiel(1998) interviews, and both her strategies of everyday life and education are completely unlike those Ahrenkiel found. Becoming a social educator is neither an epiphany nor a coincidence in the case of Anita, but more of a project, initiated at her arrival in Copenhagen. Her working towards qualifying for admission to
the SSPSE thus also becomes a way of entrenching herself in Copenhagen, her choice of immediate employment upon arrival being linked to her educational aims. Anita belongs to the *Straight Ones* class, and thus possesses primarily generalized educational capital. Like Signe, she is at ease in the interview situation, and I perceive her performance in a different manner than that of Dennis, a difference I believe should be explained by the different amounts of educational capital they possess.

### 9.3.5 Jonas

Jonas is a 26 year old male student, who has a two year old daughter. He has worked in several leisure time care facilities, and as a teacher substitute and moved to Copenhagen from J-Town, in the far southern Zealand.

The interview with Jonas takes place at his home in central Copenhagen. Jonas lives with his girlfriend and their two year old daughter in a two-room apartment, very close to KSEM. When I arrive, Jonas has set up in the kitchen, and offers me coffee. We chat for a short while, but Jonas quickly tells me that he has an appointment later on. Assuming that Jonas is slightly anxious about the interview, I suggest we get going, and setup my recording equipment.

The interview lasts for 1 hour and 6 minutes, and during it my sense is generally that Jonas is attempting to please, and tries at several points to second-guess me, by asking it what he tells me is what I want to hear, and if what he says is interesting: “Jonas: did I leave out anything <sighs> (4)”[Jonas 142] In earlier interviews, my strategy in these cases was to simply assert that the informant was indeed making sense, telling me what I was looking for, being interesting, etc. I was not completely happy with the outcome of these confirming assertions: When I re-listened to the recording, to some extent I felt that such assertions made me come across as the opposite: a bland assertion that everything is fine, while not “giving away” my presumed agenda. In order to avoid this situation, I instead adopted the strategy to respond with short, open questions on the topic the informant was on previously. Whether this strategy is successful - in the sense that it meets the informant’s desire to be a good informant is hard to judge, but in the interview it felt like a better solution, although it also increases the amount of control I am exerting over the narration.

The reason this choice of strategy is an issue at all, is that my general feeling throughout the interview is that Jonas is keeping his distance, and that his narration is driven by a sense of duty, rather than the logic of the narrative taking charge. This sense of distance persisted when I reread the transcript. Whether the issue is related to my handling of informants seeking confirmation or not
cannot really be resolved from this interview, but the sense of distance, and the relative shortness of the interview together does raise suspicions that the relation between informant and researcher was slightly uneasy. Drawing upon the interpretation made above of my relations to other informants, and to some of the facts stated by Jonas, other explanations present themselves. Jonas (cf. below) professes to some anxiety at his shortage of educational credentials. As Jonas perceives himself to be both geographically and educationally a fish-out-of-water, being interviewed as to his choices on precisely those topics recasts the interview relation in a unfortunate interrogative mold.

*Biographical résumé of Jonas’ narrative*

Jonas grew up in a rather small town - here called J-town - in the far southern Zealand. His father was a gardener, and his mother was a shop assistant. Until Jonas started school (at 6 years) he was being looked after by his paternal grandmother, who lived just across the street. He describes himself - on several occasions in the interview - as shy; a little shy boy. When I later ask him about the word, he says he was very withdrawn as a kid, and relates about when he was a boy-scout for a short while. He felt extremely exposed, when the scouts sat around and sang, and begged his parents to let him quit. But a friend of his played football, and Jonas joined him in a local club. Jonas was quickly hooked, and started playing when and wherever he was able. His circle of friends grew, at first mostly because his shyness receded, and relations to his classmates improved, but as he started playing tournaments, he got to be friends with kids from other football clubs. As the rest of narrative will reveal, starting to play football became an important biographical event, that transformed his subjective state of shyness and his inter-subjective state of seclusion as he earned friends. Later on also football also affects the structural states of Jonas life, as it turns out to be an important resource in securing employment and training, as it were.

As Jonas got older, he got close to a group of local “troublemakers”), whom he met through skateboarding. Jonas elected to do 10th form, and had a year of partying and having fun but still, he felt he grew a good deal more mature, and at the end of 10th form he decided to enroll at upper 2nd school. The partying life continued, but a year into upper 2nd school Jonas got a girlfriend, who was three years younger than him, and thus still in primary school. His friends disapproved somewhat of the age difference, but Jonas stayed with her, and lives with her still. Around the time where he met his girlfriend, he was getting tired of living with his parents.
“And well my parents and I we didn’t speak the same language right <laughs> it was you know soum (.) So I um, I got an offer fromeh from the club where I where I em coached and played for several years [...] but um I got an offer there from the what’s it youth coach [...] um that he’s a social educator and em he had a county housing for young people um from eh (1) yeah from um (2) it could be young offenders it could be all kinds of street kids and so on and so I got an offer to come over there to live because there there um they had aum aum a what do you call it a supervisor spot (.) They have like two supervisors [working] there”[Jonas 77-79]

Several biographical events and states are intersecting here, Jonas intersubjective strained relation to his parents, coincides with the event of meeting a girlfriend (both subjectively and intersubjectively important) and at the same time he is offered a job and housing in social education. This provides Jonas with incitement and opportunity to transform his situation and massively increasing his independence. So, Jonas moved in to the housing facility for young offenders et. al. - a paid job, but of course he also had to pay rent and so on. He had worked at a gas station since late in primary school, as having to pay rent, he was not much better of, even though he now had a better paid job. However, the job as a supervisor was much more demanding than he had expected - the young offenders often had great social and personal problem, including suicide attempts, and this overwhelmed Jonas. After around 4 months he moved back to his parents - but cites his time here as a very important experience: “but I learned a lot (.) Those were some good months where I got something (.) or at least now I’m able to think of it like that”[Jonas 84] When Jonas completed his upper secondary school leaving examination, he had originally planned to serve in the military, but at the conscription he was exempted by lottery. Still planning to serve, he chose to work for while initially. He got a job in a leisure time care facility, as a maternity cover for 6 months of maternity leave. When this ended, Jonas was without a job, and this frustrated him to no end. He spent a month doing various repairs on the house of his parents-in-law, because he could not stand not having something to do:

“[I was] completely restless I wasn’t doing too good justum hanging out at our place Ium at my parents in law out there at their place they’d gotten a new place (.) I hung out and fixed all kinds of stuff because I just had toum (.) I couldn’t stand at all just being at our place right I goteb restless”[Jonas 91]
But then the leisure time care facility contacted Jonas, and offered him a job as a supporting person for a six year old kid who had possibly been abused and whose case was being unravelled at the time.

“There was this opening as a supporting person for a boy um who had been abused um (.) They thought was incest abused um (.) and itum immediately I just said okay just yes thanks I'll um () take it” [Jonas 93]

Jonas was very thankful for the offer, and was employed in this job for the next year. Like the previous situation, where he was offered the supervisor position in county housing, he does not narrate himself as being active in trying to secure a job, although Jonas clearly was uncomfortable with being out of a job. The offers seem to pop up on their own.

The supporting job was part-time only, so Jonas got a number of other temping jobs, most of which he was directed to by the social educators working at the leisure time care facility. At this time Jonas and his girlfriend was offered to take over Jonas’ sisters apartment in outer Copenhagen. Since Jonas’ girlfriend was only sixteen at the time, it required some convincing before they were able to move to Copenhagen, but in the end they managed. Moving to Copenhagen Jonas did not have a job, so immediately after the move, he drove round the new neighborhood, making his pitch and leaving applications at a number of schools and other likely looking places of employment. Two schools more or less hired him on the spot, so within days of moving to Copenhagen, Jonas had two part-time jobs at two local schools, one being a supporting person for a child with cerebral palsy, and one in a regular leisure time care facility. One should note the similarity between this course of events and the supervisor position Jonas obtained when he was at Upper 2nd school as parallel attempts at attaining independence.

Jonas continued working at these two places for about three years, and then came to think that he ought to start studying something. These thoughts made Jonas apply for both (ordinary) social educator training, and teacher training, although he was very uncertain as to what he should do:

“Because I've, along the way I've always more and more persistently tried to find kinds of education right (.) A lotta my friends and so on right so they've graduated as biologists andum (.) solicitors and so on <laughs> right and I've got nothing you know so you get kinda desperate to find an education in the end right so I've also been thinking, but should I train as an electrician or should I learn something something trade-like because I think it's nice doing that sorta handicraft right but yeah right (1) but but jumping from social education and to that it was kinda yeah mmm

“[Jonas 168-170]
Jonas was not admitted to teacher training college, but was in fact admitted to ordinary social educator training at KSEM. However, even though he had applied for social educator training, Jonas was sure that he “... didn’t want to become a social educator” [Jonas 122]. Instead he was admitted to a vacant space at a teacher training college on the outskirts of Copenhagen. And so Jonas started training as a teacher while working part-time at the leisure time care facility. This was pretty tough going, starting work at 6.30 am, then going on to teachers college, but Jonas did not mind. However after having completed the first year, he began thinking that they needed a bit higher income, and so he began working more hours, and teacher college:

“...and so I began by degrees working and taking longer shifts there as a temp and and it got to be more and more and finally the school sorta faded and the leisure time care facility took over em [...] that I um that I um threw in the towel and said no now I’m quitting it out here ebrm (2) and that’s when I stopped out there and then I came back to my leisure time care facility” [Jonas 126]

While Jonas’ drop-out seems to occur both by degrees as he takes on more work, this biographical event does occur for a reason, namely economy. While Jonas does not mention his girlfriend much in the entire narrative, he does mention that she was pregnant at this point in his narrative. With Jonas living in Copenhagen in a fairly expensive apartment, and both teacher training and having to support his girlfriend and family-in-the-making, Jonas situation at this point is remarkably similar to the SSPSE students interviewed by Ahrenkiel (1998) where massive pressure due to exactly struggling to find time for work, job and family almost defined both their everyday and educational strategies (Cf. Chapter 3)

Jonas went back to the two schools, and worked for a while, and shortly after his daughter was born. They moved to a bigger place, coincidentally right next to KSEM. At this point he heard about the SSPSE, which seemed quite attractive to him. Living in a medium size apartment in Copenhagen with a small child it was not an option to start studying if this meant subsisting on the State Education Grant, but the SSPSE allows for the more generous State Educational Support for Adults, for the first year of studying, and for part-time employment during the second and third year. And so Jonas enrolled in the SSPSE at KSEM.

Biographical analysis
The narrative of Jonas, like that of Anita, has a central plot-point related to moving from the provinces to Copenhagen. Jonas describes the contrast as a matter of pace:

“Well when we moved up here um everything just when you had to get out the door, and out biking and things they were just driving fast, and people just flew by you when you were biking and you got really tired so in the afternoon you had to nip home and have a nap and so on so it just, it, people they, it was just kinda of superficial also as to people and so on right it wasn’t like umm um in J-town when you go to a store you greet people properly and you say good-bye when you, when you leave right and in that way so (. ) And um you say hello to people in the high street”

[Jonas 221]

The slow pace of J-town and the close relations were replaced by the fast pace and anonymity of Copenhagen - a description very similar to that of Anita. But Jonas’ description also tells of his, and in particular his girlfriend’s difficulties in adapting to living in a much larger town, where they knew no-one. Also, Jonas’ narration of the move includes a measure of longing, as he speaks up the familiarity between people in J-town, and the “almost meditative” [Jonas 233] pace of everyday life there. The pace, and the difficulties in adapting to it may also express the stress of making the transition to Copenhagen successful economically, and balancing work, ambitions of education for both Jonas and his girlfriend, and the difficult compromises this entails. In the end, Jonas now points out that he and his girlfriend have shifted to the Copenhagen pace, and mentality - and become frustrated at the pace of his parents, from whom they are now independent:

“well, that pace it’s become part of us (. ) Um you can you can feel it too when you go back [to J-town] you get kinda, a little more restless right alsoum my mother she putters about right like that and okay I’ve got to get going right (. ) Erm and when she’s here visiting if it’s a workday or something like that(.)come now a little faster eh” [Jonas 269]

Whereas the story of Anita’s move to Copenhagen was about finding a place that matched her conception of her self, Jonas’ move is definitely about adapting, and transforming himself to fit in the place he lives. Whereas Anita’s narrative was dramatically structured by before-and-after the pivotal move to Copenhagen, the narrative of Jonas is about a slow and steady transition, from J-town to Copenhagen, from a party-kid in highschool, to a father who needs an education for economic reasons, and whose life once he moves to Copenhagen is not about enjoying the freedom and anonymity of the capital, but about getting a job, and taking care of his girlfriend, and later on his family. Or in Ber-
taux’ terms, Anita’s move is the important biographical event, whereas Jonas’ girlfriend and their establishing a family is the event with most impact on his biography - although he does not narrate this very dramatically. Jonas’ moves because he wants a place to live in, with his girlfriend, and Copenhagen is where the opportunity for that happens to be. Jonas’ trajectory avails him mostly of social educator capital, and he does also belong to the Complex Insiders class. This class-membership he shares with Henriette, and like her, he also dismisses his own ability to obtain employment quickly within the social educational sector. He is not directly aiming at higher education, yet he does seem to compare himself with friends with university degrees, and believes himself to be at a disadvantage. It would seem that both Jonas and Henriette do in fact possess capital that allows for quickly securing position in the domain of social education, yet that this capacity is one they themselves do not consider valuable or important.

Jonas’ then comes to experience some of the quandaries of training, while working and being a parent, and thus he has a lot in common with the older female students found in Ahrenkuel(1998), rather than the young male student type that Sveigaard(2006) found. Sveigaard claimed that the different compositions of student-types at NISE in different regions has to do with differing needs for education - and Jonas here shows that this is a simplified picture, since his needs and difficulties are in fact very similar to those of other student types, than to the ones he demographically(male, young, upper 2nd exam) would seem to represent.

9.3.6 Anna Louise

Anna Louise is a 49 year old mother of six, and has worked as a daycare minder as well as in nursery school and an outdoor nursery school. The interview with her takes place at JSEM, some time after my fieldwork there was concluded. She has chosen the day, and as the students at JSEM are involved in some fairly extensive group projects at the time, she wanted us to meet at JSEM, where she is most days, working with her project group.

I arrive at the library, where I have booked a small group study room; Anna Louise lives far away from public transportation, which is why the interview is set at the NISE. Anna Louise has sent me a text message, informing me that she is on her way, and meanwhile I set up the recording equipment, some bottles of water, etc. On her arrival she is quite talkative, and in particular comments on the fact that I have come all the way over here (that is, to Jutland), just for interviewing her. She also tells me that her youngest child was ill the day before,
and that she was very worried about possibly having to cancel the interview, if he did not get better, as her husband is hardly ever able to stay at home with sick kids. But her child got better, and she was able to come. She also asks me if it would be alright for her to leave her mobile phone on, so that said child can reach her, which I of course agree to. I am left with a forceful impression of how much being a mother impinges on training to be a social educator, in her case - and her reference to her husband hardly ever being able to take care of their children in emergencies also strike a note, that persist throughout the interview.

I also note how much importance she ascribes to this interview, since she has apparently been quite worried at the prospect of possibly having to cancel. This interview thus contains a relation of dominance, here both organized around both on the danger of having to let down a researcher (teacher) and a visitor from Copenhagen.

After some small talk about how busy the SSPSE students in general are, I suggest that we get started, and so we do. During the interview, Anna Louise is very talkative, but also quite thoughtful at times. During the group interview, which took place previously, she was suddenly overcome with emotions, at recalling her oldest son’s car accident, which almost killed him. Possibly this experience makes a her bit uncomfortable in the interview setting, and when she gets to the car accident in her narrative, she does skip the entire episode, referring to the previous interview.

However, in general the feel and tone of the interview is very laid back, and informal throughout. Anna Louise is given to pondering, and so her answers to questions often move far afield. This provides a number of interesting cross-references between themes of the interview - for instance she on numerous occasions switches back and forth between talking of her own children, the children she is working with at the time, and her own childhood. Her narrative does not stay chronological for long, in contrast to all but Henriette’s narrative. She points out herself that she cannot keep track of the dates of the various events, and this is reflected in the summary below, where the age of her children for instance is more or less absent for most of the narrative. In neither the actual interview nor when rereading the transcription am I left with the senses of dominance as was described in earlier interviews. This does not mean that no such dominance exists, but rather that the way it permeates the interviews is more subtle. It does so, as noted above not by an implicit teacher-student-relation, but rather by Anna-Louise’s perception of her own diminished status in terms of geography and in terms of motherhood impinging on her availability as interview-subject. These may be understood as more general structural rela-
tions of dominance than the more contextual structure dominance the implicit teacher-student relation implies. This ties in with the overall narrative of Anna Louise, as we shall see, where the student position is understood as a different sort of investment than one related to future employment.

**Biographical Résumé of Anna Louise’s narrative**

Anna Louise grew up around Aalborg, the largest town in the northern Jutland. She lived in the central part of town for the first three years of her life. Then the family moved to one of the first high-rise units built in Aalborg, as her father got a job as caretaker of the building. When Anna Louise was about five years old, her father got a job as janitor at a local teachers college, and the family moved again, this time to housing in association with the teachers college. Here the family lived for many years, in fact until Anna Louise left home, and consequently the close association with the teachers college became an important part of her upbringing, and thus also a place she returns to several times through her narrative. Numerous important biographical events and states in Anna Louise’s narrative refer to her relation to this place, the people and the cultural opportunities there.

The teacher’s college was both where Anna Louise learned to play the recorder, and later on took part in amateur ensemble lessons there. She also went to primary school there, in a practice school where the teachers’ college students taught, which meant she was exposed to numerous experiments and newfangled stuff like working with punch cards on computers, and group projects. Before going to this practice school, Anna Louise went to musical nursery school, where her preschool-teacher played various classical works for the children, and taught her how to read music and play the recorder. Anna Louise continues through primary school, and continued through the first two years of lower secondary school, then switched to Upper 2nd school. At that time she was also into horseback-riding, and was considering to become a veterinarian, and so she chose the mathematical-scientific line in upper 2nd school. But as she realized that veterinary training took place in Copenhagen and was a fairly long university education, she changed her mind. Right after getting her Upper

171 Anna Louise does not specify exactly what kind of housing this is, and I never got round to asking.
172 Lower secondary school (“Realskole”). The incarnation - there have been several - of the “Realskole” which Anna Louise refers to was a transitional three-year school introduced in 1958. After 7th form, one could either stay in primary school, and complete 8th and 9th form for a Primary school leaving certificate, or one could switch to the lower secondary school - “Realskole”. While this led to an examination in itself - the “Realesamen” - the lower secondary school was also the main gateway to the Upper Secondary School. One could move from “Realskole” to Upper Secondary school after two (known as “II Real”) or three years (“III Real”) in the “Realskole”. This system was abolished in 1975, and replaced by 9 years of compulsory schooling, one optional year (10th form) and the set of vocational or preparatory secondary schools.
Secondary School Leaving examination, she went to the academy of physical education, since by now gymnastics had taken the place of horseback-riding as her leisure activity of choice. She also trained as a leader at the academy. When Anna Louise returned from her stay at the academy, she got a job as a nursery assistant. She was very fond of this job, “and [my colleges] were happy to have me there too. so that they definitely thought that I should to study to become a social educator” [Anna Louise 72] It is notable that while Anna Louise does not ascribe this event much significance, she has in fact been massively exposed to social educational environments, both here and at the teachers college.

Anna Louise was still attracted to biology and chemistry, and chose to train as a medical laboratory assistant. She got an apprenticeship at a hospital, and moved to a smaller town in Jutland for the three years she was apprenticed for. But just before she completed her training, she gave birth to her first child, and took 2 months of maternity leave. Anna Louise got work substituting at the hospital, but then her husband\textsuperscript{173} got a job in a different town in Jutland, and so they moved again. Here, Anna Louise had her second child, and afterwards she applied to the local hospital for work as a medical laboratory assistant. She succeeded and initially she got a job as a chemistry laboratory assistant, but shortly after there was an opening in the microbiology department of the hospital:

“and I though that sounded really really exciting (.) that with germs and (.) all that (.) It was something completely else from running around taking blood samples <inaudible> so I applied for that and I got it too” [Anna Louise 85-87]

Anna Louise was very happy with this job, and took some courses in relation to the job, but then, a new doctor was hired to be head of the microbiology department:

“But she wasn’t (.) particularly (.) I was only part (.) I was part-time employed at that time (.) and that was great when you had kids and so on (.) because we had weekend shifts too (.) Um but then she wasn’t that happy about that (.) so she was allowed to (.) actually (.) well I don’t know really (.) they called it restructuring (1) so all the part-timers (.) they were you know laid off and if they wanted to get re-hired they had to (.) then it had to be full time (.) and since I then was about to have a third child (.) I just didn’t have any interest in that (.) So I had to drop it (2) um yeah (3) yes and then I was staying at home (.) of course for a time there (.) um (1) and um (.) yes and then I just went and got pregnant again (.) with the fourth child <laughs>” [Anna Louise 87-93]

\textsuperscript{173} Anna Louise has not made any mention of her husband previous to this point in the interview.
Anna Louise faced that she would most likely be staying at home for some years to come, and decided to apply to become a daycarer. I should like to draw attention to the indirect depiction of how Anna Louise and her husband have organized their family life. It would seem that extending the demands on the family life imposed by Anna Louise’s education or work are consistently preempted by her husband’s self-employment career.

Unfortunately there were no positions as daycarer available in her municipality at the time, but next door to where she lived there was a small farm, which functioned as a nursery school and After-school recreation centre, and for the next six months Anna Louise worked here. But after six months, the municipality contacted her, and asked if she was still interested in becoming a daycarer: “they would like to hire me as a daycarer if I was still interested (.) and that I was (.) Because when you’ve got four kids right (.) it would be really nice anyway to be at home (.) so I agreed to that (.) And I was a daycarer for six years (2) where I then during those six years (.) I managed to have two more kids <laughs> so yeah” [Anna Louise 119-123]

So the structural biographical event of becoming unemployed is what initially drove Anna Louise’s attentions towards social education again. But as she refers to the difficulties of having four kids above, managing her family life also provide incitement towards working at home. During the years she was a daycarer, Anna Louise first took some social educational courses at a Rudolf Steiner facility, and later on she to some evening classes in business accountancy. This latter was occasioned by her husbands desire to get his own business. After six years of working as a daycarer, Anna Louise’s husband started up a car dealership, realizing a long-held dream of his. This intersubjective biographical event had numerous implications - the entire family moved to a house which could contain both family and dealership, and Anna Louise started working in the office of the car dealership, as an accounts assistant, which she did for several years. Anna Louise was thus able to continue working at home, maintaining the balance between letting her husband realize his dream of becoming self-employed, and taking care of her children. I believe it important to note the basically patriarchal family structure of Anna Louise’s family life. Anna Louise abandons her job, cannot switch to full-time employment, moves, and, of course, were unsure if she would be able to participate in the interview - all these areas of her life she narrates herself as subordinate to her husband’s employment. She is neither embarrassed nor frustrated by this, as she narrates these events, yet they are an important factor in understanding her trajectory, and what events shape it.

It was at this point, that her oldest son was in a car accident, where he suffered severe head injuries, and permanent brain damage. As previously mentioned,
Anna Louise mostly skirts talking about that event. She arrives at it, by telling that she had to quit working in the car dealership, because she could not handle seeing damaged cars coming in for repairs. She then goes on to tell that the municipality agreed to grant her paid leave to take care of her son, while he recuperated and during his rehabilitation.

Anna Louise still did not want to return to the car dealership:

“I didn’t want to go back again (.). to that (.). um (.). so I (1) well it had to be something with life again and it was well just something with children <laughs>” [Anna Louise 147-149]

And so the dramatic event of her son’s car crash brings Anna Louise back to social education. Close to her home was a large integrated house, with both nursery, nursery school, leisure time care facility, and a small group of children with autism spectrum disorders. Anna Louise got involved in efforts to launch a small outdoor nursery school group, which she was very happy to join, as she wanted to work with fewer kids, and be outside. From this, Anna Louise segues into telling that all her children has always gone to independent schools, and at the independent school where they were enrolled at the time there turned out to be an opening for at part time nursery assistant, in an newly launched outdoor group. Such part-time employment suited Anna Louise perfectly, since they had now moved out to the country, and was living at a small farm, with some fields, Icelandic horses, sheep, goats and “all those [animals] you know you get when you move into the country” [Anna Louise 167] so she accepted, and this is job she is currently holding. Through the last few years, she has applied for a number of courses, but none have had sufficient enrolled to run. So, at a recent staff appraisal, her boss suggested that she train as a social educator. He helped her apply to the board of the independent school, and she was granted educational leave, after which she enrolled at JSEM.

She is quite happy with the training, because it reinforces her in what she has been doing, when working with children previously, and it empowers her when having to defend her work:

“All these theory people and those things (.). that I kinda get here (.). and what’s the background exactly right (.).and that about seeing it in a historical perspective and so on (.). actually I think that’s nice taking along (2) [...] I mean you’re facing parents who ask about (1) well everything right (.). And so I think it’s nice after all to have (1) be a little more professional (.). When you’ve to answer and so on (.). that it’s not just something (.). I think and I guess and that sorta right <inaudible> ‘cause a lotta the things and exercises and stuff (.). It’s (.). [...] what you’ve done for a lotta years right’” [Anna Louise 201-211]
At this point Anna Louise segues into pondering how much the SSPSE training does in fact change her social educational work. These ponderings take leave from her consideration that she is happy to be enrolled in the SSPSE, where all students have worked with children previously. At the very end of the interview she returns to this, saying that she would not want to do the ordinary social educator training, because she would not want to be in the NISE setting for that long. The point being, that she thinks there is not really that much for her to learn:

“I mean when you’ve worked with kids for so many years (.) Then there’s no things well of course you can have some things stirred up and it’s nice to be able to discuss (.) And you see new angles and (.) That sort of things right (1) but you’re bringing a lot of stuff with you (2) and obviously there’s twenty years of difference [to ordinary students] <laughs>
Me: <laughs>(.) Yes (.) But you’re bringing a lot of stuff with you (1) you said
Anna Louise: yeah but I think if you have six kids and you’ve been a daycarer and you’ve worked in different institutions with different kinds of kids right” [Anna Louise 215-220]

Here Anna Louise explicates her relation to the education, and to the profession, as closely bound up with her family life and trajectory, and this combination in fact make up the central structure of her narrative. Her career veered into social education because of her family life, and she returns to social educational work after her son’s accident. Social education can in some ways be seen to be an extension of Anna Louise’s family life, rather than a career in itself, and so Anna Louise is very similar to the interviewees of AhrenkIEL(1998). The SSPSE training serves a purpose in relation to her position at work, but not that much in relation to her proficiency at this work. She knows what social educational work is, and how to practice it, by virtue of her long and wide range portfolio of experiences with children. Her age, her long exposure to work with children and being a mother of six; to her this means she knows most of what there is to know, and consequently, that social educational practice is regulated by the kind of knowledge one can accumulate by interacting with children. The intertwining of her own family, and her social educational work experience throughout the narrative is the main way the narrative structure is visible. And this of course indicates to us what the complex trajectory and social educator capital associated with it consists in: an embodied cultural familiarity and confidence within the domain of social education, sedimented by an exposure to numerous different setting of social educational work, with a more or less common ethos and nomos. If we are to rely on the case of Anna Louise, and contrasts it to
Signe, the difference between social educator capital, and cultural capital of care is the close association of the latter with an academic-educational ethos, inherent from the nursing profession’s attention to procedure and knowledge. This was visible in Signe’s narrative from her strong disapproval of the students and teachers who failed to invest themselves sufficiently in the training.

At the very end of the interview Anna Louise turns quite pensive about her enrollment, and explains that if she had been fifty, she would not have enrolled: “cause then I would be going on fifty you know, and then I would think fifty (.) That was kinda where I drew the line at starting [...] but no I don’t know why (.) but I’m also thinking well (.) oh I don’t know (.) then maybe I would have thought (.) no I would have been half a century late (.) if I were to train I should have done it a long time ago “ [Anna Louise 1343-1345] Anna Louise feels she is closing in on the ceiling of the age range in which one can feasibly, or sensibly, train as a social educator. This underscores that she does not consider the most important aspect of the training to be learning new elements of social educational practice, and her decisions and vacillation recalls the age segmentation of Bryderup(2000) in the study on unskilled labour in social educational institutions. There is a point where these unskilled workers no longer deem training feasible - but in Bryderup’s study, this points was in the mid thirties. Anna Louise’s choice to study although she is closing in on fifty indicates how the SSPSE is able to recruit students spanning a greater age interval. Anna Louise also hints at what allows the SSPSE to do this - the separation from ordinary younger and inexperienced students. As Svejgaard and Ahrenkiel found, the very fact that the SSPSE students are admitted is taken as a validation and acknowledgement of the very relevant and quality of this experience. Possibly this experience hinges on the fact that the SSPSE is a separate and special programme - but it also adds important points to our understanding of social educator capital: As Henriette’s and Jonas’ narratives showed, capacity tied up intimately with the domain may be invisible to the agent him- or herself. In the case of Anna Louise, this was not the case, possibly because of her former career and education in an entirely different field. Henriette and Jonas have no such former educational validation on which to rely. But there is also a more complex and profound relationship between what she considers important to social educational work, and her family history: What she believes children needs from social educators is the kind of cultural socialization, she herself was subjected to. I shall explore this in some detail in the following:

Anna Louise mentions, in direct continuation of the quote above, that she also teaches children in her local church, and as I inquire how she came to do that, she talks about her interest for Rudolf Steiner’s theories, her interest for
spiritual aspects of social education, her interest in music, and how all of this relates to the need for social education to embed national culture somehow. These considerations are quite dissimilar anything said by the rests of the informants, which in itself is quite interesting. Anna Louise makes a number of rather explicit points about what it is she wishes to provide for the children she is working with. I have chosen three longer quotes on this topic, in order to examine the relation between what she wants to provide the children with, and the spiritual and musical areas of her life.

The first quote is about how she relates to art and culture herself. In the end of the interview, Anna Louise returns to her father and the teacher’s college which was a great part of her childhood. Anna Louise’s father often helped artists setting up exhibitions at the college, and in return he was often given some of their paintings as presents, and these paintings are a fond memory of Anna Louise’s:

“You know art in many different forms (...) it’s been part of my upbringing [...] and it’s something I’ve tried to pass on (...) because I think it’s been good for me to go and look at all these pictures and (...) well could they imagine (...) what could you (...) yes I’ve often sat looking at a painting like that <inaudible> (...) imagining stuff in it [...] well really I do that (...) a lot to this day right (...) and that’s actually something you’ve brought with you” [Anna Louise 1010-1014]

This quite eloquently put connection between imagination and art as part of her upbringing is a connection she wants to pass on to both her own children, and the children she works with. In Bertaux’ terms, Anna Louise expresses the importance of some almost purely subjective biographical events and states, which she wants to re-enact for the children.

Apart from the capacity of imagination, there also an element of finding yourself in this connection, quite overt in the following quote, where she relates cultural legacy, in casu Danish songs, to cultural identity:

“I think it’s important that they learn this stuff (...) because it’s our um our cultural legacy right (1) and that (...) that you’ve like got a point of view and can say well but (...) it’s (...) it’s Danish singing these songs right um (1) [...] not because (...) I don’t think that, it’s not about, that [Danish] is better than others right (...) But it’s good if you can say sort of (...) I’ve got this, right (...) it’s Danish and I want to take it with me” [Anna Louise 340-342]

Another particularly interesting point is her pride and joy at her son, who despite suffering from permanent brain damage, has been admitted to The Academy of Music playing classical guitar. His recuperation leading to this sort of cultural endeavour is particularly gratifying to her, reiterating the spiritual importance placed by Anna Louise on music.
To Anna Louise, helping children getting a grip on what being Danish means is a prime concern, and culture is a way of doing so. It serves as an antidote to an instability of sorts, as she explains in this final quote, relating to democracy as part of everyday life:

“This thing about people sometimes vacillating (.) and don’t know really who (.) what’s Danish mean and so on (.) what is it really all that (.) Danish democracy and (.) and so on right [...] it’s a bit wobbly and (.) if they carried it with them from childhood (.) well but it’s (.) this is how we do it here (.) and it’s democracy too this getting together and they (.) [...] um (.) now one has the floor and another one has the floor and that kind of (.) well but they learn it (.) like all naturally (.) as part of the daily grind (1) I think that’s good” [Anna Louise 349-353]

In all, Anna Louise is sketching out a cultural curriculum here, outlining a purpose of her social educational practice. That purpose being to prepare or equip children for resolving the ambiguities of modern life, by providing them with a firm cultural footing. Anna Louise explicates this purpose by way of her own experiences: what her father in particular passed on to her, and how she tries to provide similar experiences for her own children, and those she works with. In a later part of the interview, she expounds on how she and her husband are hopefully providing their children with “a good example” [Anna Louise 1235-1237]. This cultural curriculum also hints at a wider cultural upbringing, and thus a more extensive inheritance of cultural capital - and while it is too intangible for specific analysis, it may also provide an explanation of Anna Louise’s capacity for feeling at ease with the training, unlike Jonas and Henriette.

**Biographical analysis**

Summing up the narrative of Anna Louise, the narrative is structured by the intertwining of intersubjective biographical events relating to her family and social educational experience. These strands of her narrative are synchronous, when she switches between concurrent relations to her own children, and to the children she is working with, and diachronically, when she embeds the events of her own upbringing in the ideals she has for her work as a social educator. She professes very small expectations for the theoretical prompting of the SSPSE training to change her social educational practice. This conception of the training fits very well with her considerations about not wanting to train if she were any older than she is, and not wanting to be part of the social educator training context for too long; the unspoken premise perhaps being that she does not desire to transform herself in accordance with the professional training. The SSPSE possibly does not require that of her, whereas she presumes that this
would be the case were she to enroll in the ordinary social educator training. Anna Louise exemplifies a position related to the one expressed by the informants in Ahrenkiel (1998) but also refines it, by relating to her work by cultural and spiritual dimensions, which goes beyond the each-thing-in-its-place everyday strategies Ahrenkiel noted, and in fact appears to integrate the dimension’s of her everyday life: her training, her work, her family and her cultural interests all connect and relate to each other. Yet, this integration structurally recapitulates the fundamental patriarchal structures of her family life. Her training and the way the training affects her work, is contingent upon her family and her children - a responsibility which primarily belongs to her. The investment that Anna Louise makes when enrolling at the SSPSE thus appears a bit whimsical, being neither subjectively, intersubjectively or structurally necessary. It appears that she herself does not perceive it to be an investment - it comes about randomly, at the behest of her employer, and she doubts both if she would have done it later, or if she will have any use of it. This is testament to the fact that her trajectory in fact has endowed her with social educator capital, in that she - and here she resembles Henriette and Jonas - is not aware of the fact that this opportunity does not present itself at random, good luck striking - but is rather the effect of the work she has done over time, embedding herself in the domain of social education.

9.4 Trajectories, Classes and Biographies

In the previous chapter, I constructed a space of SSPSE trajectories, by way of which it was possible to relate the individuals to each other along axes, and by class membership. In the previous chapter, tables 8.1 and 8.2 recap the positions of the six biographical informants in the space of trajectories, and the classes they belong to. It is important to remember that whether one aspect of an axis or the other describes an informant is a very loose relationship, and one can only use the aspects to describe general relative differences between groups of individuals; saying that Anita is located in the outsider aspect of axis one does not equate saying that Anita possesses an outsider trajectory - rather it relates her position to the other trajectories in the space. The classes are a more precise description for each specific informant. In this concluding section on the biographies, I will compare axial relations and class membership to the narrative structures discussed above - the axial discussion serves mostly to explore the concepts of capital developed in the
geometric data analysis, and whether they turn out to be more substantial when explored qualitatively. In the subsequent chapter, I will specifically discuss the educational strategies employed by the informants, and for that reason I defer any discussion of education for now. Thus the discussion here concerns mostly how the narratives can shed light on the axes and classes.

9.4.1 Insider and Outsider Trajectories

As I discussed in chapter 8, there are no real representatives of the outsider-aspect on this first axis of the space of trajectories. Although Anita in principle is closer to the outsider aspect that to the insider aspect, this is caused by a technicality of the analysis. The other five interviewees are all located closest to the Insider-aspect. And while Anna Louise is classified as an outsider, her trajectory is just as much related to the complex aspects of the third axis. It is thus a little difficult to explore this axis by way of the biographies, since one half of the opposition is lacking. I will however, present one plausible avenue of interpretation. Several sources - Ahrenkiel (1998) and also Andersen & Weber (2009) underscore that social education is a form of wage labour, and that the professions need to recall this perspective as well as the academic and caring perspectives. Yet none of my biographical informants are referring to social education as wage labour - as a job that starts and ends by daily schedule, a job that impose stresses and demands on the worker, a job that can be forgotten about once you are off the clock, that pays the same no matter how it is done, and so on. These facts are all in opposition to the caring ethos of the charitable mother substitute. I believe, that one of the likely effects of being an Insider is that one already has incorporated such an ethos. Dennis evokes it, when he drops out of his social-health assistant apprenticeship, and states that this is because of the lack of time spent with the patients. (Cf above). All of my informants have spent some time working in various caring positions, and the interviews contain hardly any considerations of the social educational work from the wage labour perspective of the worker. This would then seems to be an outlook upon the field -and ethos - that we may associate with insider trajectories, and thus with cultural capital of care.

The SSPSE students whose trajectory takes them from vocational training or work into social education might well have a different perspective - at least in part associated with wage labour. For now, I will just state as a hypothesis, that

Anita’s secondary training is Higher Business Exam, which is put as a passive category in the specific multiple correspondence analysis. This means she is placed in opposition to students with Upper 2nd and Higher preparatory exam, but also in opposition to Insider-careers and so she ends up in slightly in the Outsider-region. In the class-analysis, she is assigned to the Straight Ones class, indicating that her trajectory has more in common with these trajectories than those found in the Outsider class.
the Outsider and Insider trajectories may be homologous to wage labour versus caring ethos, as none of my empirical data allow me to explore this notion any further.

9.4.2 Direct and Indirect Trajectories

The Direct aspect of the second axis is represented by Jonas and Henriette, whereas the Indirect aspect is represented by Signe, Anita, Dennis and Anna Louise. These latter four all have Previous Careers outside of social education: Signe trained as a Nurse, Anita worked as a domestic helper for the elderly, Dennis trained as a social health assistant, and Anna Louise trained and worked part-time as a Laboratory assistant. Both Jonas and Henriette has worked within social educational institutions, or fields of work very similar. Jonas has a Previous career as teacher having both gone to teacher college and worked as a teacher substitute. They also share another point - they have both explicitly rejected the idea that they should become social educators. This can best be understood by referring back to some of the findings of Ahrenkiel (1998). Both Jonas and Henriette narrate how they ended up working in social educational institutions as a solution to a problem. Jonas needed to make money in order to move away from his parents and live with his girlfriend, and Henriette returned to social educational work as a kind of rebound after she dropped out from three different educations. In short, they harboured other dreams, educational or otherwise, and like Ahrenkiel’s informants, these dreams were abandoned. To them, the suggesting of becoming a social educator translated as staying where they were, and relinquishing their ambitions. This also affects their perspective on the training and its intrinsic value - taking the SSPSE is a way of sustaining their position at work, not realizing a dream. This may appear to be at odds with the previously suggested association between the direct aspect and generalized educational capital. Yet in fact the narratives of Jonas and Henriette are the only ones characterized by a sense of lost opportunities - and both of them specifically refers to university education. By doing so, they also reveal

\[176\] In fact, Signe has also vehemently rejected such a suggestion by her father[Signe 420]. This suggestion was made just after her break-up with the boyfriend she bought a house with, and her dropping out from nurse training. It thus also comes to mean abandoning and relinquishing ambitions and hopes due to difficult private circumstances. Unlike Jonas and Henriette, Signe has not at that point worked much in social education, and as she starts working she comes herself to realize that she is very fond of this kind of work. Enrolling at the NISE thus becomes a new vehicle for Signes ambitions - and at the same time she manages to complete her training as a nurse. In other words, her relations to becoming a social educator changes of her own volition, and she in fact realizes much of her other original ambitions. Neither is the case with Jonas, and Henriette, who accept social educator training as a solution to private or workplace difficulties, not as a career plan. These sorts of transitions are what the following chapter on educational strategies is concerned with - the difference between expectations and realizations.
that such aspirations are or were a part of their horizon of expectations, and that indicates at least the presumption of educational capital.

In stark contrast to this, Signe more or less experience an epiphany when she began working in a social educational institution, and decided that this was where she should work, and thus she should train as a social educator. Her educational capital and inherited educational dreams none withstanding, she is able to transfer these into the domain of social education, without suffering from lowering her ambitions.

Similarly, Anna Louise chose to return to working with children after her son's car accident, and her trajectory is circumscribed by her husband career, and thus she does not hesitate in relinquishing educational opportunities. Dennis chose to return to the leisure time care facility after losing faith in the social health assistant training. Anita does not go into that much detail, but as she applied to social educator training straight after moving to Copenhagen, and only postponed enrolling in order to save up for the SSPSE, social educator training appear to be something Anita did in fact aim for. These contrasts can be thus summed up by saying that there appears to be a homologous relationship between Direct and Indirect trajectories, and students enrolling by necessity or by dedicated choice.

9.4.3 Complex and Simple Trajectories

The Complex trajectories aspect of the third axis is represented by Anita, Henriette and Anna Louise, and the Simple trajectories are represented by Signe, Jonas and Dennis. The immediate difference between the two groups is their age: with the exception of Anita, the oldest informants are at the complex aspect, and the youngest are at the simple. I believe this exception is an expression of Anita's education - Higher Business Exam. Only very few students admitted to SSPSE possess that particular secondary exam, and so Anita is close to the other trajectories involving unusual educational background: those that are exempt from educational admission requirements. That the older informants have more complex trajectories makes sense, as their narratives are long, involve numerous jobs and changes. They are also the two interviews where I lost track of the biography along the way. This does qualify what should be understood by complexity: that it is the actual number of components, that make a trajectory complex, not how circuitous or unusual it is. I have returned several times to the ease with which Henriette, Jonas and Anna Louise obtain and sustain a position within social education, and their lack of attention in their narration, of this

\[\text{177 I should note here that Jonas is classified as a Complex Insider, and thus he will is taken in the following to represent the Complex.}\]
fact. I have associated this with the social educator capital. This form of capital is the least visible as capital to the agents of the domain of social education, yet their narratives allow us to discern it as effective, and as distinctive, when comparing with the difficulties of Dennis, at perceiving how to act in both the domain of social education, and the domain of social educator training.

9.4.4 Economic Capital

One factor which the geometric data analysis does not provide any access to, yet which permeates the narratives is the absence of economic capital, and the necessities this imposes upon the students. The relative deprivation of economic capital is visible as the need to enroll at the SSPSE because of the better students grant possibilities offered here (Signe, Anita), as the need to maintain a standard of living dictated by a family, and a studying wife (Jonas), as the need to obtain other sources of income than the National students grant - which may have been used up (Henriette), as an absence of economic heritage in any form (Dennis), or as the economic constraints enforced by one parent of the family needing to provide income, and the other becoming reliant or subordinate to that (Anna Louise, Jonas). In short, a massive factor in enrolling at the SSPSE, and more or less the only completely common factor mentioned by all interviewees, is a relative economic deprivation, and the constraints this implies. This is an important finding in itself, because it must be seen as a component of most - if not all - students’ choice of the SSPSE. What impact does this have on the general educational strategies of the students? To what extent are their entire horizon of possibilities delimited by this? My study has not collected data that enable any serious examination of this, as both family, social origin and economic indicators would be necessary, even if there are few immediate indications of distinctive differences. The reversed role assignment of Jonas, who needs to provide for his family, and Anna Louise, who is being provided for by her husband, at the cost of constraints on the range of her ambitions indicates one way of examining this area. Perhaps we are here seeing one socially distinctive effect of gender as well: Gender is intertwined with economic capital acquisition strategies. Yet these questions go beyond the scope of this study. What must be noted is that the SSPSE functions as a fast-track opportunity for transversal social mobility.
9.4.5 Classes

The informants are quite well distributed over the five classes (as shown in table 8.2) and I will briefly discuss here what specific aspects of their trajectories cause them to be assigned to which classes. Unlike the associations with various aspects of each of the three axes, class membership is an unequivocal description of the individual agent.

Anita, whose rare educational background causes her to be associated with both the Outsider aspect of the first axis, and the complex aspect of the third axis, in fact belongs to the Straight Ones-class. This makes perfect sense, when examining her narration, as she is the youngest informant, and decided upon her move to Copenhagen to train as a social educator, and took three years saving up for it. Conversely, Anna Louise belongs to the Outsider-class, and as she has in fact worked for a long time as a Laboratory assistant, this association fits quite well with her narrative. Signe and Dennis comes to belong to the classes matching their educational background: Signe has trained as a nurse, and belongs to the Nurses etc Class, and similarly Dennis belongs to the Social-Health-class. Finally, Jonas and Henriette both belong to the Complex-Insiders-class. Henriette has worked in numerous different contexts social educational contexts, has completed the Care Assistant training, and as mentioned above has a fairly long career within social education behind her, and so the class describes her trajectory quite well. Jonas is perhaps a less obvious candidate for this class. But his social educational career actually consists of work at several different schools, as both teacher substitute, supporting person, and tradition after school leisure facility assistant, as well as his first social education job, as a live-in supervisor in a housing project for troubled young persons. He only held many of these positions for short periods of time, but in total, his career does have a very high number of components from many different part of social educational work.

In chapter 7, I raised the issue of the possible redundancy of the class analysis, as it mainly recapitulates what the axial decomposition of the space of SSPSE trajectories has already shown. The above discussions of axes and class show the resounding difference between the ability of the two aspects of geometric data analysis, when it comes to examining individuals. The class analysis above precisely match the biographical facts given by the informants in their narratives\textsuperscript{178}, and allow me to examine what aspects of their biographies are important, when connecting the narratives to the space of trajectories. Whereas their position in relation to each of the axes is an imprecise description, that is

\textsuperscript{178} Possibly some would then ask if the class analysis reveals anything beyond what is found in the biographies. It is true that the classes do not reveal anything about the specific individuals, that cannot be found in the biographies. What the classes do, is to establish a connection to other individuals who belong to the same class and share biographical characteristics, thus providing us with a tool for connecting the individual biography directly with the entire population.
easily distorted by for instance Anita’s educational background, the class analysis provides me with a clear indication of which relative differences between informants I should employ in the further analysis.

9.5 Narrative Structures and Forms of Capital

In the above sections, I have presented the six biographical interviews, and made an initial analysis of how the informants’ narration is organized. The six narratives are distinguished by important differences, both in style and structure, and this brief concluding section will attempt to present an overview of these differences, and sum up what subjective, intersubjective and structural states led the informants to the SSPSE, and how they impact on their positions as students. Finally I will note what forms of capital seems important from the narratives. As discussed above, economic capital affects all six narrative in different ways, but I will not be taking that discussion any further.

Signe’s narrative was structured by her educational trajectory, her academic achievements serving as reinforcement, in the face of her perceived economic and cultural inferiority. Her attitude towards education seem to stem from her parents and grandparents, and she expresses a fierce loyalty towards the training qualifying her as a proper social educator. In Bertaux’ terms, she is transforming the trust in education per se, intersubjectively instilled in her by her parents, to a personal dedication and loyalty towards the social educator training as ensuring her professional skills. The pivotal biographical event in Signe’s narrative is her realization that she is good at social education, and subsequent decision to enroll at social educator training. It removes the ambivalence she has until then felt, split between her economic and social origin and her academic success. Signe’s trajectory is thus connected initially to an emphasis on educational capital, and subsequently to the cultural capital of care.

Henriette’s narrative is characterized by her gravitation towards working as an unskilled nursery assistant between a number of different failures with education. Although here trajectory includes a large number of active choices, and a number of both political and organizational affiliations, where she has worked

---

179 As the classes separate along the most important differences in the space of trajectories, the differences between informants belonging to different classes are also the differences that contribute the most to constructing the space of trajectories. Therefore, the class membership indicates what relative differences between the informants are in fact the most socially descriptive ones.
very intensely for long period of her life, she narrates these passively, portraying herself as an object, in the end more or less accepting her fate as a social educator and presenting her enrollment at the SSPSE as an attempt at improving her situation at work. Henriette dropped out of the Psychology and Danish studies that she did feel a great desire for initially, and becoming a social educator was never a dream nor a first choice like these studies, nor does she expect to learn much nor to see great changes in her practice. Henriette’s narrative thus demonstrates a striving for educational capital which ultimately seems unsuccessful to her, and at the same time an intense capacity for moving within the domain of social education, indicating the social educator capital she possesses.

Dennis’ narrative reflected a number of unsuccessful attempts at reconciling his very literal interpretations of the requirements he meets in social educational work and training with the contradictory assessments he receives. These are the central biographical events in his narrative, and have several common features: He has difficulties navigating in the fluid and flexible person-driven interactions, that to him seem to disregards all rules and agreements. Unable to decode the implicit and invisible demands, he mistakenly believes that there is neither demands nor any standards of control, and thus it seems to him that he is arbitrarily being excluded, when he encounters control. He attempts repeatedly to transform his working class background in accordance with what demands he can rationalize, and is both frustrated by not being able to see what he is doing wrong, and exasperated by the teachers, whom he perceives as unwilling to explicate how he ought to do it, and arbitrarily punishing him. Dennis’ narrative is structured by his lack of any sort of capital, and the accompanying missing habitual capacities.

Anita’s narrative hinges upon the biographical event of moving from far northern Jutland to Copenhagen. She explicitly distances herself from her hometown, her parent, her secondary schooling, her friends, her deceased boyfriend - all of which she relates to by explaining how she was perceived as (and perceives herself as) a black sheep in these surroundings. Once she uprooted herself, and moved to Copenhagen, all by herself, she fit right in. She compares herself to her brother, almost literally noting that living in Jutland implies replicating his life history of wife, family, house, and doing neither results in her parents’ disapproval. She narratively discards her entire origin, and her transformation is accomplished by shifting to the urban context of the capital - and creating distance to her hometown, her parents, and the pressure they represent to her transforms her intersubjective biographical state. Anita’s narrative is at least in
part related to her generalized educational capital, but the geographical shift - and all that it signifies - is a more important factor in her case.

Jonas’ narrative was structured about another kind of geographical move, the slow and steady transition from provincial town to capital. Jonas moves from the outskirts of Copenhagen, along with his 16-year old girlfriend, and immediately faces economical difficulties. This forces him to work and in the end it proves difficult for him to find time and economic opportunity for getting an education, and this is what leads him to the SSPSE. Thus Jonas’ narrative about Copenhagen is ambiguous: the capital grants him independence at the cost of reducing his social mobility. Jonas experiences this pressure as life becoming fast-paced, yet as it grows on him, he distances himself from his origin, tiring with his provincially-paced parents. And so the biographical event of moving is for Jonas is occasioned by the attempt to establish a family, and the move allows him to transform the biographical subjective, intersubjective and structural states accordingly. Jonas’ narrative shows a number of relations to social educator capital, and some indications as to a hope for higher outcome from his generalized educational capital.

Anna Louise’s narrative is structured by her family: by her wish to pass on to her children what was passed on to her by her parents; by her emphasis on the similarity between her work with children, and her own six children. But the most important way by which Anna Louise’s narrative centres on her family, is how important biographical events in the family - her husbands job, her son’s car accident - cause her to take up jobs in social education. She expounds on how she want to prepare children - her own, and those she meet at work - by providing them with a cultural foundation. She embeds this project in the experience she has with children, and that same extensive experience also means she does not imagine the SSPSE training to teach her much, and thus her life history, her family life, and her social educational work intertwine and support each other. This leaves her with little need and little expectations for the training to provide any knowledge and proficiency beyond what she already possesses. Anna Louise possesses both social educator capital, and cultural capital, and this mixture - along with her acquiescing to family obligations and her husbands career preempting hers - is what her narration revolves around.

The six narratives I have reconstructed here are aligned along a small number of themes: family, education, geography, and social origin. While the above summaries discard numerous aspects and details of both interviews and narratives, they do retain the gist of the different trajectories of the informants. The main
themes of the narratives more or less confirms the findings of similar interviews with social educators: social origin and class, breaking with origins by moving, family and education are all themes touched upon to some extent in the studies cited in chapter 3. But, while it is trivial that my informants narratively reconstruct their lives along these themes, the similarities and differences between how the informants relate to these topics are by no means trivial, and it is by way of these that I will attempt to explore the space of trajectories. I would note here that the interviews contain a greater variation of relations to the education than the informants in the Ahrenkiel (1998) study, and that there is not an immediate relation between any of the above themes, and the way the students narrate their relationship to the domain of social education. There are both biographies where social education is an epiphany (Signe), biographies where it is a conscious choice after more or less thorough deliberation (Dennis, Anita), biographies where it is an acceptance of how life turned out (Henriette) and biographies where life at home (Anna Louise) or economy (Jonas) made it a sensible choice.

In the above conclusions and summaries, we see an outline of the homologous relationship between trajectory and students’ perception of the domain and the training.
In the following chapter, I shall try to pursue the above themes in an analysis of the educational strategies of the agents, drawing on both their biographical narratives and their appraisal of the training, as constructed from the third methodological mode, the group interviews.
CHAPTER 10

Educational Strategies of SSPSE Students

The biographical analysis examined how the six informants narrated their social biography, and what coherence and connections they constructed through their life historical course of subjective, intersubjective and structural relations. These narrative structures was connected to the concepts of capital as they were proposed in the geometric data analysis.

This chapter specifically focuses on how the informants relate to the training, and how those patterns of relations are related to the social biographies of the informants. I will continue the exploration of the social biography of the informants as the combination of the narrative structures described in the previous chapter, and the class analysis and space of trajectories found in chapters 6 and 7, and reconstructing the educational strategies from the mentions of the training in biographical interviews, and group interviews. I will be looking at the training from some themes derived from the discussions of chapter 3 and the interviews with students themselves: expectations, structure and navigation in the training. The aim is to reconstruct the relations between the students’ social origin and position and their strategies towards the training. I will introduce the data from the group interviews, whose themes were how the students experience being students in the SSPSE, immediately addressing the student strategies. This also allows me to examine both the relations between the students’ strategies and the three informants who were not part of the biographical methodological mode. For these informants, I am of course limited to the position in the space of trajectories, and class membership having very little in the way of biographical narratives.

In my initial analysis, I attempted to cross-section the biographical interviews by the important themes in the geometric data analysis. This proved impossible: While for instance such themes as age and work experience can be examined as discrete quantitative dimensions, applying such an analysis to qualitative data
makes little sense. Experience is embedded in age, and not trivially so: older students have had longer time to accrue both years and kinds of experience, and thus the relation is multidimensional and nontrivial. Dis-embedding experience from age means not only discarding those correlations but also disabling the analysis from considering the chronological changing of perspectives caused by the length and width of the experience. In order to allow the analysis to retain this intertwining of themes, I will instead employ the results of the previous analytical chapters as a framework of comparison.

This chapter is organized as follows: initially I make short theoretical discussion of how to construct the concepts of expectations and strategies within a Bourdieuan framework. This is followed by a brief methodological discussion on the group interviews, and their precise setup and conduct. This sections includes a brief introduction of the three informants who only took part in the group interviews. I then analyse the strategies following the classes, and make a brief examination of the interaction between strategies seen in the interviews, before concluding on this chapter.

10.1 Expectations and Educational Strategies

The idea of educational strategies stems from the use of Bourdieu made by Ahrenkiel (1998) and Hultqvist (1988, 2001) as discussed in chapter 3. The concept is inspired by Bourdieu, and refers to the complex of conscious and pre-conscious ascription of meaning to the use of education. Bourdieu himself has defined strategies as follows:

“[a] practical mastery of the logic or immanent necessity of a game, which is gained through experience of the game, and which functions this side of consciousness and discourse (like the techniques of the body, for example). Notions such as habitus (or system of dispositions), practical sense, and strategy are tied to the effort to get away from objectivism without falling into subjectivism” (Bourdieu & Lamaison 1986:111)

Thus the strategy should not be seen as a conscious planned-out effort, but rather a connecting point between the dispositions of the individual, and his perception of the social conditions under which his life currently unfolds. The educational strategies indicate what purpose the educational projects of the stu-

---

180 This is in fact precisely the advantage of geometric data analysis, as opposed to classical analytical statistics: instead of reducing the relationship between age and experience to coefficients and correlation measurements, GDA retains the multiple dimensions of these relationships, and remains linked to the individuals in the analysis.
dents serve in the light of their current social position: What is the social purpose that education serves in the social biography of the SSPSE students? In the case of Ahrenkiel, the informants unequivocally turned out to employ education in order to obtain one or more of these three goals (in parentheses I have added a Bourdieuan reconceptualisation):

- improved or empowered position on their workplace (i.e., improving position through institutionalised cultural capital),
- reinforcement of their employment situation (i.e., sustaining position through institutionalised educational capital)
- improvement of private economic situation (i.e., converting cultural capital to economic capital by way of institutionalised legitimation)

These goals are related to a subjectively highly ambivalent situation of three everyday life arenas: work, family and training, which the students had great difficulties in combining or switching between. In the previous chapter, these goals turned out to relate to the age, gender, family situation and educational career of the informants, and several students turned out to be possessed of other competing or supplementary goals. The relation between such goals, and how the students attempt to realize them by making use of capital and habitual capacities is what I will be examining in this chapter. In the previous chapter, the relations between trajectory, capital and biographical narrative was the first part of the homological exploration of the domain of social educator training: what capital and capacities for making use of that capital are accrued along the different trajectories? This chapter will concern itself further with exploring precisely how these capacities are put to work by the students in relation to the SSPSE context.

10.1.1 The Concept of Expectations: Muel-Dreyfus

The overall themes that I have been analysing are the students’ construction of the relationship between training and social educational work. In the parlance of NISE and social educators, this is often spoken of as the relationship between theory and practice (cf. Von Oettingen, & Wiedemann, 2007). I have not used this particular dichotomy myself neither in interviews nor in analysis, because I believe it implicitly confirms specific assumptions on the way training and professional practices relate and determine each other (cf. Brinkkjær & Nørholm 2000). Instead I have taken the notion of expectations from Muel-Dreyfus (1983, 2001) as an analytical key to the students’ assumptions on how their training, their experiences and their future as social educators connect.
Francine Muel-Dreyfus’ groundbreaking study (Muel-Dreyfus 1983) explores the relations of teachers at the (previous) turn of the century and social educators in the sixties, and how their relations to their professions and their training reflect the structure of their expectations, and how this in turn reflects the transformation of the relationship between education and academic capital in modern France.

Muel-Dreyfus demonstrates how the professions exert pressure upon the agent, and that this pressure may well be in another direction than what the agent’s disposition would suggest. In the case of professions-in-the-making (op. cit. p.7), as the ones studied by Muel-Dreyfus, the agents are literally losing their heritage as they make their social ascension: their inherited cultural systems of meaning and worth are not automatically applicable to the new fields into which they come to belong, and while they adapt, the past remains alive in their perception of their position:

“Ce passé qui leur a permis de devenir ce qu’ils sont effectivement devenus est un passé toujours présent, objet de nostalgie mais aussi de tourment, et sur lequel il faut sans cesse faire retour comme si la position sociale acquise était avant tout une position de solitude” (op.cit.p.13)181

While the quote concerns the teachers, the relation to the past is amply demonstrated by both sub-studies of Muel-Dreyfus: The teachers at the turn of the century shift away from the work and life forms of the parents (provincial artisans and workers, op.cit. p.32ff.), and into an academic profession, leaving the teachers with a dissociation from the life of their parents. The social educators obtain a higher level of education than that of their parents, yet this is in part due to the concurrent expansion of the educational system. Thus the inherited assumptions about the value of a university education prove incorrect, and the social educators’ social ascension proves shorter than they expected. This discontinuity is also explored in general by Bourdieu in Homo Academicus (Bourdieu 1988) and by Elisabeth Hultqvist, in a Swedish concurrent context. This causes the social educators to symbolically “remold” or reinvent the profession (Muel-Dreyfus 1983:184ff.), replacing the hitherto image of the social educator as an pathway for women’s social ascension, in part perceived as a bureaucratic and conservative profession, with an image of the academic career the new social educators feel deprived of182. These studies demonstrate how the transformation of the field sediments as generational discontinuities in the perception of the value of capital. This provides me with a recast concept of expectations as the

181 "This past, which had permitted them to become that which they effectively became, is ever-present, an object of both nostalgia and torment, and one which they must incessantly revisit, as if this socially acquired position were first and foremost one of solitude”[My translation]

182 There are numerous other steps and proviso that propel this analysis along, yet I will not repeat them here. I have discussed and analyzed them extensively elsewhere. (Frederiksen 2001)
subjective perception of the transformative potential of the capital an agent possesses. This perception is a product of the social position of agent, and the chance of such expectations to *adequately* assess the objective conditions in the current field, is a function of the distance between the agents’ social position and acquired capital, and the current field. The relation between the field, and agents categories of perception and appraisal may become distorted when the structures of the field are becoming modified - a distortion that comes in the shape of respectively allodoxia - ambiguity between agents about what constitutes doxa; and structural delay - representations of the field that does not take into account new features of the field (Bourdieu 1996:219). The capacity for sustaining categories of appraisal and perception that are congruent with the actual current state of the field, by access to pertinent information, is *informational capital* (Broady 1998).

### 10.1.2 Fields and Informational Capital

The ability to correctly assess what objective probability one has at obtaining various social objectives, such as successfully converting cultural capital by way of education, is crucial to social strategies. And when social strategies are made the object of objectivation, they must be constructed as an intermediary between current social position and whatever social objective the individual is striving to attain. Whereas the biography makes literal sense of the past, the strategy makes sense of the future. Bourdieu has drawn attention to the fact that social and cultural capital in effect also generate an access to information about the imminent changes in value of the field (Bourdieu loc.cit.p.218f.), and thus indications of which opportunities are promising and which are not. The well-placed agent thus possesses a “...*sense of placement, an intuition about the structure and the dynamics of a field that enables agents to anticipate its future*”. Informational capital should understood as a way capital may affect the agent’s perception and appraisal of the field, in a manner similar to how capital can function as symbolic capital.

In the current context, these theoretical outlines should be understood as a way of connecting the forms of capital constructed in this study to the capital possessed by the agents studied here. More precisely in particular the agents’ possession of respectively educational capital and social educator capital and their capacity for generating adequate (i.e., successful) educational strategies within the context of the SSPSE needs to be examined. To what extent are these two forms of capital able to function as informational capital, and pro-
vide the agents with relevant assessments of the structural changes (cf. Chapter 4) the domain of social educator training is undergoing?

10.1.3 Strategies: Hultqvist and the Socionomes

In the light of the above clarifications, educational strategies is the term I will apply to the students’ perception and appraisal of the domain of social educator training. Apart from Ahrenkiel (1998) which was discussed in chapter 3, an important source of inspiration in this respect is the study by Elisabeth Hultqvist (Hultqvist 1988) on Swedish socionomes trained in northern rural Sweden in the sixties and early seventies. This study - entitled “Man blev nå’t” examines how overall structural changes in the Swedish society (smallholding becoming unsustainable and the loss of employment for forestry workers due to industrialisation) meant that the children of the former forestry workers and smallholders had to look for different kinds of employment, new strategies of reproduction (op.cit.p.12). Becoming a socionome is one such strategy, and Hultqvist’s study concerns how this generational transition takes place:

“the internalisation of the economic and social condition features as part of [the socionomes’] system of dispositions, and is [...] important to understanding the socionomes’ educational strategies.” (op.cit.p.20)

Hultqvist traces how the ethos of the smallholders and forestry workers’ affect how the new generation of socionomes reproduces this ethos in their perceptions of the socionome work. This ethos emphasizes work effort as important instead of position, training, etc., and draws upon a specific form of cultural capital related to political and popular movements (op.cit. p.24ff., cf. Broady 1985, Bourdieu & Wacquant 1996:105). This form of capital and the smallholder ethos serves as a sort of substitute for cultural capacity (Hultqvist 1988:35). Thus, Hultqvist demonstrates that the student practice employed by the students, while connected to the socionome training context, in its actual configuration draws upon whatever inheritance the students’ can muster. It is this dual nature of the educational strategies - their relation to the project of capital conversion, and habitual origin, that places strategies as central in the construction of the homology.

183 The socionome-profession no longer exists (the training was closed in 1977), but corresponded roughly to social workers. In Sweden (unlike Denmark and Norway) socionomes were not trained at universities, but a specific social work colleges.

184 [One did become something] - my translation, which is somewhat unsatisfying. The Swedish title indicates both the acquisition of an education and a title, and the self-effacing usage of an indefinite pronoun, which I am unable to translate succinctly.
10.1.4 Analytical Measures

Both the work of Hultqvist and Muel-Dreyfus incorporate interviews or written autobiographies as the main empirical source. Hultqvist constructs the relations between strategies, origin and structural changes, mostly by way of time - that is, by showing how these structural changes are concurrent with the social needs of the agents, and thematically similar. The underlying claim being that there are no social coincidences. Muel-Dreyfus bases her analytical procedures on an attempt to disentangle herself from the profession’s or institution’s understanding of itself and the ideologies surrounding either (Muel-Dreyfus 1987), which prevent the agent from seeing the social history of the profession, and the “social origin of the professional calling” (op.cit.p.5). The tools both make use of in their analysis are thus ones of reconstructing the arbitrary social conditions at work in constructing the dynamics of the field. Both draw upon historical, statistical surveys, in order to construct these conditions. I have in the geometric data analysis constructed a tool that can serve a similar purpose here, albeit with little access to generalizations about parental social origin.

The following is a short discussion of how I construct the analytical steps from interviews to homologies between classes and strategies.

The expectations explicated by the informants express how they connect their past experiences with work and education with their future, their hopes and longings. The training may support, contradict, hamper or transform these expectations, all in accordance with the extent to which the expectations and the training converge. The training takes its shape as was discussed in chapter 3 from the conflicting strands of interests and strategies stemming from the community of professionals, from the NISE themselves, and from the State.

The ascription of meaning and symbolic value of social educator training is derived from both the field of education and the domain of social education, and so the degree of convergence between training and students’ expectations relates to the social biography of the students, and whether it has brought into their possession the relevant and efficient informational capital needed to successfully adapt their educational strategies to the current state of the domain of social education.

Expectations as such is not easily demarcated as a phenomenon in interviews. Statements that in a commonsense way could be rubricated as expectations crop up as response to questions such as: Why did you start/enroll at the SSPSE? How do you feel about the training? What has been hard? What did you expect from the training/this subject/your work practice? Have you been surprised? Have you been disappointed? How does the tuition relate to your practice? Will it change your current work/employments situation? What do you think of work practice? These questions all aim
at an assessment, either framed by the future, or framed by recalling how the student imagined the training as future. I have decided on not attempting to operationalize the concept of expectations in a theoretically strict manner, and instead mainly go with statements that either explicitly reference the future, or statements which assert elements of the training as surprising, disappointing, or in some other way assessing aspects of the training as experienced. I will in the following subsections discuss the expressions of expectations ordered by the classes. Taking into account the forms of capital proposed in the geometric data analysis shifts my analysis from the informants’ own perception of the field to the entire field, allowing for the interpretations to shift from expectations to strategies, thus shifting the analysis from the perception of the domain from each position, to the oppositions spanning the entire domain.

10.2 Group Interviews

The third methodological mode - the group interviews - is what provides most of the material for the analyses of educational strategies. In this section I will briefly outline the way in which the group interviews were conducted, and the preparation and analytical tools used for them.

10.2.1 Preparation and Methodology

The group interviews provide empirical material for to research questions:

• How are the biographies related to educational strategies?
• How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

As for the first questions, I will address this by structuring the analysis around the classes constructed in the geometric data analysis, and the relations between narrative structures and capital found in chapter 9. As was briefly discussed in chapter 2, some of the main points in favour of using group interviews are the access they provide to the actual dynamics, interaction and oppositions of the field. In my case this means allowing different positions in the fields - as represented by my informants - interact in relation to the training. A point made in numerous different studies inspired by Bourdieu (in particular Bourdieu 1999) is that the relationship between researcher and interview subject is not a suspension of the power relations of the fields, but rather a situation that must by necessity be analysed with these structures in mind. As I explored extensively in the previous chapter, this meant that I repeatedly found myself in relations
cast in the teacher-student-mold. In the group interviews, the actual relation between students are not re-invented just because the setting is slightly different - rather, they must be seen as a direct continuation of the interaction of the students in the classroom. For this reason - and because of the safety-in-numbers-argument (cf. Chapter 2) - the group interviews may differ from the biographical ones in that the relations within the interview have a chance of being less dominated by my presence.

For the above reasons, my preparation for the interviews consisted in main selecting topics, concepts and situations from the training, which I would be able to pose open and explorative questions about, and thus my interview guide were extremely open and flexible more like notes than a guide. The interview guide for one such group interview can be examined in appendix 7. I also often chose to pose the questions as questions about opinions, in order to stimulate discussions between the informants, where I would take little part in the discussion. In a similar way to the argument about self-revelation made by Schütze (cf. Chapter 9) such interaction may stimulate the informants to elaborate beyond their initial intentions - not because of a narrative logic in this case, but rather because of an interactional one. As such interaction may (and does, as we shall see) also become a good deal more confrontational than the interaction in a single-person interview, I believe that this methodological device inherently possesses a strong impetus in the empirical direction I am seeking: the differentiation of strategic dispositions.

The second question will only be addressed in this questions by constructing a set of strategies in relation to the classes. The demands of the classroom is the subject of chapter 12.

10.2.2 Group Interview Setup and Conduct

All three group interviews - one at JSEM, and two at KSEM - were conducted at the NISE. These sites were in practice the only option available, but also serves to maintain the sense of continuation from training-setting to interview-setting, as discussed above. This may affect the interview, in that this may reinforce the relation between me and the students as an implicit teacher-student relation, but I do not see any way to avoid this. All three interviews start of with some students showing up later than others, and some having to leave a bit earlier - and in the case of the two KSEM-interviews, some students also cancel. At all interviews, I use electronic recording equipment, and make paper notes. The students are seated around a small table in no particular order, and I have brought some bottles of mineral water. In each of the interviews, the students
participate eagerly, laughing and joking along the way. Some students - Signe at KSEM, and Albert at JSEM - are very eager to respond, and take up much space in the interview, whereas others - Jonas, at KSEM and Eva at JSEM are more hesitant, and take up less of the interview-space. This seems to correspond very much with their classroom practices, as I shall return to in the next chapter.

While there are several cases of the interaction between me and the students, that could warrant further analysis, in order to objectify my researcher position, I will only examine one such situation here.

In the JSEM interview I start of the interview by asking the informants to briefly present themselves, and they do so in turn. This turn-taking is in itself very similar to a central feature of the classrooms, as I shall return to in the next chapter. As Anna Louise presents herself, she arrives at an episode where her oldest son was seriously injured in a car crash. Narrating this episode, she is very affected by it, and has difficulties proceeding, something which both I and the other students note. Eva asks Anna Louise what is happening, Jytte also makes a supportive/concerned remark and I stop the recording and asks if Anna Louise is OK. If she wants to stop or break, and offers her some water. After a brief pause, Anna Louise laughs, and says she is fine and wants to continue. [Interview notes JSEM I]

What I want to explore here is the way I myself choose to react. The actions I believe are the set of reactions I would employ in an exam situation, when a student is wracked by anxiety due to the exam situation. In other words, I myself recreate the implicit teacher-student relation which also structured several of the biographical interviews. In this case, the implicit perception of the relation exacts several other effects on the interview. I take on a host-position by stopping the recorder, offering water and the option of breaking of the interview and so on. As the biographical interview indicated that Anna Louise was somewhat in awe over being interviewed it is no surprise she elects to continue. By stopping the recorder I also make it clear that there are things that I find too intimate to be considered part of the interview-object. And finally, I do not shift to a personal-empathic relation to Anna Louise, as does Eva. These characteristics are all similar to the objective-assessing gaze of the examiner, whose interest lies wholly in the educationally relevant themes, and not in the personal or subjective aspects of the students under scrutiny. This does seem rather unfortunate, as the interview setting should rather inspire confidence in the students. However, as the position described above also is one of reduced participation, the extent to which it upsets the balance of the interview is no

185 Although I should point out that the biographical interview was conducted later than the group interview - thus the unsurprising aspects are only present in hindsight.
simple matter. Furthermore, it does position me outside the students, as they - led by Eva and Jytte - instead position themselves in a supportive way, and in the context, confirms their membership of a community which I do not belong to. I cannot completely assess the end result of these effects, that appear to affect the interview setting in opposing directions, but I find it important to note that I do not myself leave the implicit teacher-student relation, but in this case it may not only have aversely affected the interview.

10.2.3 The Informants in the Space of Trajectories

I will briefly introduce the three informants, whom I have not yet described:

**Jytte** has worked for 8 years as a prison officer, and also for a short period of time in a leisure time care facility. She is 42 years old at the time of the interviews, and attended an older form of vocational business school. She has taken courses in cognitive behavioural therapy, and partially completed a Diploma Programme in Care and Social Education. Due to acute and severe illness, she dropped out, and once recovered, decided to enroll at the SSPSE to continue working within social education. It is Jytte’s previous work as an prison officer (coded as Other Experience) that places her in the Outsider Class, although whether this constitutes a previous career outside of social education is debatable. Jytte shares the outsider class membership with Anna Louise.

**Eva** is also 42 years old, and has worked mainly as a nursery school assistant, and a bit as a childcare assistant in a leisure time care facility. Originally she did Basic Vocational training and commercial/clerical training, but then began working as in elderly care, and completed training as a Social Health Assistant. Along the way, she had four children, and began working in social education first in a nursery, and then a leisure time care facility. In the latter she has been part of a group taking care of children with problems. She decided very suddenly to apply to the SSPSE, as she was told that admission criteria were due to change and possibly exclude her. Eva’s training as a social health assistant places her in the class of social health assistant. Eva shares the social/health assistant class with Dennis.

---

186 The data on these informant stem from the group interviews, notes from talks during the fieldwork at JSEM, and the questionnaire discussed in Chapter 6. As neither of these contexts were specifically biographical, the data are inchoate and do not for instance include whether Jytte or Albert has any children, nor any references of their parents’ work, or educational history.
Albert is a 32 year old man, who has completed primary school and then worked for 10 years in a leisure time care facility. Along the way, he completed training as a Care Assistant with the specific purpose of qualifying for admission to the SSPSE. He has aimed for this for a long time, but the need to maintain his income while his wife completed her studies postponed applying. Albert’s training as care assistant, and the many years of experience causes him to be assigned to the Complex Insiders class. Although one could say (and Albert himself does so) that he has in fact followed a very direct course towards one specific goal for a long time, the fact that he has neither preparatory nor vocational secondary education separates him from the Straight Ones. Albert shares the Complex Insiders class with Jonas and Henriette.

If we now briefly reexamine the situation in the space of trajectories and class membership of both the biographical informants and the remaining three informants from JSEM, the nine informants are distributed over the aspects of axes and classes as depicted in the tables 8.1 and 8.2, and I refer the reader to those tables, for listings of class and axial relations.

I would like to point out that only two informants are described by the same aspects of all three axes, and belong to the same class: Henriette and Albert. Considering that there are large differences between their biographies (age, gender, work experience) one should thus be careful not to assume similarity between even individuals described as closely related by the geometric data analysis. The geometric data analysis can only relate those aspects of their biography that were entered as active questions in the analysis - that is the essence of my differentiation between trajectory and biography, as it were,

As has been discussed previously, there are some informants whose position in the space and class membership a difficult to reconcile. Anita’s Outsider position along the first axis stem from her education as has been mentioned, and for that reason I will mainly consider her membership of the Straight Ones Class in this analysis. The same goes for Jonas’ apparently Simple trajectory and his membership of the Complex Insider class.

Jytte and Anna Louise pose a different apparent contradiction, as they possess Insider trajectories, but belong to the Outsider class. Since the almost all my informants has Insider trajectories, and the class analysis provides me with three distinct classes describing different kinds of Insider trajectories (Complex, Nurses etc. and Social Health Assistants) I have chosen to mainly consider Jytte and Anna Louise’s membership of the Outsider class as representative in this
analysis. But was discussed in chapter 8, there is a group of Outsiders - termed the Absent Outsiders earlier on - with whom I have not made any interviews. The following sections will go through the classes as follows. The largest class, in terms of the membership of my informants is the complex insider-class. This is followed by an combined analysis of the Nurses Etc class, and the Social Health-assistants Class. Following this, I will shortly discuss the Straight Ones-class, of which Anita is the only member, forcing my analysis to rely on comparison with the other classes. Next, I will discuss the Outsider class, and finally conclude the chapter by examining three interview-samples of interaction in details, and relate them directly to the space of trajectories.

10.3 Complex Insiders

Albert, Jonas and Henriette are the three the informants who belong to this class. The similarities of their trajectory is mainly that their entire careers has taken place within the domain of social education, and that they have little or no other training than the SSPSE. Henriette and Albert have both completed the Care Assistant training, and both Jonas and Henriette possesses a secondary preparatory exam. The Direct aspect of their trajectories should thus be noted to refer to the fact that their trajectories (including Care assistant training) stay within the domain of social education. Both their the trajectories of Albert and Henriette are also Complex, which refers to the length and number of components of their trajectories, rather than the domain it has unfolded in.

The most prominent shared feature of their relations to the training is the aspect of necessity rather than desire. Jonas has postponed enrolling, and dropped out of teacher college in part due to the economic necessities of living with a small family in Copenhagen. Albert has postponed applying, because of his wife's education. Henriette did not want the training, but was excluded for particular task at her work, because of not having trained as a social educator. In short, their decision of whether and when to apply is driven by outer necessities. This may seem reminiscent of the Ahrenkiel (1998) informant who would have preferred to get the certification from a vending machine but in fact, all three of them disagree with that notion: the training is expected to provide them with something. In the following, I shall explore what I have found to be the common thread in their expectations of the training: The focus on obtaining knowledge rather than reflecting oneself.
In the second group interview, Jonas explains about how the training on second year is harder than during the first year, but also much more satisfying to him.

**Group sample 1**

Jonas: and you really pick up the pace now [...] because you’re getting so much. I mean, the first summons I just thought wow [...] and everybody they were just, everybody just had that feeling. Now we’re getting our money’s worth right [...] everybody they were. You know people just lit up now they were. yeah this is so cool right [ KSEM II:517-525]

While it is not completely clear what it is that causes Jonas to experience the summons tuition like this, his expectations are being met, and that appears to go for the entire class as Jonas sees it. The expression “getting your moneys worth” is one Jonas uses frequently about the training, and later in this interview he points out that, this being their last course with tuition(as opposed to supervision), he intends to get as much out of it as he can.

**Group sample 2**

Jonas but like Signe said. We’re getting close to graduating. Now I’ll damn well get the last bit from my eight thousand a term right [...] I want to be bloody well equipped for the bachelor project. Because I’m really going to push it for that right [ KSEM II/324]

The reference to the price of being enrolled, and the discussion of the training being worth it mirror the necessity attached to the entire decision of training. Training cost Jonas a great deal, both money, time and efforts, and he wants it to be worth it. The experience from the summons in the previous quote indicates how such worth appears to him: it relates to amount (much) and speed (pick up the pace). To Jonas, the training is a literal investment, and he is very aware of the aspect of converting economic capital into institutionalized cultural capital.

In the biographical interview Jonas noted that he was very happy about the class, and how it felt to part of the group of SSPSE students. And in the first group interview, when Dennis becomes very critical of the activity/culture subjects on third term (cf. 10.4 below), Jonas dismisses Dennis’ criticisms by referring to the pleasant social experience of being in the group; so although Jonas does not consider these parts of the training to be immediately useful, he does side with the teachers and the training, and displays substantial loyalty to the training, when confronted with Dennis massive criticism of that training. So far, Jonas’ expectations of the training are that it should be worthwhile, which it

---

187 As I will be referring back to many of interview samples used in this chapter, I have numbered the samples.

188 Summons [indkald] brief intense school based activities, interspersed in longer periods of working at home, or being in work practice
is when the training makes knowledge related demands of him. Yet even when the training does not make any such demands, Jonas remains relatively loyal to the training, and refers to the social aspects as equally important.\textsuperscript{189}

Social aspects of education are important to Henriette\textsuperscript{190}, who repeatedly stated that a major contributing factor to dropping out of Teacher training and being extremely uncomfortable with Upper 2\textsuperscript{nd} School was the competitive, uncooperative ambiance of these places. This is an inversion of Jonas’ reference to the group or the class as an alternative kind of satisfaction with the training. For Jonas the socially amicable setting was a substitute for the training being worthwhile, whereas Henriette narrates an open and uncompetitive social setting as a \textit{prerequisite} for her investing in the training. The common feature is that the training needs to be worthwhile, and it is the task of the teachers and planners that it be so. Henriette also stresses the importance of theoretical knowledge, but is concerned about the depth of the knowledge she obtains:

\textit{Henriette:} \textit{[The] teachers [...] who really want (.) it, don’ t they [...] and they are really committed andum [...] and when there’s five minutes left until, no take these 70 pages too right [...]there’s a lotta possibilities (.) But there’s not really time for it right um (.) Or maybe it’s too much, I don’ t know (.) I mean sometimes I worry that we’ll come out knowing a little bit about a whole lot.} \textit{[Henriette 580-591]}

The \textit{70 pages} as example of the possibilities that are open to Henriette hints at two levels in how she assesses the training. First, the level of service provided by the teachers is highly important. She praises the very act of making knowledge available and stating that it is important, even if the schedule does not allow any discussion of it. Secondly, the teachers and the training appear to extol the understanding that there is much more to know than what they have time for. Rather than frustrate Henriette that they do not have time for it all, passing out \textit{70 pages} of text five minutes before the lessons ends indicates to Henriette that the teachers think there is so very much more that the students ought to learn, and that the teachers are attempting to make as much as possible available to her. And it also coincides with the biographical themes that Jonas and Henriette shares - that they could or should have striven for more valuable educational credentials.

This is similar to the “\textit{Take, don’t get}”-catch phrase found by Kampmann (1998b, cf. Chapter 3) stating that the training was something the students were sup-

\textsuperscript{189} There are indicators - and Jonas’ statements above are one, Henriette’s just below another - that the other SSPSE students function as a sort of social capital, in relation to gaining social educational employment, and to “keeping up” with the training.

\textsuperscript{190} Henriette was ill for both group interviews, and thus her descriptions of her relations to the training all stem from the biographical interview.
posed to actively take, not passively receive; it is the responsibility of Henriette
to avail herself of the possibilities on offer. Both Henriette and Jonas generally
relate amenably to the training, and their primary expectations are of knowledge
that can underpin their practice; and as the pace quickens, and the teachers
let on that there is much to learn or to know, that is what makes the training
worthwhile.

Albert also expects a supportive relation between knowledge and his own
practice, explicitly stating that he believes that his work in social education does
not necessarily need changing or improving, but rather a theoretical backdrop:

Group sample 3

Albert: But you could also (.)say (.) um (2) even if we’ve been competent
(.) assistants (.) right(.) What we, the work we’ve done it’s been really
great (.) but maybe we’ve not known why […] I mean (2) and that’s (.)
you know (2) knowing why you’re good at what you do that’s too (.) well
that feeling it’s (.) um (.) Really worthwhile right [JSEM /1 741-743]

Albert states that his social educational knowledge may be limited, but his prac-
tical proficiency is not; a position congruent with Jonas and Henriette’s em-
phasis on training making a great amount of knowledge available. There is an
undercurrent of reinforcing a subordinate position in an educational hierarchy
without granting anything but educational superiority to the fully fledged so-
cial educators occupying the upper echelons of the hierarchy - a dominated
position in the domain of social educator training resisting translation into a
similarly dominated one in the domain of social education. As Olsen(2007)
demonstrated (cf. chapter 3) there are in fact modal differences between the
way unskilled nursery school assistants, and fully fledged social educators relate
to the children, which indicates that the transformation SSPSE students does
undergo entails more than just acquiring knowledge. Yet to Jonas, Henriette
and Albert the knowledge aspect is what makes their investment in the training
worthwhile.

The knowledge that Jonas, Albert and Henriette expect from the training is
characterised by a theoretical/general nature, but they also harbour expecta-
tions as to the mode of acquisition. Throughout the JSEM group interview,
Albert often returns to the theme of what he wants from the training, what he
does not want, and in particular how he wants it. One quote is very illustrative
of this point:

Group sample 4

Albert: the knowledge (.) right(.) that’s what I care about […] and I
feel (.) I feel it frustrates me when right […] like (.) They’ve begun in
commercials (.) suddenly (.) using a stereotyped psychologist sitting there saying (.) And how do you feel about that? Right (.) We all laugh at that because we recognise that depiction (.) and we think (.) Oh yeah that’s just too much right (.)that’s what I think (.) I can feel (.) when pedagogy is exerted upon me (.) In this place[...] when those questions come up (.) Are you thinking differently about your own part in relation to or, and I um <laughter> I’m tired before they get to the question mark, right <laughter >

Me : What is it that tires you?
Albert: Well I get <sighs> (.) I get tired ’cause I think (.) um (.) I think it’s the answer (2) to (2) the social educational question that’s important [...] if we take a concrete question (.) It could be [...] is it good or bad to force children out on the playground [...] for two hours a day (.)right

Jytte : Mmm

Albert: Answer (.) Yes or no(.) well I think it (.) well I think it’s that answer that interests me(2) um (.) I don’t think it’s interesting, that interesting (.) What it is in my upbringing that causes (.) that I think that the answer’s interesting [ JSEM /I 566-584]

What Albert expounds on here is the question of whether he or social education is the subject of debate in the classroom. He is not demanding concrete unequivocal answers, but he expects tuition and discussion to be about knowledge rather than about himself191. The example he gives of a general proposition, dis-embedded from any practical contexts is revealing of the form of knowledge Albert expects: global, absolute, imperative and yet concerned with the greater good of the client. But it is important to note, that Albert grants that such propositions are not common, and he does not expect to be just furnished with such propositions, nor does he assume them to be above contradiction. He allows for differences of opinion or ideology, as this is what he wants to discuss. What he dismisses is that such differences of opinion should be related and discussed as dependant upon the discussants rather than upon their knowledge. Albert speaks of what interests him above, indicating what he prefers in return from his investments. His position is thus quite similar to Jonas assessing whether something is worth his money. They both assume that there is knowledge to be had in the training, and that the teachers ought to be the ones supplying it. They do not completely subscribe to the previously mentioned catch phrase that the training is something they are supposed to take rather than get; instead they expect some form of guidance. Henriette indicates teacher complicity in

191 In the interview the informants also posits this as the opposition between process and product; a rather common and perhaps a bit worn cliché in the Danish project pedagogy traditions(cf. Olsen & Pedersen 1997)
establishing this expectation of knowledge and answers, by her references to teacher emphasis of the vast amount of available knowledge, and lack of time to guide the students through it. To some extent, Henriette and Albert’s positions relate to both an understanding of knowledge, and a pedagogy that fails to make this knowledge available to them: Albert is not getting his money’s worth nor the goods he bargained for, and Henriette worries if the returns of her investment will be too little knowledge on too much.

Summing up on the expectations, the three member of the Complex Insiders class agree upon the theoretical and global nature of the knowledge they expect from the training. They relate it to ascending an educational hierarchy and to underpinning their practical work, rather than affecting it. They assess training as an investment, that must bring returns and be worthwhile, and thus they were not expecting to be in charge of the course of their training themselves, and they are all to some extent reluctant in taking on this responsibility - Henriette being less reluctant than Jonas, and Albert being decidedly frustrated by this responsibility.

While Albert, Jonas and Henriette trajectories do belong to the same class, their pathways to the SSPSE are quite different. Albert has set a course for the SSPSE, working for a number of years, waiting for his wife to complete her training, completing Care Assistant training himself, and then applying to the SSPSE. Both Jonas and Henriette were quite reluctant to become social educators, but in the end did so: Jonas to get educated like his friends and to improve the economy of his family, and Henriette to improve her position in the social educational hierarchy at her workplace. It would thus seem that there is an important difference between Jonas’ and Henriette’s ambivalence and reluctant acceptance of the SSPSE, and the planned course of Albert. As Albert was not interviewed biographically, it is not possible to completely assess the extent of this difference. But there is one important point of comparison, that connects to both similarities and differences between the three. Albert has not completed any secondary education, neither vocational nor preparatory. Both Jonas and Henriette has preparatory exams, and both have felt that they ought to acquire further education of some sort - make something more of themselves than they have.

Henriette went as far as to enroll at university because she felt she ought to put her Upper 2\textsuperscript{nd} exam to use, and Jonas was unsettled by not having any education while his friends were completing university studies. To them, the SSPSE was settling for something less than they felt they ought to strive for. Albert makes no mention of any such compromise with his ambitions; rather,
he has thought up and completed an educational strategy lasting several years in order to gain access to the SSPSE. But herein does lie a point of necessity embedded in Albert’s trajectory: having no secondary exam, changing career to a different field (transversal mobility) is quite difficult. Whereas Jonas and Henriette in principle have acquired educational capital valid in the entire field of education, Albert’s educational capital is quite limited, and all but domain specific (i.e. social educator capital), condemning him to continue investing in the domain of social education, if he is to maintain his relative position.

Summing up, there are four points of strategic convergence between the three informants belonging to the Complex Outsiders class:

- Their decision to apply for the SSPSE is related to necessity, either by way of unsuccessful attempts at obtaining educational capital, or simply low amounts of institutionalised cultural capital. This translates both to a lack of economic capital, and subordinate positions in the social educational hierarchy.
- The SSPSE training is an investment that the informants expect to be worthwhile, by bringing returns in educational capital, economic capital, and improved positions in the domain of social education - social educator capital.
- The expectations to the content of the training is thus highly related to the knowledge aspects of the domain of social education. The training is expected to impart knowledge in the form of global theory, that underpins social educational practice. Such knowledge serves as legitimizing the position of the student, educational capital being of value when returning to the domain of social education.
- The education is not mainly meant to affect the agents’ practice, but rather to improve or reinforce the bargaining position of the informants, when facing colleagues, parents and administration.

This strategy, outlined by the above four points, I will term Necessary Knowledge Investments. It is a common feature of the informants belonging to the Complex Insiders class. The sociological pertinent feature of this class is the relatively low amount of educational capital - preparatory training is rare, and the Care Assistant training is common, and these properties assign their bearers to a dominated position in social educational work. Such a position disposes its occupants for attempting to ascend the hierarchy in work, by obtaining legitimation by way of education and consequently the training’s intrinsic properties are not immediately important.
In the following I will move on to the two other insider-classes, both of whom share a Health/Care-previous career.

10.4 Nurses and Social Health Assistants

The Nurses etc, and The Social Health Assistants, differs from the Complex Insiders discussed in the previous section, by possessing what I proposed be called cultural capital of Care. There are three informants who belong to these classes: Signe, Dennis, and Eva.

Eva and Dennis share Social Health Assistant Class membership, albeit with the important difference that Eva has completed the training and apprenticeship, whereas Dennis dropped out from the apprenticeship. Dennis has no secondary education, whereas Eva has completed vocational training. Thus their educational capital is comparable with the three Direct Insider informants discussed in the previous section.

This is not the case with the third informant, Signe. She has completed Upper 2nd school, and nurses’ training, making her educational trajectory stand out as both longer, and imbuing her with a greater amount of educational capital, although it is not immediately clear how convertible it is. Since she is the only member of the Nurses etc. class, I have chosen to analyse these two classes together, and explore the differences between them.

A first common feature of the trajectories of these three informants is that there is an aspect of attraction, or desire, in how they narrate their decision to apply to the SSPSE. In Signe’s case, it comes in the form of almost an epiphany, that she is good at working with people with autism spectrum disorders, and she consequently decides to become a social educator. Dennis‘ decision to become a social educator sprang from his drop out of the social health assistant apprenticeship, where he realised that he was actually quite happy with working in the leisure time care facility. Eva has worked for a long time and has been kept from applying by her family life:

**Group Sample 5**

Eva: I've been an assistant for seven years, (2) mostly in the nursery school and also up here in (.) Leisure time care facility (.) And I've (.) like Albert (.) been thinking for many years going but the training (.) I have to have it (.) at some point anyway. Umm (2) So I have four kids at home and I've sorta had to make it fit in with them getting old enough that (.) now it was time for Mum to get on with something[ JSEM /I:35]
Although she herself refers to Albert, there is in fact a difference in how Eva subjectively relates to the project of training. Albert says that he "would like to complete training as a social educator" [JSEM /I:29] to complete the training, and as discussed above he set a long term plan in motion in order to qualifying for admission, while waiting for his wife to complete her training. Eva already possesses the necessary qualifications, and it is a different kind of constraint, that has prevented her from enrolling. Eva has been working while having children, but enrolling in the training is different to her - perhaps distracting in a different way than working. The final statement in the quote above now it was time for Mum to get on with something indicates both that she has been waiting, even longing, for this opportunity, but also that she as a parent(Mum) needs to justify it in relation to her children. Eva has a subjective desire to get on with something, that she imagines will distract her from her children and this is why she has hesitated applying. Albert has had to postpone applying, until his wife completed her training. Eva and Albert thus has very different expectations as to how the training will affect their everyday life, and these differences stem from how they relate to the project of training: To Eva it is something she longs for and desires for herself, to Albert the training is part of a strategical ascension of the educational hierarchy. Turning back to Signe and Dennis, the element of desire in their narratives relate to their experiences with working in practice, and the subjective feeling and states this produced.

As discussed by Hultqvist(1988, 1998, 2001) and Muel-Dreyfus(1983) trust and intimacy with the educational system endows students possessing little cultural capital with a calling-like relation to the profession as they feel indebted to the state, whereas students with a higher amount of cultural capital are able to make more subtle use of the educational system, and see it as a tool, rather than a gift from a benevolent state.

In Signe’s case the desire aspect does take on such aspects of a calling. She narrates her realisation that she could be a social educator as an epiphany but also as something that was meant to be, that has always been the case, and she were just unable to see it herself.

it sorta frustrates me that I didn’t get it earlier () but well (1) yeah () so it goes () but () again somebody got it before I realised myself right (1) so at least three people knew that this was what I was meant to do () before I really knew myself (3)[Signe 420-421]

192 Eva’s husband is completely absent from her statements throughout the interviews.
Unlike Jonas, Henriette, or Anna Louise, Signe does not narrate her long work experience in social educational institutions as something that eventually leads to the training. She enters the domain of social education somewhat randomly, and realises that this is what she should do, and consequently starts making plans for becoming a social educator. And as was discussed in the previous chapter, Signe turns out to be quite resourceful in making the educational system work for her: first she obtains a deal with the her employer, the municipality, to support her economically beyond what she is entitled to, and when this arrangement falls through at the last minute, she arranges to switch from the ordinary social educator training programme to the SSPSE. Unlike the stories of Jonas and Albert about necessities, economy and postponements, Signe quickly manages to set herself up economically, indicative of a relationship to education as something to be navigated in, and made use of strategically.

Of all the informants, Signe is the most loyal to the training, the one who refers the most to the professional ethos. She comes to the training because her habitus allows her to navigate within the educational system, but she is left feeling indebted to that system.

Two quotes illustrate how Signe invests something personal and emotional into her thoughts of work. The first quote is Signe imitating and berating some of her former, older colleges at a special care institution, for their wage labour attitude towards the work as a social educator:

> **Signe**: My colleges were going stale (1) **uh** (2) **mm** (1) um thatum (.)
> Some of my older colleges they were there’ cause it’s money in the bank, every month andum [they go] now I’m fiftysomething so who the hell’s gonna hire my at some other place and I can’t be bothered to learn (.) here I know the schedule of each day [...] and so I guess I really got kinda scared that I could end up like them’ cause I would never want that [...] but I’ve seen a few where (.) also the way they act towards their [clients] or whomever they’re taking care of it’s I feel it’s a bit like (.) that (.) That’s almost abuse right[ Signe 460-468]

Signe assumes working too long in one place leads to indifference and emotional displacement, and this incompatible with how the job should be done. In the preceding parts of the interview, she relates this to herself:

> Because I also have to (.) [the work] has to give me something, before I can give something to others (.) If I’m to be there for this group of people then I have to constantly want to come there or else it’ll be negative stuff I give’ em then it’ll be (.) then I might accidentally start treating them as if they’re a burden (.) and (.) that that I can’t countenance right[ Signe 450-452]
She does not require her work to do something to her personally because this would be more fulfilling - rather such subjective benefit enables her to do her work as a social educator in a proper and respectful way. Here Signe expresses an ethos that seems common to her former career, and her current training. A related point is made in the group interview:

**Group sample 6**

“Signe: that week up until we were to begin the exam task (.) you were told one thing Monday, and then when we evaluated and you’d **struggled** to get that task done in those three or four days (.) and then when we evaluated on Friday (.) there’s NV up there saying the opposite of what he said Monday

Anita: mm

Signe: And that makes me feel kinda (.) can’t you remember five days back (.) what(.) if you’re contradicting yourself (.) how do I (.) what am I supposed to work from right

Dennis: mmm

Signe: ‘cause again (.) I can’t just look it up in the study programme and go COM exam and check up this and that and the other thing [...]  

Anita: there’re several who thought that at the exam (.) that he said something (.) that they then did something at the exam (.) which then turned out to be wrong

Signe: exactly

Anita: right”[KSEM I/355-362]

That exam is a point of anxiety is no surprise, but Signe’s frustration is connected to the lack of clear communication from the teachers. Here, she is in accordance with the frustrations of Dennis, when he cannot discern what he perceives as rules, and this perhaps indicates the different capacities provided by educational capital, compared to social educator capital. As we shall see, such anxieties as to exam success concerns the older students with social educator capital less. At a point in the group interview, [KSEM I/390 ]Signe also states that she assumed her Health studies exam would be a breeze, because of her nurse training - yet in the end this turns out not to be the case. Signe is realizing here, that there are other mechanisms at work in the domain of social educator training than only educational capital.

Signe also reminisces about how she were able to get a hyperactive and anxiety ridden autistic adult to relax [Signe 414] as part of what made her realise she would be a good social educator, and so Signe in general connects work, training and ethos in similar ways: the social educator **calling** - a desire to train and do caring for a living.
Dennis’ narrative and the way his expectations of the training are formed could be described as an inversion of Signe’s narrative. Dennis was in primary school the object of partial exclusion and dropped out of social health training after realising he was about to fail his apprenticeship. He narrates how he came to realise that his experiences working in the leisure time care facility was when he felt the most in touch with the clients he was working with, something he berated the social health assistant work for lacking. But upon enrolling, Dennis experiences demands he cannot decode, structures he does not understand, and tuition that wastes his time. Whereas Signe is being indebted to the educational system, Dennis feels he is being let down.

The two of them has several fierce disagreements in the group interviews, which are quite revealing of their respective loyalty and frustration. I have chosen one example of such a disagreement, but the interviews contain several with very similar structure: Dennis criticises something for being a waste of time or too lax, whereupon Signe (and in this case, Anita) disagrees, and attempts to demolish Dennis arguments, claiming it to be inconsistent, misunderstood or both, transferring the responsibility for the training making sense to Dennis, reiterating the *Take, Don’t Get*-figure.

The following example is an abridged version (I have cut out two longer explanations by Signe), and the actual content is not as important as the structure of the discussion. It concerns a brief course introducing the student to the six Arts and Activity subjects (AA): Environmental studies, Music, Movement and Physical education, Drama, Arts and Crafts, and Danish/Media. Shortly after this introduction the class of SSPSE students are to select two of these, which they will then study in their third term. Dennis is the last of the group to comment on a question I posed: “How do you imagine you benefit from studying here?”

**Group Sample 7**

*Dennis: [...] There was too much that was (.) in my opinion (.) sort of didn’t matter (.) there were too many of the practical subjects which (.) music and (.) rhythms and so on (.) some were more relevant than others (.) for instance I didn’t think music (.) I don’t think you could use that really (.) [...] I’d hoped that I’d gotten more (.) the only thing I could use was that I learned some new words for the things I’ve already done often (1) eh but I think the theory part was fine (.) only there ought to be more of it (.) a bit earlier*

*Anita: Inaudible, overlaps with Signe>*

193 Later on in this chapter - in section 10.7 - I will examine several examples of interacting strategies in further details.
Signe: but it was just an introduction to it [...]  
Dennis: yeah  
Signe: because you only had 14 lessons in those AA subjects didn’t you  
Dennis: sure  
Signe: and so you can’t really expect that much  
Dennis: no but I thought it was a waste (.) I would rather have done without it  
Signe: but then you wouldn’t have anything to base your decision on when you have to decide[...]  
Anita: Exactly  
Signe: also it’s <inaudible Signe and Anita talking at the same time>  
Anita: That’s what it was supposed to be too (.) It's to introduce [us] to them  
Signe: mmm Dennis: yes  
Anita: so you can decide from that right [KSEM /I:146-165]  

Anita and Signe are literally getting in each others way, in their eagerness to put Dennis assessment of the AA introduction into what they feel is the correct context. They do so by insisting that Dennis adjust his expectations and assess the introduction as a short introduction. The argument they make essentially reiterates the framing of the introduction as made by the teachers, alluding to common experiences. They do so by referring to headings and keywords in short burst like statements, which seemingly serve to remind Dennis of the purpose as it has been presented to them all. Effectively they are making it clear to Dennis that he believe he has neither understood the purpose of the training he was exposed to, nor the explanations he has been given of the structure of the training. To their eyes, his demands are irrelevant and he is not shouldering the responsibility for the training himself\(^{194}\).  

Dennis felt that his time was wasted, and his expectations were not being met. Dennis does not clarify his expectations that much; the above reference to something he could use hints at applicability as a central demand. But from the biographical interview and Weber’s analysis of complaints (Weber 2001) I also believe that Dennis disapproval of numerous subjects and facets of the training are to taken as an indication of his own relation to the training in general, rather than at face value. Dennis has great difficulties in decoding the principles organising the training and this frustrates him. This frustration tinges his entire relation to the training. When Dennis is put in a group interview setting, his  

\(^{194}\) These interactions should also been understood in the light of the implicit teacher-student relation, that characterise my presence in the interviews. Signe and Anita not only disagree with Dennis, but also want to ensure that his representation of the training does not reach my ears undisputed - they do not want to appear to me as if they, too, have failed be responsible for their own training. In short I believe that they are also here relating to me as an evaluative authority, representing the training.
frustration and uncertainty is not shared by the other students, and Dennis feels exposed. In effect, the introduction presupposes the training making sense, and Dennis does not share this presupposition.

A final discussion between Dennis and Signe show how their perceptions of the training differs, and how this widens to encompass the domain of social education as well. I ask the group whether their training makes them more or less uncertain in relation to returning to their work in social educational institutions:

Group sample 8

“Dennis: it might be hard getting out of the um box you’re in or the position you’ve got in (.) the whole system (.) I think that when I get back [...] you’ll actually return to your own [position] if you’re not careful (.) And if you don’t get back there (.) Then your colleagues will certainly help you get back in line (.) ‘Cause that’s the spot they expect you to occupy when you get back too

Signe: are you sure about that (1) because I have a clear idea that if I were to come back to the autism centre they would expect that it was [...] an assistant with a bit sharper tools in the shed than when she left them”

[KSEM I/827-828]

The expectations of Dennis and Signe differs, showing how the capacity for making sense of the training corresponds with the expectations of what position one can come to occupy, when returning to the work. Dennis’ perception of the training as not giving him what he expects or needs translates to less optimistic expectation to himself and to his colleagues, whereas Signe expects of her colleagues that they should expect more from her, now that she has trained - a structure of expectations similar to how she expects her co-students and teachers to possess a capacity for dedicated investment in the training similar to her own.

The relation to training that Signe (and Anita) espouses centres on the ethos, and entails making(producing) sense of the training in the educational domain. This is only a tenable position, if one possesses a capacity for confidence in the meaningfulness of education as a strategy for improving ones situation socially and economically. Signe’s narrative indicates she does possess sufficient cultural or educational capital. Dennis, has no distinctive educational capital, nor did his parents. The disagreement above is essentially about this opposition in relations to education, and capacities for making sense of the training as a part of the

195 On one occasion Jonas sides with Dennis, and this disagreement has a completely different dynamic. It is a discussion about the difficulties of SSPSE students returning to the social educational places of work after graduating, and it is cited in Group sample 8 above.
field of education. In simpler terms, there is an opposition here between an ethos of caring and an perception of training as specific to the work. The combination of the ethos of caring (which coincides with the cultural capital of care) and educational capital provides Signe with a capacity, that Dennis does not possess. Eva in fact displays a similar capacity, when she responds to some of Albert’s criticisms (as cited above) about the training focussing excessively on him as a person:

**Group Sample 9**

_Eva: growing personally it also comes from things being done the way they are being done (.) maybe we should look at it the other way and say(,) It’s just as much for that [the teachers] choose to do it (,) going in and asking directly why is it that you (,) think like you do(,) you bloody have to reach in and look at how you feel (,) what my opinion on this [JSEM /I:697]

Eva does not possess any substantial educational capital, yet she seems to be able to make sense of the training nonetheless. This is possibly related to her age and to the fact that she is enrolled with a different purpose than the three younger informants discussed here - we shall see that the Outsiders - Jytte and Anna Louise - possess similar capacities.

There are thus two points of convergence and one point of divergence common to the informants who belong to these two classes. The points of convergence are

- Training as a social educator is desirable, rather than necessary. There are no immediate economical or structural incitements, that press these informants into applying of the training. The incitements to obtain additional educational capital is narrated to stem from their own subjective relation to social educational work and practice.
- This subjective relationship contains aspects of caring, and the relationship to the work is spoken of in terms of care rather than, say, knowledge. The experiences of work as embedded in relations to clients shows up in their narratives, and is part of the reason they applied. In short, the agents have incorporated an ethos of caring.

Both of these points relate to converting cultural capital of care. This educational strategy I will therefore term Care-based Educational Ascent. All the informants above are attempting to make use of the educational system to achieve something less tangible than the solutions to the economic or work hierarchy situations found with the complex insiders in the previous section.
There are elements of making use of the educational system, but with references back to the relational aspects of the work.

This leads me to the point of divergence:

- The Care-based Educational Ascent strategy requires a capacity to make use of the educational system, which can be derived from cultural capital, and this allows the informants to make sense of the training, and believe in the illusio of the educational game. But in the cases where such capacity and capital are absent, the opposite occurs: distrust, frustration, and the illusio of the educational game is dispelled.

It seems likely, that the point of divergence here, may coincide with the separation between Nurses etc. and Social/Health Assistants, the latter being less likely to possess much educational capital.

I have argued above how this strategy relates to educational capital, but the latter point here illustrates that there are differences in the amount of capital between the students from the two health/care classes. Signe’s cultural capital of care in fact functions as informational capital her - she is aware of ways the ethos of the domain of social educational work can be applied in social educator training. That care is central to this strategy may in fact stem from the professional discourses of nursing and social health work, which both refers to care as a central and peculiar aspect of their professional skills - cultural capital of care.

10.5 Straight Ones

Making any solid statements about this class is hampered by the fact that Anita it its only member interviewed. I will restrict myself to some broad speculations here, but they must be read as only an outline.

The discussion above with Signe and Dennis demonstrated that Anita possesses the cultural prerequisites for taking responsibility for her own training, not only relating to the domain of social education, but also in the domain of social educator training. This is similar to what characterized Signe in the previous section.

However, Anita says very little about her decision to enroll at the SSPSE except that when she moved to Copenhagen she applied to the ordinary social educator training, and then changed her mind, when she realized the cost of living in Copenhagen. So she saved for some years, and then applied for the
SSPSE. She seems to have been quite firmly decided upon training as a social educator, and in that, and her original decision to aim for the realtor training there is perhaps the gist of her relation towards the educational system. This is somewhat similar to Signe’s relation to education. Anita seems to have been quite decided upon training as a social educator and (also like Signe) there is a clear connection between working in social education and becoming a social educator.

As she turns to describing her experiences as a student of the SSPSE, this tends to be confirmed, as she is very happy about the training and in particular mentions the practical training in Environmental studies, and sees a number of ways to apply it to her current work with a young disabled boy. When Anita tells of her being hired to her current job as a home teacher for an autistic boy she almost overflows emotionally:

I was asked to look at their homepage um (1) which has pictures of him and which has well everything since um when he was born, and until they found out he had brain damage and the whole course of events and that stuff and () read all this and saw pictures of him and I thought that that boy I’m going to () I’m going take care of him you know he wasem () he’s um () but right he’s just really tsss () little () boy you just wanna grab right [Anita 713-715]

Later she goes into to minute detail of the methods she has been taught as part of working with him. It seems that Anita is mostly concerned with the ethos and purposefulness of the training.

Anita and Signe are thus quite similar - but as they are also similar in respects not part of the geometric data analysis, is becomes difficult to discern what can in fact be related to class, and that should rather be seen as related to a combination of gender, age, marital status, and areas of work experience. These are all points of close relatedness between Signe and Anita. What I believe can be said, is that Anita incarnates an educational strategy of self-evidence. Unlike all other informants, she does not need to establish her choice of training in contrast to any former career or training, that she has broken away from. While the foundations for this are the slimmest possible, I would hazard a guess that the class of Straight Ones may be characterized by precisely such strategy, mediating preconsciously between that of the Complex Insiders, and the two Health/Care-based classes - seeing the training as neither a loss of status, nor as a desirous calling, but rather as a natural possibility when choosing education. Such an interpretation would fit nicely with the claim that the Straight Ones are the core potential recruitment base for the SSPSE.
10.6 Outsiders

The Outsider class is represented by Jytte and Anna Louise, whose trajectories are also indirect. The Outsider aspect of the first axis is all but unrepresented by my informants, as discussed in chapter 8. The discussion in this section is thus restricted to the kind of Outsiders I have in fact been able to interview.

The first common feature of those informants, Jytte and Anna Louise, is their age, as they are both in the older half of the SSPSE student population. Age and Outsider trajectories are, unsurprisingly, often connected, as an Outsider trajectory means having trained and worked in a different field prior to accumulating sufficient social educational work experience to be admitted to the SSPSE. Both of Jytte’s and Anna Louise’s trajectories do involve work that fall well outside of what the social educator profession conventionally has been associated with: Jytte was a prison officer, and Anna Louise worked as a medical laboratory assistant.

Glancing at the other two older informants in my study, such an outsider career is not present with either of them: Henriette’s work career is entirely within social education, and Eva previous career was an Insider Career, as Social Health assistant. I will thus underscore the fact that age does not necessarily imply a career change nor a propensity to abstain from education while employed as unskilled labour in social education, which is basically what the distinctions between complex-simple and direct-indirect also encapsulates.

When examining their interviews, expectations of the training is a topic rarely touched upon. Anna Louise did not herself come upon the idea of the SSPSE; her superior suggested it to her in response to her frustrations of lack of courses in her current work. As discussed in the biographical section on Anna Louise, she both doubted that the training would actually lead to her learning anything new, since she had so much experience with children prior to being admitted. Mostly she seemed to expect that she would be able to present her arguments more convincing to parents, in her social educational work. Yet in the group interview, she notes the importance of her classmates in the SSPSE study groups:

**Group Sample 10**

Anna Louise: suddenly you get three others in (.) and (.) it does too make you question (.) how you think of it yourself right (.) and I think that’s nice (.) that it’s not just one self um (.) who has another opinion (.) and thinks that that’s right no you can actually look at it in many ways (.) and that can actually help to like (.) to change you (.) and I guess you get more [...] tolerant like
Albert: Mm

Anna Louise: more open minded (.) don’t you [...] and that’s (.) I think
maybe (.) like (.) that’s actually a bit important to us as SSPSE students
because (.) you really are used to some habits[ JSEM /I 363-365]

Anna Louise does see a need for herself to change perspective somehow, but
the source of such learning is her co-students, and she seems to have a quite
solid trust in them and their knowledge, just as she is confident about her own
social educational proficiencies196.

At the same time, she gives the impression of being a very conscientious stu-
dent, most forcefully as I am setting up the biographical interview. She was quite
worried about possibly having to cancel the interview, and in general wants to
be a helpful informant, and live up to whatever expectations I might have of
her. At one point in the group interview when discussing supervision Anna
Louise also espouses the position that it is the responsibility of the students to
learn something from the supervision:

**Group Sample 11**

Anna Louise: you should see it as an opportunity for getting (.) response
Albert: yeah

Anna Louise: on what you’ve actually been doing
Albert: yeah

Anna Louise: in the group right (.) [...] I mean she’s not actually, really
she could be indifferent I mean (2) it’s us (.) who have to get something
from it [ JSEM /I 431-437]

Anna Louise thus accepts that the job of the teacher supervising the group is
to offer up opportunities to the students, and in connection with the previous
quote on the costudents her expectations emphasise the framework that enables
the SSPSE students to explore knowledge, which is already in their possession.
Anna Louise thus tries to be a quite diligent student, siding with the teacher and
takes on the responsibility of making sense of the training, and steering her
own course. She adheres by the catch phrase, *taking* rather than *getting*.

Jytte more or less shares these expectations and relations. Her original deci-
sion to apply comes about after a serious illness forced her to scale down from
the diploma programme in social education she was studying at the time, and
the SSPSE training enabled her to stay working within care. In the group in-
terview, Jytte tells about how she and her group has gone about obtaining an
overall understanding of social educational theories:

---

196 As mentioned in an earlier footnote, statements such as these hint at a potential for an social capital
interpretation of the SSPSE class. Yet I have not found enough material - or spent sufficient time tracing
it - to be able to construct any solid interpretations.
Group Sample 12

Jytte: *but who did Giddens get his (.) because he’s also gotten it*
Eva: *yeah that’s right*
Jytte: *from somewhere*
Eva: *yeah*
Jytte: *and we’re struggling with that now*
Eva: *really.*
Jytte: *So we’ve simply made this binder now with (.) psychologists sociologists and philosophers (.) and then we wrote who [...] wrote something down on what they are and what they stand for (.) what kind of theories they made [JSEM /I:761 769]*

This complex and difficult endeavour bears witness to the diligent attitude with which Jytte approaches her training. It is completely unlike the strategies adopted by Dennis in his attempts at navigating in the training. I term this diligence. Jytte’s training is likely what teachers have in mind, when extolling taking the training, and Dennis’ repeated demands for an explanation of what he is supposed to do conversely belongs under the heading of erroneously assuming that social educator training is something you get.

Jytte also protests when Albert vents his frustrations about the teachers focussing on him rather than on social education. Jytte posits that the questions that relate to Albert personally are in fact the teacher gauging how he incorporates the social educational knowledge:

Group Sample 13

Jytte: *She is often addressing how you actually (.) or that’s what I experience her (.) She doesn’t ask directly (.) but indirectly (.) how did you actually take in this learning (4)[JSEM /I:562]*

Throughout the interview, Jytte verbosity explains the terms and structure of the training, and what the teachers’ ideas behind them are, further demonstrating her solidarity with the teacher perspective on the training, and her own loyalty towards it.

It is remarkable, that Anna Louise and Jytte share such a loyalty and responsibility towards the training, when they both arrived at applying to the SSPSE as a sort of fall-back solution; Jytte because of her illness, and Anna Louise’s superior suggested to her that she should enroll, after several of social educational courses had fallen through for her [Anna Louise 176]. And of course Anna Louise mentions both her age and her great experience as reason for abstaining from training, or having little benefit from it.

This should probably again be seen in the light of the capacity for using the educational system strategically. Anna Louise was brought up close to a teachers college where her father worked, and went to primary school at a practice school
at the teachers college. Her own children has gone to independent schools, all indicating that Anna Louise considers school to be a matter of options and strategical choice. Jytte was changing careers and planned leaving work as a prison officer, and this led to her enrolling at a social educational diploma programme. Such programmes does not certify their students for any one specific occupation or profession, and do in fact not clearly address any specific employment - in the terms of Hultqvist, here one does not become something. Thus Jytte has not made a particularly obvious choice of further education in order to enable career change. She does not say what her strategy exactly was, but that there was one (and the choice was not random) indicates that Jytte also strategical utilises the educational system. Her choice of the SSPSE comes about because she wanted to

**Group Sample 14**

Jytte: ...maintain(...) close to the line I just had, Care studies (...) And so I chose to(...) train as a social educator (...) [JSEM /1:38].

The five common points of how these two informants relate to the training are thus

- They are both diligent students, meaning that they responsibly and seriously work at fulfilling the tasks set for them in the training, and feel responsible towards the teachers who set the tasks.
- They are loyal to the structure and pedagogy of the training. They accept the reasoning presented for the training being set up as it is, or construct such reasoning themselves in solidarity with the teachers, and they accept responsibility for charting their own course of learning and meaning from the tuition and lessons on offer.
- The training was neither necessary nor a dream for them. They both wanted something else as part of career related further education, and ended up settling for social education as a perfectly acceptable fall-back choice.
- They both seem to make quite reflected and strategical use of the educational system, and their investments are not following conventional pathways to neither social educator or any other profession or vocation.
- They are both relatively old compared to the rest of the SSPSE student population, and have had jobs outside of the domain of social education. Their educational strategy seem slightly at odds with itself, because while they posses both a belief in the purpose of the training and are loyal towards it, they did originally want another kind of training. This would likely predispose them for being more reluctant to completely rely on the training. I believe that this should be interpreted in the light of their age: Unlike Anita or Signe, the SSPSE training is not Jytte’s or Anna Louise’s first step onto the career ladder of social
education - it is rather their last. Anna Louise makes this clear by saying she
would not enrol if she had reached fifty years of age. For that reason, Jytte and
Anna Louise’s purpose of enrolling is neither job nor financial security, nor is
it to ascend the hierarchy of their places of work. Or, in Bertaux’ terminology,
you are not seeking to alter, but sustain their structural biographical state, which
is similar to the older care assistants studied by Bryderup et.al. (2000).
Anna Louise was concerned with passing on the cultural heritage of her own
upbringing, and Jytte chose a form of further education that does not lead to
any specific vocation until her illness. Thus, it would seem that their strategy
of education relates primarily to their subjective biographical states: there is
an inner biographical crisis or ambivalence, in light of which they accept the
training. Thus their position differs from the desire for training that imbued Eva,
Signe and Dennis; because their desire was related directly to the care aspects
of their work. In the case of Jytte and Anna Louise, the loyalty and diligence is
not derived from care of clients, but from subjective biography.

I will be terming this strategy Voluntary Diligence, underscoring that there is
neither need nor necessity in this strategy. The strategy subjectively relates to
narratives of being older, facing the winding down of working life, yet wanting
to reflect upon ones own practice and life, and obtain knowledge related to that.
In terms of capital this strategy does mean converting in particular social edu-
cator capital to institutionalized capital, but there appears to be little emphasis
on the economic or positional gains this may provide.

I want to make it absolutely clear that this strategy and the analysis from which
it was derived does not encompass all outsiders in the population. The absent
outsiders (discussed in chapter 8) who were not willing to be interviewed are
generally males in the thirties, vocationally trained, with a career as craftsmen.
That their educational strategy should be Voluntary Diligence should be a most
surprising finding, and is in fact gainsaid by how they act in the classroom, as I
shall return to in chapter 12. The above strategy only characterises the part of
the outsiders that I have in fact had access to in the interviews: the outsiders
with Complex trajectories. Outsiders with Simple trajectories most likely has
different educational strategies and I posited a guess as to how their relation to
the training might look in the previous chapter( cf. Section 9.4.1)
10.7 Strategies in the Space of Trajectories

In the previous four sections, I constructed three separate educational strategies - Necessary Knowledge Investment, Care-Based Educational Ascent, and Voluntary Diligence, and the sketch of a strategy related to Self-evidence, concerning the Straight Ones. In this section, I will try to outline their relation to the space of trajectories. But before doing so, there are a few reservations I need to make. First of all, the number of informants limits the precision of such a relation. While I believe that the classes provide a fairly firm foundation for exploring the space of strategies, there are few member of each class, and several groupings which are not present at all. The absent outsiders has already been discussed, but there are at least two other strategies, which I find conspicuous in their absence. First, there are no students who consider the training a possible way of access to further training. Several universities in Denmark - most
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prominently The Danish School of Education, Aarhus University\textsuperscript{197} - offers training continuing directly from completed social educator training. None of my informants mention any such notions. Nor are there any of my informants who state that social educator training has been their vocational dream since childhood or something similar. Albert’s long-term-strategy for obtaining the training is somewhat similar, but still it is a strategy, that is remarkable in its absence. The absence of these two strategies either hint at an omission on my part, in selecting informants, or a feature of the recruitment of the SSPSE. I am leaning towards the latter, but this is a matter of opinion or assumption, rather than analysis: that a student with a truly long-held dream of the social educator vocation would perhaps be more likely to avail him- or her-self of the ordinary training; and aiming at further training after graduating as social educator is likely to entail surviving on a students’ grant, or both working and studying part-time. Since the informants all note that this is a tenuous and difficult situation, it is likely that the prospect of further training appears unattractive.

Having made the above reservations, I have in graph 10.1 plotted the strategies in the plane of first and second axis in the space of modalities. I have done so by positioning the strategies along the edge of the space roughly in the direction of the classes they are associated with. Such an illustration should be seen as mere illustration. It is a rough guide to how the strategies I have constructed analytically in the above discussions can be located in the space. In the next section, I will try to explore the relations between strategies, in order to describe all of them more precisely.

10.8 Interacting Strategies

In the following sections, I will try, by examining three short sections of dialogue between the students, to establish how the relations of dominance connect the strategies, and consequently the classes. It is important here to remember that while the interviews were framed by the training and directed towards the training by me, there is an important undercurrent of the domain of social education and the nomos and ethos of that field, which are also present for the informants. Their relations do not belong to one domain, nor do they refrain from straying from the domain of social educator training and into the domain of social education.

\textsuperscript{197} http://dpu.dk/site.aspx?p=6515 for an overview of the numerous offers of training for amongst others, NISE graduates.
There are very severe limits as to how exact such an analysis can be, in my case. The relations I examine are by necessity between a few very specific students, and as I shall discuss in the samples chosen below, there are several cases, where there may be several forms of dominance which my interpretation cannot disentangle. And - as the previous sentence reveals - the word interacting in the heading of this section should not be mistaken for a new theoretical perspective - it is synonymous to relating, but as the strategies are analytical extensions of the informants as agents in the group interviews, using the word relations seemed to be confusing; after all a strategy seems an entity unlikely to relate itself.

10.8.1 Educational Capital and Work Ethos

The first sample is from a discussion on working in groups. It stems from the second group interview with the KSEM group.

**Group Sample 15**

Me: Does this teamwork work out, so that you do equal work, do you make it work so that you share the load like that
Jonas: I can only speak for myself okay
Dennis: oh sure
Jonas: we’ve got () We’ve got this workhorse in our project group who just well
Signe <laughing>
Me: <laughing>
Signe: oh you’re just mean Jonas <laughing>
Jonas:no but it is really() For instance yesterday right after we’d been having(),well()
Signe: bad supervision
Jonas:after we’d been having supervision and working in the group()[...] and all that then she goes back home and writes minutes and a schedule for what we’ve got to do in the coming [weeks] right () Got a textmessage you’ve got mail right () at about eight or()
Signe: half past () no <laughing>
Jonas: [...] so I’m sitting there well and I haven’t gotten further than () Well, I’m sitting with my daughter on my lap right ()
Me: mmmm
Jonas: so like that it’s kind of a bit () sort of feeling a little guilty towards Signe that way right yes [KSEM/2 465-478]

While Jonas tells us two things here - he does not work as hard as he feels should, and this is in part because of his family, and Signe is working very
hard, and setting the tone for their group - Signe appear to say very little. She is partially flattered by Jonas’ story, and does acknowledge it, while modestly making a show of being insulted. Yet as we saw in the previous chapter, Signe does in fact disapprove strongly when her co-students do not make what she sees as the necessary effort. The sequence above shows Jonas recognizing the culturally dominated position he occupies in relation to Signe. And Jonas is in part also launching a slight protest, by referring in passing to his family, which in his narrative played a central part in preventing him from following a more educationally ambitions trajectory. As such the above sample shows Jonas accepting as legitimate the dominant position of Signe, by relating it to himself, and his own trajectory.

I have attempted to depict the interaction in graph 10.2, by way of the plane of the first two axes, and from this we can see that Jonas and Signe’s relation is almost only structured by the second axis.

Graph 10.2: Signe and Jonas in the first principal plane
The graph indicates that the cultural capital of care seems to be dominating the social educator capital in so far as the former is combined with educational capital. Signe’s educational capital, a relation of dominance moving from south-west to north-west in the graph above\textsuperscript{198} - or in other terms, the Care-Based Educational Ascent strategy is in a dominating relation to the Necessary Knowledge Investment–strategy.

10.8.2 Illusio and The Object of Study

The attitude taken towards the training reflects the degree to which the expectations of the individual are met by the educational system, both in terms of assessments and pedagogy such expectations reflecting the specific socialisation of the informants’ social origin. These expectations differ as much in how the informants assume the educational system to be \textit{pliable}: that is, something that can be used in different ways, and which offer different sorts of opportunities, or \textit{rigid}: that is, treating all applicants and students the same, and having only few points of access, and a strict connection between such points of access and the nature of the qualifications obtained in the end. I have discussed the nature of Dennis’ inability to sustain the illusio in the educational game of SSPSE, when confronted by aspects of the training he lacks the capacity for making sense of. Something partially similar is present in the way Albert relates to the training. The quote put in group sample 4 hint at this, and it is even more evident in the following quote. Albert and Jytte are assessing the introduction to the training, from the first week after they started:

\textbf{Group Sample 16}

\textit{Albert:} well it (.) I (2) felt long before the (.) introduction was over that now I’ d like to get on and open a book right (2) I though it was a long time before something really happened [...]  
\textit{Jytte:} When you say that I feel that when we (.) we started here the first days (.) I was impressed with the reception we got because we were actually taken really good care of (.) we were counselled and we were (.) shown round (.) And there were mentors for us and (.) well but they really tried creating really really safe surroundings for us (.) so that it was (.) it was good to enter

\textsuperscript{198} It is a common convention that maps showing relations of dominance are rotated so that dominance is depicted as moving from above to below, and from right to left. In my work with these plots, I have often come to take this ordering of relations for granted, and for that reason i have chosen to neither rotate my plots, nor use the up-down/left-right terms, instead employing north/south/east/west.
Albert does not feel that he needs comforting or to be made to feel safe when starting; he is here to study, and what he encounters does not fit with his pre-conception of studying. He is literally identifying learning with books, and knowledge rather than nurture and social relations. It is a similar reaction to that of Dennis, in that they both feel they know what they want and need from the training, and they are being presented with some quite different things. But while Dennis is frustrated when he cannot discern what is expected of him, Albert (Cf. Group quote 4) recognises that he is being exposed to pedagogy. He is objecting to being put in a pedagogical relation which objectifies him - that is, makes his opinions and their origin an object of discussion. Albert’s illusion is harder to sustain in the face of being made the object of analysis himself - and in the end, this is a specific confrontation with the academic dominance of institutionalized cultural capital, and the consequently dominated position of himself and the social educator capital he possesses.

In the quote above, Jytte responds to Albert by emphatically embracing the pedagogy of the NISE, and stating that she was satisfied with the introduction. It is not that she does not recognise the pedagogical devices of the NISE, it is just that she relies on the training and the NISE, and is pleased to be in their hands. The following quote demonstrates Jytte both recognising the pedagogy but also accepting it:

**Group Sample 17**

Jytte: Yeah it’s made so fucking important all the time (.) right (.) you could say (.) say no (.) they make such an effort to tell us that there isn’t anything that right or wrong (.) but there just is (.) right (.) else she wouldn’t sit and correct our tasks [JSEM /I:453]

Like Dennis, Jytte recognises that there are implicit demands at work, but unlike Dennis, this does not completely frustrate her; she accepts taking responsibility for her own training, and is able to sustain an illusion, even though she spots contradictions in the training.

There is an important aspect of how one conceives training at issue here. To what extent is the reflexive relation to oneself a part of the curriculum? Jytte states above that being taken care of and feeling safe is a relevant part of becoming a student. As she considers her relation to herself a legitimate part of the curriculum, and one that may be exposed to teacher scrutiny, then it is reasonable to want reassurance and safety as part of the introduction to the domain of social educator training. As we saw previously, such is not the case for neither Albert nor Dennis.

The relations as they plot in the space of trajectories is illustrated in graph 10.3.
This graph shows how the dominance relation of Jytte and Albert (and less remarkably, that of Signe and Dennis) is ordered by the third axis. This was the axis of trajectory complexity, and it opposed institutionalised cultural capital to social educator capital. In other words, the Voluntary Diligence strategy dominates the Necessary Knowledge Investment-strategy.

Graph 10.3 Albert and Jytte in second principal plane

**10.8.3 Taking Instead of Getting**

The final sample of interaction in the interviews was occasioned by the students being informed, on the day of the interview, that the teachers will be present for a much shorter time than the students expected, at a simultaneous marketplace show of all the student projects. During the interview Eva raises this as a disappointment:

---

**Group Sample 18**

_Eva:_ I’m very concerned if (.) how (.) what we end up with afterwards when it’s all done (.) is it just (.) has it all just been (.) [nothing to show for it]

_Jytte:_ yes but
Eva: where you think (.) will you look at that (.) that was a lotta work (.) but (.) what did we really gain from this in the end?  
Jytte: it’s <inaudible> 
Anna Louise: think of it as working for your own sake  
Eva: yeah  
Anna Louise: I do think it’s really great [JSEM/1:504-506]

Eva’s response to the absence of the teachers is that this reduces the meaningfulness of the presentation to her. She expects the teachers’ presence: if they are not there to assess the presentation, how will she learn anything? In order for the situation to become meaningful as learning, Eva seems to require a sanctioning that what goes on is relevant, correct or of sufficient level. Anna Louise demonstrates then how to reconstruct the situation as learning. She responds to Eva’s disappointment by expressing how the responsibility for making sense and learning, could be taken over by Eva herself. In effect, Anna Louise is representing the Take, Don’t Get educational way of thought to Eva here. The discussion about this presentation goes on, and Anna Louise goes even further, by accepting that the explanation for the teachers absence “... must be something about working hours (.) right (.) it must be something about something (.) practical and some-

Graph 10.4: Eva and Anna Louise in first principal plane
thing economical” [JSEM /I:535] Anna Louise then goes on to suggest that the students should just stay longer and spend the time they feel they need even if the teachers cannot be there, which the group comes to agree with her about. Thus, what Eva introduces as a disappointment about lack of purpose and meaning is transformed into a suggestion on how the informants themselves should and could take responsibility for enabling such purpose and meaning. The discussion shows both how Anna Louise’s illusio does not falter, and how Eva’s initial expectations of the training potentially deprives her of the capacity to sustain illusio. Eva is thus possibly teetering on the edge of not trusting the training, but here her costudents reinforce her. This is also an illustration of how the NISEs pedagogy shapes the interactions of the student peer group. It seems likely that such a reproduction of the institutional logic also takes places within the classrooms and group sessions.

Graph 10.4 illustrates how these interactions are located in the space of trajectories. It indicates a dominance relation where the Care-Based Educational ascent-strategy is dominated by the Voluntary Diligence-Strategy. Eva represents a case of cultural capital of care, which is not combined with generalised educational capital, as was the case with Signe.

10.9 Shape and Adequacy of Educational Strategies

Summing up, I have constructed three strategies, related to the classes: The Complex Insiders share the strategy I termed Necessary Knowledge Investment; The Nurses etc and The Social-Health Assistants shared the Care-based Educational Ascent, which differed as to how much educational capital the agents possess; and the Outsiders - the ones present amongst my informants - shared the Voluntary Diligence Strategy. They have here been listed in ascending order of dominance, although the domination occurs in different dimensions - the Complex Insiders’ strategy is dominated along the second axis by the two classes with the Care-Based Educational Ascent strategy, and along the third axis by the Outsiders - and the Outsiders dominated the Care-based Educational Ascensionists along the second axis. I have not been able to discern any dominance along the first axis, which is most likely explained by the fact that I have no Simple Outsiders as informants.

These relations of dominance were constructed by examining recurring differences of opinion as to what the training is meant to do. What can one reasonably expect, and how to make sense of what one did not expect - such
strands of perception have been crucial to exploring the strategies. When the tuition does not focus on knowledge, or the teacher does not provide clear or consistent answers, or is not available at evaluations or presentations - all of these elements are perceived by several informants as expectations that have been let down - and they are also connected by the catch-phrase of *taking, not getting* training. The unmet expectations all fall under the heading of the training being explicit about what students are to do, and how. The events that fail to meet these expectations all fall under the heading of students being expected to navigate and make sense - *produce sense* - themselves. The dominance relations of strategies relates to the students’ varying capacities for either generating congruent expectations, or adapting to unmet expectations. Dennis has throughout found such events to be frustrating to the point of the unendurable. Albert recognizes that he is exposes to a particular form of pedagogy, but dislikes it strongly. Henriette literally takes the responsibility of keeping up with the teachers’ ambitions of the training on her own shoulders, yet also fears that she may drop out, rather than complete the training. Eva has difficulties with the absent teachers at the presentation, but comes to see how she can make the event meaningful herself. Signe, Anita and Jonas only protest the apparent teacher inconsistencies, when related to exam. And finally, Jytte and Anna Louise appear to possess expectations that actually match the training itself.

These expectations are also expectations as to *the form of the return of the investments* the informants are making. Possessing different sets of categories of perception and appraisal of the domain of social educator training, the informants’ generate expectations and strategies with different adequacy, in relation to the domain. In the opinion of Dennis and Albert, they are not getting any reasonable return on their investments. It is literally a waste of time, as Dennis puts it, and thus a lost investment. Signe does not - even at her most dissatisfied - lose her investment. She is outraged when teachers, co-students or colleagues invest less than she does, but this only devalues her return; it appears as if she could have obtained the same return from a smaller investment. It is precisely this, that distinguishes her from the two Outsiders, Jytte and Anna Louise. They are not perceiving their investments as investments but rather entirely as *illusio* - perceiving their investments in the domain as an aspect of being in the field.

A final note is that these strategies all reflect the dichotomy of the *professionalisation strategies* discussed in chapter 3 - Can the social educator professions achieve a higher professional status by referring to the knowledge presumed available within *professional practices*, or must such knowledge be transformed into *academic or scholarly theoretical forms*, before it can be recognized as professional? The strategies revolve around these issues, by no means providing (nor
attempting to) an answer, but rather showing that the interest in the training becoming academic, or retaining an less scholarly relation to the profession is not just a matter of which strategy seems the most likely to succeed. Rather the interest - the expectations, as it were - in what is seen as theories and knowledge, or the reluctance to dislodge training from practice, relates to what sort of students the profession is recruiting, and what perception of education they possess. To what extent is the ethos and illusio of the field education dominating the domain of social educator training, rather than the ethos and illusio of the domain of social education? This is in part dictated by the students recruited to the training, but conversely that recruitment is regulated by how the training is perceived. The educational strategies are at the centre of that reproduction of both the domain of social education, and that of social educator training.
CHAPTER 11

Field Access

This short chapter discusses the process of obtaining access to the two sites of fieldwork/classroom studies. Whether these sites are representative has been discussed extensively in Chapter 8 and so this chapter examines how my access was initiated, granted and maintained, and in turn how my relations and my position as researcher appears in the empirical material. Finally, a summary of the extent and material results of the fieldwork concludes this chapter.

11.1 Access

Sara Delamont (Delamont 2002:96) describes field access as a process, rather than a contract. The process is that of approaching possible sites of fieldwork, obtaining contacts and initial negotiations with these gatekeepers, hopefully leading to agreement - and then perseverance in maintaining agreements and mutual acceptance. I wanted to follow a group of students for a longer time, and so needed both permission from a number of teachers, the NISE and of course the students. As most NISE maintain a separate bureaucracy for the SSPSE, I would also need the cooperation of the team-leaders or coordinators of this part of the organisation. I imagined - correctly, as it turned out - that these coordinators would be the most important gatekeepers, that is, persons within the organisation who were decisive in whether I were granted or denied access.

Throughout this and the following chapter, I will cite field notes, transcripts of teaching, and various handouts and teaching materials. In order to keep the NISE anonymous, I will not be giving the exact dates, nor will I indicate all details such as gender, age, or subjects taught unless I can do so without the teacher becoming identifiable to his or her colleagues. For this reason I have not provided a complete set of neither field notes nor
transcripts. Samples of each can be found in appendix 18.

11.1.1 Obtaining Access

My intention was initially to have only one site, which was of course to be selected very carefully. However, it turned out that actually finding a site was considerably more difficult that I had naively assumed.

Delamont (ibid.) recommends approaching an organisation such as a NISE initially through a letter. The letter is to be short, not too specific on details, and not require too much from the addressee. From my own experience as employee at a NISE, I doubt that letters are the most viable venue of contact. Almost all actual letters sent to NISE are unsolicited inquiries from publishers, or lecturers offering various services. I worried that my inquiry would disappear in this mass, and chose instead to use email for my initial contact. In my email, I would briefly outline my project, and then attempt to make an appointment to either meet with the person I contacted, or to talk with her on the phone. In all cases, this person was the SSPSE coordinator, or one of them. I let this person decide whether it was within their competence to discuss this with me, or if they needed to contact their Rector. I did not want to initiate contact with the rector myself: if my inquiry had been pre-sanctioned by the gatekeeper’s leader it might well smack of an order rather than a request. In one case I was redirected to the Rector, in another to an internal administrator, but in most cases the coordinators felt capable of processing my requests themselves.

In turn, I contacted 9 different NISE, and a pattern quickly emerged. I would start by trying to contact the coordinator of the SSPSE at each NISE. These were generally very interested in my project, and would refer me to the teachers who were currently teaching at the SSPSE.

In several cases, these teachers never responded to my inquiries, whether by email or by phone. It has overall been a very rare occurrence to actually be able to contact a teacher by phone. The NISE teachers do not keep specific office hours - in fact they rarely have an office of their own. Leaving messages elicited only few responses. Emails were in general more successful although the response often was delayed by weeks. But here another problem revealed itself. In most cases, I needed to approach a large number of teachers - in one case, I was emailed a list of 21 partial names - and pitch my project to each of them. Unsurprisingly, these teachers proved just as difficult to reach by mail or phone as the former coordinators. In the end, access to KSEM hinged on a few very enthusiastic gatekeepers, who were willing to establish
contact to the relevant teachers on my behalf. In both cases, these gatekeepers received a letter\textsuperscript{199} from me, which they distributed to the other relevant teachers, and discussed at team meetings whether they wanted to allow me to visit, whereupon they responded, and we made an agreement. Since both the teams with whom the gatekeepers had discussed my request would also be teaching in the classes, I now had the acceptance of all the relevant teachers\textsuperscript{200}, and the gatekeepers would then ask the students whether they would allow me to observe the class. I was a bit worried that the students would be disinclined to refuse, when my request were presented by the SSPSE team leaders, but if I had been present to do so myself, I think they would have found it equally difficult to refuse, albeit for reasons of politeness.

The course of events described so far, provided me with access to KSEM. During my fieldwork there, however, it turned out that there were several long breaks, where I would not be able to follow the students. The students also turned out to be somewhat atypical, compared to the total population of SSPSE students (as discussed in chapter 6). For these reasons I chose to attempt to gain access to another NISE, preferably one in Jutland with different profile of students. I approached JSEM as my first choice, and it turned out to be remarkably easier to gain access here. The process was more or less the same as outlined with KSEM, but while the KSEM procedure took several months, an agreement with JSEM took only three weeks to arrange.

The course of events in the case of KSEM was fraught with both reservations and worries, and the attitude of the gatekeepers was that I might gain access if teachers and students agreed on a way both ethically acceptable and subjectively tolerable\textsuperscript{201}. Contrastingly, the gatekeepers at JSEM were never in any doubt that JSEM would grant me access, and the only question was when it would make most sense.

The procedure of gaining access so far outlined is remarkably similar to Delamont’s (op.cit. 102ff.) general template for gaining access to school settings, as I follow the hierarchy from the top down to the students. It seems to me that the students, in general the last ones asked for permission, are at a severe disadvantage. Their ability to refuse is quite limited, and so far I have not come across any projects that alleviate this disadvantage. It is an ethical conundrum, since the student’s acceptance is crucial - more so than

\textsuperscript{199} Examples of such correspondence is in appendix 21

\textsuperscript{200} At KSEM, one teacher did not want me present during classes. The gatekeeper informed me of this, and did not give a specific reason for this wish. Of course I respected this, and I did not press for a reason. Subsequently I stayed away for the three days this teacher taught.

\textsuperscript{201} Neither KSEM nor JSEM were uninterested in my project, nor did they think it irrelevant to their own work. But while the attitude at JSEM was that they would surely find a way, the attitude at KSEM was that they sincerely hoped it would be possible to find a way to accommodate me.
the organisation. I see no immediate solution, but I have tried to take it into consideration, by providing the students with several more discrete ways of removing themselves from my work: I arrive before the students, and make it quite visible where I will be sitting, so that the students can move to other ends of the classroom, if they so prefer. In settings where the students are working in groups, I only approach groups consisting mainly of students who have agreed to interviews, and I ask permission of them all. In breaks, I stay in one place and do not follow the students to the cafeteria unless they invite me to.

The fact that the students’ perspectives are sorely lacking from more or less all research hitherto conducted into social educator training (cf. Chapter 3), makes this problem all the more pressing. It seems that not only have researchers mostly taken either NISE teachers didactic point of view or that of the profession, when examining the training, they have also refrained from considering this hierarchy, limiting themselves to accessing the upper echelons of that hierarchy, and thus only obtaining the points of view which proliferate between teachers, or between fully fledged social educators, and their professional organisations.

11.1.2 Maintaining Access

While this approach outlined above proved the only viable way of obtaining access, it does have certain serious flaws:

First, in both cases, my relation to the teachers I will be observing is being forwarded through a team leader or supervisor of these teachers. In effect, this reduces their actual ability to deny me access, or later renege on the agreement.

Second, some these gatekeepers expected to be kept in the loop - an expectation that was neither easily met, nor without problems in relation to other teachers. In some cases, I made appointments with other teachers or students directly, without involving the gatekeepers. While I considered it most ethical to deal with my informants directly, it turned out that the gatekeepers also felt that their role included acting as filters between me and the students or other teachers. In a peculiar inversion of the former point, some gatekeepers seemed to feel, that their students and colleagues would be unable to refuse interviews etc, if I addressed them directly. During my fieldwork, I came into contact with a number of teachers, secretaries, administrators, other students etc. and several of these invited my to discuss my project or my work, and to observe their teaching, giving me the impression that
most teachers and students were unfrightened by my presence. Yet when
gatekeepers learned of me making appointments directly with a teacher, their
reaction was not always positive.

Third, I was massive dependent on the gatekeepers, yet they of
course had many other duties within the organisation. This contributed to the
second problem mentioned above, since in the beginning it seemed sensible
to me to avoid inconveniencing the gatekeepers with every little question or
request. The gatekeepers at one NISE ended up being quite openly ambivalent
about their agreement with me, since they felt responsible towards both me
and their colleagues and students, yet did not have the time to act as go-
between as much as they felt they needed to.
These difficulties were revealed gradually, and on two occasions at KSEM my
access was in partial jeopardy. The first was a teacher, whose classes I followed
for two days:

Before observing the classes taught by this teacher, I made contact by
email, but received no response. On first arriving, I then asked whether
my presence was acceptable, which I was told it was, and that I could seat
myself wherever I wanted. I noted that the teacher was quite distracted by
my presence during these days, and that this teacher, unlike most teachers
I met, did not try to establish a familiar relation towards me, neither by
initiating conversation with me, nor engaging in the attempts at small talk
I initiated. The teacher did not ignore me, however, and referred to me in
third person, both directly and in discussions with the students. When
I later talked to one of the gatekeepers, I was told that this teacher would
prefer that I was not present in later classes. [Field notes KSEM II/1]

The other occasion where my access was hampered was related to an exam:

Several of the students in my focus group at KSEM had invited me to be
present at their exams, but in order to do so, I would need the permission
of the teacher conduction the examinations, the external censors, and the
NISE. The teachers involved were also quite willing, on the condition that
the NISE administration made sure that there were no legal problems. The
administration decided that there were no such problems. At this point
one of the gatekeepers contacted me. He was of the opinion that such

---

202 Through the gatekeepers I had been told that this teacher did not mind me observing. I still contacted
each teacher personally before showing up, asking that they let me know if they had changed their mind.
203 E.g. “If we can just move our researcher a bit further to the left” when asking me make room.
204 However, I would not be able to record the examinations.
requests must be presented to him, before I made arrangements with the teachers conducting the exams. I apologised, and in the course of several emails and phone-calls I found out that one or more of the teachers was worried that I would press the students into allowing me to be present at their exams. While I explained that this was most certainly not the case, and that I in fact had been invited by students themselves to participate, I also judged that this part of my fieldwork was becoming highly problematic. I suggested to the gatekeeper that I would refrain from observing exams, and that all parties involved in my final week of fieldwork at KSEM be given an opportunity to passively decline being observed\textsuperscript{205}. This seemed an acceptable solution to the gatekeeper. [Field notes KSEM III/2]

Here I am confronted with the vulnerability of the teachers. My presence makes their position more precarious. In this light perhaps my request to witness exams was ill-advised, since this is likely to be a situation where teachers are very sensitive to such outside presence. In both cases the solution was to withdraw, but as I will describe below, this vulnerability more or less permeates my relation to the teachers completely. Later events also revealed that behind this apparent ethical transgression of mine, there loomed an long-lasting conflict between teachers. I have no desire to explore such conflicts, but the episode does underscore the depth and complexity of the access maintenance issue.

11.2 My Location in the Field

Whenever I am present in the classroom, I am exerting some sort of influence on what takes places there, and I am also perceiving the classroom in a particular way. While the latter is only accessible in the most indirect ways - one example was the implicit teacher-student-relation, that was extensively discussed in chapter 9 - the former is visible in how the students and teachers specifically

\textsuperscript{205} In practice I did this by sending all parties, teachers and focus group students, an email, which informed them that I wanted to make sure that they were not regretting their participation. If they still wanted to participate and would allow me to observe their classes, they should actively inform me of this, by email or phone. If I did not receive such an email or call, I would interpret that as a refusal. No-one chose to refuse - all teachers and students involved wrote or called back within two days. I got the impression later that I had in fact inadvertently stumbled onto a conflict between members of the SSPSE team, where some members of the team had sanctioned my visit against the wish of another member. This impression is supported by some of my field notes, where I wrote that the team member in question" at each course I suggested that I could observe, XX warned me that it might not be of interest to me, or will probably be difficult to participate in. I get a general sense of reluctance and unwillingness on XX’s part” [KSEM field notes OBS I/4]
relate to me. While I at no point have subscribed to the ideal of the invisible, inconspicuous “total observer” (cf. Chapter 2), I was of the assumption that prolonged presence would reduce the impact my presence had on the students. I have not been able to discern any such development, something which I attribute to the ever changing character of the NISE setting, and the haphazard nature of my presence-schedule. Since neither the lesson, the day, nor the week has a recurring rhythm, there is no everyday setting to disappear into. As I shall return to in the next chapter, there is in fact hardly any periphery due to the specific spatial organisation of the rooms. For that reason, I remained a prominent feature of the rooms, and for that reason, I will make use of how I related and were related to in the rooms.

In order to discern how I am present in the field work, I am not attempting to reduce some sort of bias, or correct for my perception. Nor do I try to analyze my own choices and reactions in an all-out psychoanalytical manoeuver (cf. Hunt 1989). While I believe the former claim to be an essentialist misconception of what data an observer can produce, I am more pragmatic in my abstention from the latter. The micro-analysis that Hunt suggests one to conduct is both time-taking and difficult, and it produces reflections that may border on the confessional. I have chosen a more pragmatic approach, which has already been applied to the interviews - that of selecting sequences that I either in the situation or the re-reading and analysing find to frustrate me in some way. My subjective experience of frustration makes for an excellent tool, for determining what preconceptions are at work in the situation or the analysis. These samples have been included in both chapters 9 and 10, and indicate in particular an underlying perception template, that I am using: the implicit teacher-student relation. This template originates in my own previous employment as a NISE teacher, and is hardly a surprising discovery. Eva Hultin has, however, suggested some categories for understanding how teachers doing fieldwork make use of their experiences as teachers, and what this may entail (Hultin 2007). The categories she uses could be summarized as respectively knowledge from and familiarity with the field: knowledge being, for instance, knowing what abbreviations mean, and in which order the elements of the curriculum goes; one could term this a capacity for understanding the language of the field. Familiarity refers to the more implicit aspect of knowing what it feels like, to be in the teacher position, for instance involuntarily cringing when a digital projector fails to work. In my opinion, both of these forms of experience present the researcher with unique obstacles to overcome. The knowledge of the field means the researcher will have little access of his own to what concepts are new, unfamiliar or difficult to understand for the students. The familiar-
ity will present the researcher with sympathies and direct his/her attention in specific ways. This is not bias, since that concept presumes that there exists an unbiased observational position - rather it means that all observations are being made from specific points in social space, and the categories of perception and appraisal relate to that position. In the following, I will attempt to locate that position by way of how I am being related to.

11.2.1 Locating Me in Relation to Students

Throughout both the access negotiations and my subsequent fieldwork at KSEM, a central tenet of the gatekeepers’ and teachers position was the vulnerability of both students and teachers, when exposed to outside observation. The teachers’ vulnerability is both normal (Cf. Delamont 2002:104) and understandable, and so from my very first contact I attempted to soothe and reassure the teacher that I was mainly interested in the students, and not going to evaluate the quality of the teaching. The attitude of protecting of the students is less easily understood. In one particular setting did students indicate uneasiness at my presence, that of student groups working on their own. This occurred several times in the first week of my fieldwork, and so I shortly decided to refrain from following students working in groups. But as the students got to know me, they began inquiring about my project, about what I was writing down, and how I was going to analyse what I saw. I tried to answer these questions candidly, but also simplifying greatly. Since I took these questions to indicate acceptance or trust in the side of the students, I did not want to present them with answers such as: "I wonder whether those of you without a qualifying upper secondary examination have difficulties navigating in a schooling environment?" - even though this is one hypothesis that I quickly formed in the field. Instead I would present an answer similar to this "I would like to see how you can use your experiences from all sorts of different social educational work, and all sorts of different educational backgrounds." Thus I tried to enunciate my interest in the students as acting, knowing subjects, rather than intersections of sociological variables. But obviously, in my design the students are both,

---

206 One such occasion was a day early in my fieldwork at KSEM where "the students were working with a group task set by the teacher. A group of students allow me to sit down and listen to their discussion, but as it is quickly revealed that none of them have read their assignments for that day, and thus will not be able to start on the task set, they begin to display a great amount of stress and several glanced at me." Once I had noticed this, I moved away from this group of students. [KSEM field notes OBS I/7]

207 I let all students look at what I was writing, and left the PC open when out of the classroom, so that students were able to sneak a peek at my notes.

208 These questions are taken from my field notes of the first week at KSEM, but the latter question was not written down verbatim.
depending on the methodology currently brought to bear on them. A couple of other incidents where the students and I interacted directly may indicate how the students were making sense of my presence.

At JSEM, I am sitting in the quite large cafeteria typing notes on my laptop, after the class I was following left for the day. Two students, whom I have neither seen nor spoken to before, approach me, and ask “Sorry, but we were just wondering, what, exactly, you are doing here?” They laugh and say they have seen me around during the week, and started wondering what I was there for. The two students are enrolled in ordinary social educator training, and so the only occasions they have had too see me are in the Lecture Hall and in the hallways and cafeteria. I explain what I was doing, and what my project was, and which the teachers I was working with. [field notes JSEM, 4-8]

This incident made obvious that even though I tried to “blend in” by dressing neutrally, and generally being discreet, this had made no difference. I was no student, and this was apparently obvious to the students. My presence and appearance was conspicuous enough to not only make these two students wonder, but to make these two students first discuss it, and then approach me. In short, I am a stranger, possibly even an intruder, from the students’ immediate point of view.

Once they are familiar with what I am doing this could conceivably change - but not by much. In the last group interview with the focus group at KSEM, one of the students [Signe] ask me who pays for what I am doing, and how I got to do it. I explain what a Ph.D. student is and that mine is partially funded by a University College, “just like the one you are studying in”. Signe indicates that she does not know what a University College is, and does not ask any further questions. Another student [Dennis] is the only one to comment further, as follows:

“... I know a couple of, I know one guy, who is, I don’t know why he bothers but he is a researcher too, he is what’s it called eh, something where you race all over the world, he is one year, two years in some different places, I don’t know what he does, but apparently it’s very very complicated and we don’t have it in Denmark” [transcript KSEM GRP II, p.2]

While the students does relate me to one of his friends, it is hardly a very clear relation. Unlike fieldwork in universities(Cf. Thomsen 2008), where a Ph.D.
can be situated by the students as something familiar, albeit at a different level, these students have no relation to neither research nor the higher echelons of the organisation in which they are themselves enrolled. Dennis’ reference to his acquaintance who is a researcher serves more to indicate that Dennis is not really familiar with what exactly this acquaintance does, and thus the only similarity too me must be the label “Researcher” and this unfamiliarity. In short, where the students who knew nothing of me identified me as a stranger, the ones who do know me and have been told of my project still does not know what label to assign to me, nor what my relation to their domain is. I am still some sort of stranger to them.

I will make note of two further points in the relations between me and the students. The first is that there are several students who never speak to me, decline to be interviewed in my questionnaire, and position themselves far from me in class. The two students whom I notice very early on is acting in this way, are both male, respectively a former plumber and a former carpenter, and are, when examined in the geometric data analysis, both Simple Outsiders. This behaviour in the classrooms towards me appears to confirm the analysis made in Chapter 8 of the Absent Outsiders.

A final point which delineate how I perceive and relate to the students can be explored from the order in which I learn the names of the students. Two of the first students I get the name of are Signe and Dennis. Both are very verbose in the class, often self-selecting and very active in discussions, but they are also students to whom my teacher-guided attention is quickly led: Signe as a students who active wants to make sure she has understood teacher instructions correctly, and Dennis as a student who often positions himself in opposition to the other students, and in opposition to the teacher as well. In contrast, the students whose name I learn the latest are the ones who are silent in class, and also place themselves far from me. Thus I am in part scanning the classrooms by applying an implicit teacher-like attention to the room, and the students are reciprocating this relation.

11.2.2 Locating Me in Relation to Teachers

The teachers, on the other hand, do not find me strange. My current work is very much within their horizon of possibilities, and they have several different assumptions and expectations of what a Ph.D. doing fieldwork might want and might produce. One teacher at JSEM has done a Ph.D. herself, and tells me
“I’m gonna give you a piece of advice - start writing much earlier than you think - it takes so much longer than you think” [JSEM field notes 2-10].

My gatekeeper at JSEM tells me that

“I’ve dreamt about a Ph.D. too, you know, sort of ‘Oh, I should do one those too’, but in the end I’ve come too see that ‘It probably won’t be’” [JSEM field notes 3-11].

Two of the teachers I meet are familiar from various Social Educator Training conferences; one at JSEM whom I meet in the teachers room, and who does not teach the SSPSE students, and one [PK] who teaches one of the classes I observe. In class, she asks me “Where was it you taught, when you did teach?” and “But wasn’t it this year you came to [social educators teacher conference]?” [Transcript KSEM, PK I/1]. These incidents show attempts to relate to me as a colleague, as someone not significantly different from a NISE teacher. On other occasions, the teachers relate to me in a different way, as one of the gatekeepers at KSEM does in an email: “I look forward to you giving us [the teachers at KSEM] a bit of spanking for our teaching”. [Email, KSEM II/12]. Here, the gatekeeper relates to me as someone who will not only be able to evaluate the quality of the teaching, but whose evaluation will be unpleasant. A related and common incident is that many teachers explain to me that the teaching this particular day is special or uncommon. What I will observe today somehow differs from what is typical, from what this teacher prefers, may not interest me, or may not be as interesting as something else. Some examples:

EH tells me after my first class with her that “What happened to day is perhaps not very typical for psychology”, because there is so much that she needs to go through. There aren’t that many different forms of teaching like cases or group work, and because psychology is such an immense subject, there is just too much she needs to introduce the students to. [Field notes KSEM I]

HF tell me that “it’s almost impossible to teach music in this room, there’s 25 students, you can’t teach that many, and the room doesn’t work with that many students” [Field notes KSEM I]
WEM explains that “None of us [the teachers] are really happy about this form of teaching, but we’ve agreed to try it out, but you can see, it’s difficult, it doesn’t really work” [Field notes JSEM 2-5]

MM introduces me to the workshop, and mentions that the SSPSE students only come here a weekend at a time “and you know I’m a real arts and crafts-teacher, and you don’t have the time for anything in just a weekend. You ought to see one the development-projects I work with, I think that would interest you.” [Field notes KSEM III]

Hardly any teaching is presented to me as “how it always is”, as common, normal or regular. In short the teachers preposition their teaching as imperfect. They presumably assume that I will notice if they are not teaching in a whatever manner they themselves imagine they ought to. This is an attempt to protect themselves, underlining that my presence makes the teachers’ position precarious. It is another manifestation of the same vulnerability my presence seemed to produce in my difficulties with maintaining access, as discussed above. And if the teachers relate to me as Ph.D. student as either someone who most likely will find their teaching uninteresting and would prefer something else, or someone who will return to spank them, this defensive or evasive position should not be a surprise.

I attempt to ameliorate the situation, by stating that I think this teacher is both inspiring and impressive, that I am mostly interested in the students and I neither want nor can evaluate their teaching. I need to reassure them that I am not evaluating their teaching, but since it is the students I am most interested in, I also try not to socialise too much with the teachers, and risk the students identifying me with the teachers.

But the teachers, as shown above, very much need to relate to me, and so it proves difficult to avoid the students relating to me as a teacher as well. This shows on several occasions:

On one occasion the students ask me about a social educational term (“4th order knowledge” [Field notes JSEM II/3]), because the teacher’s answer apparently does not really satisfy the student, and on another occasion a teacher asks me if I know “anything about grounding?”[Field notes JSEM II/4].

In both cases I truthfully answer that I do not know the answer. Had I known the answer, I would probably have said the same, since on both occasions I am being related to a “spare teacher”. Simply put, my need to disarm myself as a threat to the teachers position is limited by my need not to appear too much the
teachers’ pal in the students eyes. I experienced a number of situations where the teacher was clearly distracted or unnerved by my presence. Whenever I sensed this was the case, I tried to put the teachers more at ease, since it is surely more important that teachers feel at ease in their work, than if the students become slightly more antagonised towards me.

One way I steer around the conflict is by arriving very early, so that I will have a chance to talk to the teachers and reassure them before the students show up, in particular if it is the first time I meet the teacher.

The two teachers whom I follow for more than three days in a row stop being defensive, and instead begin to discuss something else with me, namely concrete episodes and students, which I have witnessed. The following example is taken just minutes after an individual study guidance interview with Albert, where the teacher SS asks me to help her interpret the situation.

SS: Listen Jan, I just need some feedback here on what just happened, um, what’s he like, isn’t he kind of strange?
Me: Um
SS: I think he’s difficult to read
Me: um, well, when you’re looking at them in class, he’s one of those you remember, him and ZZ ...
SS:[interrupts] Yeah, they’re very active
Me:Yes, and they’re quick to spot what ...
SS:[interrupts] They’re quick to read the code
Me: Yes, and isn’t that what he does here, he reads what you want him to say, and says so directly
[...]
SS: No but I have a really hard time reading his codes, I can’t decode his agenda, I’m really working hard with him
[Transcript, JSEM 1-19]

Here I am being recruited as a colleague, and the conversation does not imply that SS is worried that I am evaluating her performance. Mostly she appears eager and enthusiastic, when I confirm that I have noticed this student as well. Summing up, the teachers either relate to me as a colleague, or as someone who will judge their work. Since parts of the collegial relations explicitly reference my ph.d. work, the collegial aspects are to be understood as attempts to mitigate the other aspects of my position. It seems that the teachers who I spend the most time with begin relating more to me as a colleague.
11.3 The Extent of the Fieldwork

My fieldwork at KSEM was begun in December 2006, and ended in November 2007. In between I spent what amounts to about six weeks at the NISE. While I originally wanted my fieldwork to be one long continuous period, this was not possible for a number of reasons, both bureaucratic and private. In between the start and the end of my fieldwork there, the students spent three months in work practice, and one month of summer vacation, and I myself was on paternity leave the first 5 months of 2007. Several times the students had no scheduled teaching for weeks at a time, or only very few scheduled classes. Still I was present for no less than an entire week of scheduled teaching each time, and on my first visit to KSEM I was there continuously for three weeks, the only exceptions being the classes of one teacher, as mentioned above.

My fieldwork at JSEM was begun much later, in December 2007, and consisted in three visits. Since it was quite difficult to visit a NISE in Jutland, I chose to visit for an entire week, in which there was a lot of scheduled teaching, and for two separate days before and after.

Between the time the KSEM class enrolled, and the time the JSEM class enrolled, a new executive order (Undervisningsministeriet 2007b) on the training of social educators has been effected. As described in chapter 3, this means certain structural changes late in the training, but also several large changes early on. Most importantly the number and names of subjects change. I have chosen to keep using the names which were current under the former Executive order, and at KSEM. In effect the only subject-related change I see at JSEM is that the subject Psychology has been made part of Social Educational Studies. There are a number of qualitative differences, which I shall return to, but as far as structural comparisons go, this is the only noticeable difference. There are quite a few differences, which are remarkable in that they are not visible to me, although I am aware of their formal existence. This is not an issue I choose to delve into.

It is quite difficult to say whether I have in fact observed everything that typically occurs in first year SSPSE student training, much less whether I have observed all that may be pertinent to my research questions. And while I do not believe that there are specific moments where the social logic of education asserts itself with a unique force, there are certainly modal differences between settings within the training. If the theoretical concepts on social use of language and pedagogic discourse outlined in the beginning of the next chapter do apply, they apply to some extent all the time. However there may be situations where they are more self-evident to the researcher than others. Below is a table that sums up my fieldwork by way of three partitions: the two sites, the formal
subjects of the training, and the type of setting. The numbers does not add up within the categories - some days I stuck around the NISE to try to get a feel for the place and the atmosphere, some classes were both group supervision, and Social Educational Studies, and on two occasions the class I followed were split into groups with different subjects. The hour counts noted here are based on my field notes, and the recordings I made. They are of course not completely accurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakdown of fieldwork coverage</th>
<th>KSEM</th>
<th>JSEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> time spent at each NISE</td>
<td>145 hours</td>
<td>42 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>21 hours</td>
<td>22 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Studies</td>
<td>21 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Organisation, Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Craft</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement and PE</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study guidance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SETTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group supervision</td>
<td>13 hours</td>
<td>14 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups work / project work</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group presentations</td>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teaching</td>
<td>78 hours</td>
<td>10 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual supervision</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>7 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group interviews conducted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two, lasting 2 and 2½ hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>One, lasting 2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual biographical interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, between 1½ and 2½ hours</td>
<td>One, lasting 2 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Handouts etc.</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photos taken</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.1: Fieldwork extent by site/subject/setting

There are a number of subjects taught in Social Educator training, that I have not observed. Social studies being the most glaring omission under the old
executive order. Of the subjects I have been unable to observe, this is the only theoretical subject either of the classes I follow have in fact been exposed to. Of the Arts and Activities subjects, the students at KSEM have had classes in Environmental Studies, Drama and Danish/Media which I were unable to participate in. The Arts and Activity subjects have been significant restructured in the new executive order, but the JSEM students have not had classes in any of these subjects yet.

There are a few other particular parts of the training, that I have been unable to observe. Both classes I follow have in fact been enrolled for some time when I meet them. I would very much have liked to follow their very first meeting with the NISE, and each other. However, this was impossible for both logistical reasons, and because the gatekeepers at both NISE were rather reluctant to allow outsiders to participate in this process. The reasons given were that “this is a very sensitive period for these students, they are very fragile”, and that “SSPSE students in particular were very vulnerable because they are unaccustomed to being in school” [field notes, emails JSEM I and KSEM I]. For the same reasons, KSEM preferred that I was not present for the first days after summer vacation.

Both classes’ three months of work practice took place during my field work. I was on leave myself during the KSEM students’ period of work practice, which made it impossible for me to follow them. I had not met the students at JSEM when their work practice began, and it would be both logistically impossible, and also a very intrusive first time meeting, if I were to approach them individually and ask to visit them during their work practice period. I do not think this is a problematic omission from my field work. The conditions of doing fieldwork in social educational practice make completely different practical requirements of the researcher, and I would have great difficulties in comparing the observations. Besides, numerous studies have been done of comparable situation (Bayer 2001, Olsen 1995 and 2007, Palludan 2005).
CHAPTER 12

The Social Educational Classrooms

The following chapter is concerned with two things: the different rooms in which social educational training takes place, and the interactions between students and teachers taking place in these rooms. By rooms I mean quite literally the different rooms of the NISE - some designated by the subject taught there (“Music”, “Movement and PE”); some by the way the activities are organised there (“Lecture hall”, “Workshop”). In general the overall organisation of the social educator training is spatially mirrored in the partitioning of the NISE physical space. The interaction of students and teachers within these rooms is tinted by the purpose of the rooms, and the training activities located within these rooms. The chapter is thus organised by the rooms as a spatial organisation of various forms of interactions, and subsequently various samples of interaction and alteration within these rooms is the object of my examination. This, the fourth methodological mode, relates to the third research question:

3. How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

By constructing first the classrooms of social educator training and then examining how the informants act within those room, I will address this question in the following. The informants are here being ordered by the strategies examined in chapter 10, and thus the set of strategies are the framework within which I will try to understand how the students relate to the training. The sections discussing each of these rooms are preceded by a section discussing the theoretical gaze I bring to bear on the training. As these field-note samples and transcriptions of recordings from lessons tend to be lengthy, I have tried to reduce the number of samples, so that most samples are used for more than one analytical purpose. For that reason, I have also chosen not to include observation samples with all informants. All strategies, however, are represented in the observations.
12.1 Theoretical Outline of Classrooms and Classroom Talk

The theoretical framework of my fieldwork in the SSPSE classroom is respectively the work of Basil Bernstein (2000 in particular) on pedagogic discourse, and the sociological analyses of language and power by Pierre Bourdieu (1991 in particular). These theories have come to be a stable of current classroom observations in numerous works of Danish educational sociology (Buchardt 2008, Brinkkjær & Bayer 2003, Palludan 2005, Gytz Olesen 2005 and others), and in this section I shall briefly outline the overall theoretical thrust of both, and discuss how they can be combined for the purpose of my study.

12.1.1 Objectivation and Structural Theories

The overall claim proposed by Bernstein is that “How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control” (Bernstein 2003b:85).

In this programmatic statement, Bernstein establishes that the interactions of students and teachers are not to be understood as local altercations of power, but as minute re-enactments of societal structural features. In doing so, Bernstein is attempting to justify the application to the classroom - an extension of the domain of sociology similar to that performed by Bourdieu in his works on language (Bourdieu, loc.cit). Bourdieu here strives to dethrone language as preexisting object, and instead consider it as a social practice like any other - “an instrument of action and power” (op.cit. p.37)

The two positions are similar in that they propose to consider respectively language and classroom regulation of educational knowledge as being within the realm of sociological objects of study.

This similarity comes about because both Bernstein and Bourdieu’s positions are in opposition to (previously) dominant positions within the fields of respectively pedagogics/didactics and linguistics, both of whom ascribed a unique status to respectively pedagogics and language, requiring their own methodologies and indeed scientific disciplinary seclusion: pedagogics, linguistics. By asserting that neither teachers nor language users possess a clear vision of the social strategies they employ, and the social efficacy of such strategies, the teacher and the competent language user are being stripped of a great measure of the subjective authority and competence which pedagogics and linguistics hitherto claimed the agents possessed.

These considerations are important because the sociological gaze, in particular as incarnated within the theoretical frameworks of Bourdieu and Bernstein, may appear to disregard the experience and ideal of the studied agents as it...
objectifies them, and even to grossly violate their understanding of themselves. This appearance is just that: Appearance. A central point of in particular Bourdieu’s methodology and epistemology is that the researcher must confront his own construction of the agents with their self-construction and understanding of the field. Whether the agents are being understood or abused is of course something that the reader must decide for him- or herself along the way in the following sections. I believe that theories such as those of Bourdieu and Bernstein enable the researcher to examine closely the very aspects of practice that agents are themselves unable to scrutinize, and such examination cannot help but appear as if it encroaches upon the agents’ understanding of practice.

12.1.2 Language as a Symbolic Practice

Bourdieu has been a central theoretician of educational sociology since two of his earlier publications, *Les héritiers* (Bourdieu & Passeron 1985) and *Reproduction* (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990), both of which are concerned with social inequality in education, and it was these two studies in particular which set in motion the Scandinavian interest in Bourdieu’s sociology, as outlined in Chapter 5. In the latter of these, an ambitious and intricate theory of the inner social workings of education is laid out. In order to examine any social institutions, one must initially lay bare the social conditions upon which it is predicated. Bourdieu understands education as a doubly arbitrary act of symbolic imposition, and for such actions to be consecrated institutionally, is it required that this nature is objectively misrecognized (op. cit. p. xx). This he expresses by the concept of *symbolic violence*, which forms the cornerstone of his analysis of education, which goes on to construct a detailed axiomatic analysis of how pedagogical work, pedagogical actions and educational systems through symbolic violence reproduce the current set of dominance relations between social groups and classes. Examining educational practice within a Bourdieuan framework thus hinges upon the concept of symbolic action. Detailing this theory is in itself a daunting endeavour, and I will restrict myself here to explaining the nature of the concept of symbolic violence, and how social dominance by way of symbolic violence is re-translated into specific distributions of positions and capitals within social space.

Symbolic violence is by Bourdieu defined as “...the imposition of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary power.” (op. cit. §1) Bourdieu states that in fact all pedagogic action, that is any teaching conducted within any educational context, equates symbolical violence in two senses: first, since the power to establish a pedagogic relationship is preconditioned upon preexisting arbitrary power relations between groups or classes (op. cit. §1.1); and second, because the cultural meanings selected for inculcation through pedagogic action are arbitrary, in the sense that they cannot be derived from any universal principle or nature of
neither things nor humans. (op.cit. §1.2, §1.2.1). Effectively, this conceptualization of what meaning is transmitted through teaching completely disregards any professional, academic or educational purport the teaching may lay claim to; not, as it were, by claiming that any such purport is irrelevant or self-delusory, but rather by stressing that any teaching or educational practice also entails socially reproducing the dominance relations upon which said education practice is predicated. In effect, this is simply a restating of the principle of multidimensionality of social space (cf. Chapter 2) - what the agents of the field consider the unspoken purpose and meaning of their practice is understood as an illusio - interests and purposes with a social origin and history.

The reiteration of the arbitrariness of whatever cultural meanings are being taught, as well as the use of the word inculcation, does not merely serve to provoke the reader used to considering education as a rational, purposeful and emancipatory activity. Bourdieu uses them to underline his realist structural perspective on social action, emphasising that while there are no (non-arbitrary) principles beyond the social perception of reality from which one can derive meaning, there are aspects of social relations which are beyond perception - specifically power relations embedded within symbolic relations (op.cit. §1.1.3 Gloss).

Symbolic violence envelops all aspects of educational practice, but one could argue that Bourdieu does not within his educational studies develop an apparatus for discerning its application and efficacy within interaction. In the previously cited (cf. Chapter 3) classroom study by Søren Gytz Olesen (Gytz Olesen 2005b), the entire vocabulary of Bourdieu’s theory of symbolic violence is judiciously applied, but the analysis does not transcend illustrating precisely the applicability of the theory.

As classroom interaction is at least perceptually very much a matter of speech and language, some ideas of how to proceed with examining symbolic violence can be gleaned from Bourdieus works on language and linguistics. Here, Bourdieu applies a similar sceptical position towards the immanent conceptualisation of language as an object in and of itself, instead proposing to examine the economy of linguistic exchanges, thus making it clear from the outset, that use of language entails both relations of dominance, and specific social interests. Specifically, Bourdieu states that every speech act is a conjecture - based on and basis for causal series of speech acts. Language should thus be understood as a system of production and consumption, that is: perception and circulation. This model induces both the concept of interaction as linguistic markets (each related to different social contexts, i.e. fields), and the agents as possessors of linguistic habitus

“...which imply a certain propensity to speak and say determinate things (the expressive interest) and a certain capacity to speak, which

209 And, in fact, all actions as such. (Bourdieu 1991:37)
involves both the linguistic capacity to generate an infinite number of grammatically correct discourses, and the social capacity to use this competence adequately in a determinate situation.” (Bourdieu 1991:37)

There are thus three levels of distinction within the agent’s linguistic practice: that of expression - what does the agent elect to utter?; that of style: in what way does he say what he wishes to express?; and that of elicitation: what utterings do the agents seek to elicit from others?

The linguistic market is a “...system of successive reinforcements or refutations [which has] constituted in each one of us a certain sense of the social value of linguistic usages and of the relation between the different usages and the different markets, which organizes all subsequent perceptions of linguistic products...” (op.cit.p.82)

Each agent’s linguistic practice is thus not a matter of that agents ability to produce speech (Chomsky), but rather a matter of that agent censuring his speech, producing appropriate discourse - completely analogous to the production of strategies, as discussed in chapter 10. For this reason, all discourse is to some extent euphemized: being censured or dressed up in style which ritually minimises whatever transgression takes place, in order to produce products appropriate for the demands of the relevant linguistic market. Thus, completing the market metaphor, each agent attempts to produce utterings(by which I mean the linguistic commodity) which are profitable socially; that is, which are endowed with symbolical efficacy, and thus function distinctive. In order for them to be so, they must be recognised as symbolically dominant, which is to say able to function as symbolic capital. In effect such symbolic domination equates symbolic violence.

Whether an agent is able to afford his discourse such symbolic efficacy is related to said agent’s apprehension of his or her relative position within the field, relations to the other agent involved, and in particular to the institutions framing the interaction. The symbolic efficacy of the discourse is determined by extent to which the agent is able to take into account the relative positions of sender and receiver, within the field, and the various capital hierarchies relevant. Thus, understanding the field and the nomos of the field equates being able to employ effective discourse and reap symbolic profits - effectively, speech is also an aspect of a dominant habitus(Cf. The discussion in chapter 10, and Bourdieu 1996:368f., Broady 1998:423).

This theoretical reconstruction of language as symbolic reproduction of dominance relations underscores the unequal ability to perform discourse no matter the agents’ linguistic competence (cf. Chomsky). However a classroom analysis based solely upon these theoretical constructs is limited in its ability
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210 As I get into the analyses later on in this chapter, I will be referring to statements as a common place description of the students speech on a common-sense manner, where as utterings refers to the specific linguistic commodified object.
to describe the actual interaction within the classroom. While it provides an important understanding of how discourse within a context such as a classroom takes shape, it does not provide any specific concepts addressing either the qualities of the setting or the discourse. For that reason I will be employing the classroom analytical concepts of Basil Bernstein, which I will introduce in the following sections, and subsequently discuss the interrelation of Bourdieu and Bernstein.

12.1.3 Classification and Framing - Power and Control

As cited above, Bernstein’s work centred on understanding how social control within education structures curricula and pedagogic discourse. To this end, he developed a - somewhat inaccessible - system of analytical terms, which I will describe in some detail in the following. Initially, I will describe the terms by which Bernstein understand the features of classroom interaction, the specific incarnation of which he terms the pedagogic code modality. I will then discuss how these terms are part of what Bernstein calls the pedagogic device, the overall reproduced structure relating knowledge to education within any educational context in modern societies, before returning to examine in detail two specific code modalities - invisible and visible pedagogy.

Bernstein describes classroom interaction by analysing how pedagogic discourse is organised, and what regulates how transmitter and acquirer make use of it. Pedagogic discourse in any context encompasses two different kinds of discourse: instructional discourse, which is concerned with the transmission of skills; and regulative discourse, which is concerned with defining social conduct. This is illustrated in graph 12.1 The regulative discourse dominates, orders and embeds the instructional discourse(Bernstein 2000:34), and while the instructional discourse is underpinned by criteria delimiting content selection, sequencing and pacing, the regulative discourse is underpinned by criteria of hierarchy(Bernstein 2003a: 107-8). Both discourses are underpinned by a third set of criteria, delimiting what constitutes legitimate learning. Such criteria differs widely between different contexts, and this is what Bernstein’s concept of code describes: the three different sets of criteria together makes up the code of the pedagogic discourse of the contexts, and the specific nature of the criteria is the code modality of that particular pedagogical context(op.cit.p.108-9).
Specifically, the criteria are described by respectively their framing and classification values. These three concepts - classificatory and framing principles in collusion making up the pedagogical code - are perhaps the most well known aspects of Bernstein's work. Classification and framing partitions the regulating structure of pedagogic discourse into respectively power-related to classification and control-related to framing, and the code modality within a particular pedagogic context is simply the specific control regulation within a specific system of power relations.

12.1.4 Classification
Bernstein uses power to describe the social division of labour in the classroom, and examines how power relations creates boundaries between agents, categories and discourses in the classroom; thus agents are transmitters or acquirers, curricular subjects are classified as being different, and associated with different discourses. These classes can be very insular, with strong boundaries drawn between each other - and in that case, the classification is said to be strong. Conversely, in those instances where the boundaries are murky, and the difference between classes of categories, agents and discourses is difficult to make out, the classification is said to be weak. This is often abbreviated as respectively C+ and C-. Classification can also be partitioned as internal or external. The internal classification is concerned with what takes place within the classroom: differentiation between roles of agents, differentiation between activities and tasks, spatial organisation; and external classification is concerned with the relation between taught subjects and knowledge domains, and whether it is rigid and explicitly defined, or not. I have attempted an illustration of these different modalities in graph 12.2. Agents relate to classification by way of recognition rules, the possession of which enables the agent to correctly recognize and discern what pedagogic context he or she is currently situated in, and thus how the categorical sets of agents, subjects or discourses are related.

12.1.5 Framing
Framing relates to control, and thus conceives power as disseminated throughout the network of relations between agents. Where classification sets up boundaries between subjects, agents, and discourses, framing relates to the manner in which meaning is communicated within the pedagogical context. In a context with strong framing (F+, cf. above), it is explicitly communicated what constitutes meaningful utterings within that particular context, and conversely, in a pedagogic context characterised by weak framing (F-), what constitutes
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211 To wit, the first and most-cited Danish translation of Bernstein's work was entitled “The Code-theory of Basil Bernstein” (Poulsgaard 1974)
meaningful utterings is only implicitly communicated. The character of the framing of a specific pedagogic context can also be either internal or external; Internal framing is used to describe the locus of control - in strong internally framed contexts, the locus of control lies with the transmitter, and in weak internally framed contexts, the locus of control shifts to the acquirer. External framing then concerns the control of what practices and discourses are allowed to enter the classroom - strong external framing means that it is strongly regulated - by the transmitter - what outsider discourse and practice is allowed to enter the classroom, and weak external framing means that the acquires have a great deal of influence on what outsider discourse and practice is allowed to enter the

Graph 12.2: Pedagogic Code Modalities
classroom. These concepts are depicted in graph 12.2. Agents relate to framing by way of realization rules, the possession of which enables the agent to combine meanings and produce legitimate utterings within a particular pedagogical context. If an agent possesses both the recognition rules and realization rules relevant in a specific pedagogical context, that agent may by following those rules successfully recontextualize his or her experiences, shifting their validity from one original context to another. Graph 12.3 depicts the relationship between pedagogic discourse, recognition and realisation rules, and recontextualization. In passing, I would like to draw attention to the fundamental relational nature of Bernstein’s concepts - another trait of affinity between Bernstein and Bourdieu. Before going into the Bernsteinian concept of recontextualization, however, the larger picture of how Bernstein relates pedagogy to education should be discussed.

12.1.6 The Pedagogic Device

Bernstein also examines the way in which potential knowledge and meaning is transformed into pedagogical communication, by way of pedagogical devices (Bernstein 2000:25ff.), which is described as a relay of pedagogic communication, regulating it by a hierarchy of three sets of rules: Distributive rules, from which is derived recontextualisation rules, from which is derived evaluative rules. These rules make up what Bernstein metaphorically terms the grammar of pedagogic discourse. Distributive rules distinguish between knowledge classes - that which is mundane, and that which is esoteric, or in Bernstein’s more general terms the thinkable and the unthinkable. (Bernstein 2001a:149)
thinkable knowledge has a specific relation to some material basis, and its meaning is thus consumed by that very basis - it is utterly bound by its context. The unthinkable being the knowledge which has no relation to a material base, is thus relegated to (in modern societies) the upper echelons of the educational system. The unthinkable knowledge however unites the esoteric and the mundane or the material and the abstract, and this transcendent relation grants the unthinkable knowledge a potential power: “it is the crucial site of the yet to be thought” (Bernstein 2000:30f.). Thus the distributive rules regulate the field of the production of discourse. The point being that neither the pedagogic device as relay, nor the pedagogic communication it relays is “ideologically free” (op.cit. p.27). Rather, they are regulated so that specific distributional rules of knowledge set up specific pedagogical discourses, related to specific pedagogical contexts, all reflecting the current social division of labour and the social relationships within the current division of labour.

The recontextualising rules are derived from, and subordinate to, the distributive rules of the pedagogic device. The lines demarcating legitimate discourse and transmitter/acquirer roles having been set up by the distributive rules, pedagogic discourse (cf. the previous section) is made up of instructional and regulative discourses; the former categorising and relating skills, the latter creating social order (Bernstein 2001a:151). In total the two sets of discourse collude as a recontextualising principle: “Pedagogic discourse is constructed by a recontextualising principle which selectively appropriates, relocates, refocuses and relates other discourses to its own order.” (Bernstein 2000:33). The point being that discourses are being transformed - recontextualized - when they move from one context to another. This occurs both as material practices become curriculum subjects, but also as acquirers draw on discourses from other contexts than the educational one.

Bernstein provides an example of what this recontextualising entails, when a student wielding saw, plane and chisel processes a slab of wood: outside of pedagogy, this would be spoken of as carpentry, but inside pedagogy it becomes woodwork. Similarly, cooking becomes home economics, a real discourse becoming an imaginary one(ibid.) - imaginary referring to the fact that the discourse has no relation to anything outside of pedagogy. Bernstein also points out that this is the case for subjects whose name does not change by recontextualisation; entering into pedagogic discourse, physics in school being imaginary physics. The discourse of physics is transformed as it moves into a new position as pedagogic discourse (op.cit.p.32), the rules of its appropriation (sequence, pacing, selection) not being derived from neither physics itself nor physicist practice(Bernstein 2001a:152). Thus, the recontextualising rules of pedagogical discourse is the source of both the what and the how of physics pedagogy, specifically the rules within the instructional discourse. The other half of the pedagogic discourse: regulative discourse, as described above, provides a model
of both the learner/acquirer, the teacher/transmitter, and the relation between the two (Bernstein 2000:34ff.)

The evaluative rules of the pedagogic device are what transforms the pedagogic discourse into the specific pedagogic code modality of a pedagogic context. Bernstein exemplifies this process by looking at time, which each pedagogic discourse punctuates in some arbitrary and imaginary way, providing a set of age stages (e.g. of children as learners) (op.cit.p.35f.). This provides a symbolic ruler enabling continuous evaluation of acquisition and transmission, relating the two and thus specifying a pedagogic practice.

12.1.7 Visible and Invisible Pedagogy

The previous sections may appear to border on the clinical, in its clockwork-like conceptualisation of all minutiae of pedagogic interaction in the classroom. But the practical application of the concepts however allows the researcher to outline the relation between the curriculum and the pedagogy at work in a specific pedagogic context. One such analysis is a famous examination of two pedagogic devices: visible and invisible pedagogy by Bernstein; one which has since spawned numerous similar analyses, of which several examine the interaction of NISE teachers and students (Gytz Olesen 2005a, Bayer 2001).

Bernstein (Bernstein 2003b:116ff.) characterises as invisible a form of pedagogy which has the following features:

- Teacher control over the pupil is implicit rather than explicit
- Context is arranged by teacher, pupil is expected to rearrange and explore
- Pupil appears to have wide powers over selection, time-scaling and structuring within that context
- Pupil appears to control his own movements and social relationship
- Reduced emphasis on transmission and acquisition of specific skills
- Criteria for evaluation of pedagogy are multiple, diffuse, and defies measuring.

Conversely, visible pedagogy is the very opposite of the above: explicit teacher control, specific activities organised by teachers, pupil movement organised by teachers, emphasis remains on skill acquisition, and evaluation criteria are explicit. Thus, the opposition between the visible and invisible pedagogy is in particular one of the manner in which criteria and expectations are transmitted: both whether such transmission is being specified as such, and the specificity of the criteria being transmitted. Referring to the conceptualisation explored above, this amounts to saying that invisible pedagogy is weakly framed and classified internally. There may be stronger external framing and classification aspects. The evaluative rules of the invisible pedagogic device are an inner measurement of readiness, applied to the teacher’s inferences about the pupil’s development, and an outer measurement of busyness, applied to the teacher’s obser-
vations of the pupil’s external behaviour.

The invisible pedagogy, according to Bernstein, is related to what he terms the new middle class\(^{212}\) (op.cit.p.120f.), as the ideologies of education originate as ideologies of class. Whereas the old middle class’ ideologies of hard work and knowledge acquisition were instituted in (English) public and upper secondary schools and in clear and present regulation of pupils as visible pedagogy, the new middle class’ ideology of nurture and equality now being institutionalised as invisible pedagogy, and thus the opposition of these two pedagogic devices are in fact an ideological conflict of the middle class\(^{213}\). But it is important to note, that such changes in the pedagogic device does not imply any changes in the function of the device - or more specifically, changes in the evaluative or recontextualising rules of the device does not necessarily imply any changes in the distributive rules.

The important change brought about by invisible pedagogy is that manifestation of the pupils as persons becomes an important recontextualizing and evaluative aspect of the pedagogic device. The invisible pedagogy presupposes both an intimate familiarity with the educational system, and a specific pedagogic code, which Bernstein terms an elaborated code. The relation of the invisible pedagogy to the new middle class implies that new middle class students possess, by virtue of their socialisation, such an elaborated code in addition to the code of the older middle class, which Bernstein terms restricted (op.cit.p.134). Thus the pedagogic devices of invisible and visible pedagogy, organise classroom interaction along lines laid out by class origin and societal social structures.

The relation between visible/invisible pedagogy and class has led to accusations against Bernstein on numerous occasions (Labov 1969 is a central reference, the debate is referred in Chouliaraki 2001:31f.). The claim being that Bernstein perceives pupil’s inability to recontextualise successfully within an invisible pedagogic context as caused by that pupil’s deficit of linguistic competence, whereas the case is in fact that there are just different kinds of linguistic competence. Bernstein’s counter argument, repeatedly put and refined throughout his publications(Cf. Prefaces in Bernstein 2000, 2001, 2003a, b) is that dif-

\(^{212}\) Bernstein’s concept of class is, at best, elusive. The analytical distinction between old and new middle class is linked to the distinction between visible and invisible pedagogy by Bernstein’s analysis of their origin, but that link is not required in order to discern different pedagogic devices within pedagogic communication. I will thus not be applying Bernstein’s class-analysis to my empirical data, and I have thus chosen to forego any deeper investigation of what exactly sociologically differentiates the different fractions of the middle class according to Bernstein.

\(^{213}\) Specifically, the ideologies are according to Bernstein, related to different forms of (Durkheimian) organic solidarity related to the new and old middle classes. Durkheim’s original conception of organic solidarity relates to individuals, whereas Bernstein claims the new middle class relates to persons - the latter emphasizing the differences between persons, the former emphasizing the similarities and the shared rights, duties and so on. Thus Bernstein speaks of respectively individualized and personalized organic solidarity, the former originating, as per Durkheim, with the economic division of labour, and the latter originating with the more recent complex division of symbolic and cultural labour.(Bernstein 2003b:121)
different linguistic competence socially forms a basis for selection; the question is not whether one democratically considers all sociolects equal, but rather that “Success or failure [within education] is a function of the school’s dominant curriculum, which acts selectively upon those who can acquire it. [...] The code theory asserts that there is a social class-regulated unequal distribution of privileging principles of communication...” (Bernstein 2003a:118)

Bernstein's position is thus one of explicating the relations between different micro-sociological practices of competence acquisition, and macro-sociological power relations.

12.1.8 Bernstein and/or Bourdieu

My choice of combining Bernstein and Bourdieu follows in the footsteps of numerous Danish classroom analyses (Bayer & Brinkkjær 2001, Buchardt 2008, Gytz Olesen 2005). Yet although intermingling these two theoretical positions is common, the specific points of connection are still important. I believe the two theories share other features than the ones described in the previous section on objectification (cf. Section 12.1.1). What Bernstein tries to conceptualise with the pedagogic device and the embedded evaluative rules is precisely dominance relations, fields, nomos and agents’ symbolic efficacy in the Bourdiean conception. Yet the interactional aspects of Bourdieu’s theory does not specify the concepts in relation to any one specific locus of analysis, such as a classroom and curriculum; rather, Bourdieu insists that one always remould the concepts empirically. This is precisely what Bernstein’s concepts of code modality, framing, classification and recontextualization achieves. The concomitance of how Bourdieu describe agents producing symbolic efficient discourse, and how Bernstein describe acquirers successfully recontextualizing discourse is striking, and comes about because the object of the theories is identical: how social structural power relations are embedded in everyday social practice.

In other words, possessing the necessary recognition and realization rules equates possessing habitual capacity for sustaining illusio and producing an orthodox symbolic practice. And successful recontextualization equates successfully anticipating and producing the utterings attuned to what the dominant agents are attempting to elicit.

In the analytical application in this chapter, I will be using Bernstein to explore the symbolic intricacies of classroom interaction, by way of framing, classification and recontextualization in particular. As noted above, the social class-analysis embedded in Bernstein’s theory is quite difficult to operationalize. Bourdieu understands the class’ relations to codes as a matter of dominated agents being further removed from the sources of information than dominant,
and thus being less au fait with the linguistic market\textsuperscript{214}, and this is a more refined and dynamic way of relating power relations to classroom interaction, than the Bernsteinian one. In my case the educational strategies form the connecting link between social power relations (position, habitus, capital) and the dynamics of the classroom.

12.2 Control Templates and Theory Classrooms

Within my fieldwork at the two NISE, I have attempted to order the various settings, by way of Bernstein’s concepts. As pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, I very early on noticed that there were consistent differences between the various subjects of the social educator training, and the rooms in which they take place. As such I have defined a set of pedagogical contexts within social educator training, which is what I have previously referred to as the classrooms of the training.

Within those contexts, I encounter three templates of pedagogic control repeatedly. These three templates makeup an immense part of how the classroom interaction is being controlled, and in particular how the invisible pedagogy is conducted. The templates are remarkably consistent across rooms, subjects and teachers, which is why they will be my access point to examining and comparing the rooms. I will in the following discuss the three templates in details, and the move on to describing the various rooms.

The templates I have termed The Horseshoe, The Round, and The Out-and-Back. In the following I will present these three templates. I will do so mainly with examples from theoretical lessons, and thus this section also serves to explore the theoretical classrooms, in order to avoid repetitions. Subsequently I will go on to discuss a selection of four rooms of social educator training I have constructed, in relation to these three templates and to the strategies. (Apart from theory class, the rooms are: supervision, lecture hall, and workshop). In short, the theoretical classrooms are noticeable primarily due to their weak internal classification. There is no visible relation between the subjects taught in these rooms, and the way space and positions are organised. There are no specific tools, or teaching aids, that specify the purpose of the room, and on occasion, the subjects are difficult to tell apart. The same teacher may teach the same class two different subjects in the same room, on the same day, referring to the same textbooks. By what measure can one then differentiate between these subjects? Only by what the teacher states to be the difference; that is only

\textsuperscript{214} I should like to point out, that although Bourdieu’s theory describes speech and language primarily, it is in no way limited to language - rather, his point is that language as much social practice as all other aspects of culture. Thus, one cannot make the claim that Bernstein’s concept of codes encompasses more aspects of classroom regulation than Bourdieu’s concepts of symbolic capital.
by the internal framing can the students decode the subject differences.

On one occasion, I witness a teacher (HHF) explaining that later that day, the class will have their first lesson in the subject ISS. He is presumably referring to the subject IIS (an abbreviation of Individual, Institution, Society - a subject which was introduced with the reform of social educator training 2007), but neither he nor the students notice the misnomer, and spend several minutes trying to decipher the abbreviation. [Fieldnotes, JSEM IV/3]

The confusion likely stems in part from the relatively recent establishing of the subject, and the fact that ISS is in fact the name of a very well-known Danish cleaning company. Yet the fact that all involved can even become confused in this way, indicates that when it comes to theoretical subjects, there are very few fixed anchors, by which one can navigate between the subjects. Unlike a subject such a psychology, which has a clear antecedent in university academic discourse of psychology, IIS is an entirely imaginary discourse, with completely weak external classification.

The theory classrooms are thus completely void of any explicit markers of classification, requiring the students to rely on their ability to muster appropriate recognition and realisation rules. The three templates of pedagogic control are equally free of subject-related specification, and thus provide a useful analytical point of departure in order to discern the recontextualization the students are expected to perform.

12.2.1 The Horseshoe

One prominent feature of all classrooms but one is the horseshoe. Without fail, in all classrooms, both theoretical and A&A, the students are seated in a semi-circle open in the end facing the teacher, the whiteboard and the teachers desk. In the theoretical subjects, this semi-circle is created by the desks being situated along the walls. In the A&A subjects the horseshoe it just as present but more subtly so. In Music, the teachers stands and sits at the blackboard, with an upright piano to his side, and the students are seated behind congas, xylophones or sitting with guitars, in a semi-circle in front of him. In Movement and PE the students lie or sit on the floor, on a set of mats pre-placed by the teacher in a semi-circle. In Arts and Crafts, the students are seated at a large, round table, where the teacher occupies one end, and the surface of the table is used for demonstrating various techniques of handicraft. There is a teachers desk in all rooms, although in most cases it is an ordinary desk no different from the rest.

Horseshoe is a translation of an expression in Danish teachers lingo - presume originating in the shape the tables create, as is apparent on some of the drawings included here.
in the room, noticeable only by its position and usage. It occupies a unique position, is separated from the horseshoe, and is used in a distinct way by both students and teachers: The teachers being “anchored” to it, returning to it, and often sitting on top of it, and the students studiously ignoring it as a seating option, only sitting there when asked to present.

The horseshoe is a control device, an important feature of the internal framing of most classrooms. As I shall expound on below, it provides a stage for the teacher, it enforces participation and it obliterates periphery. As is the case with all control devices, these aspects can be restated in terms more in line with the purpose of the training: the staging also a way of democratizing the room, allowing all students equal visual access, the enforced participation comes about because of the direct, attentive relation between the teacher and each students, and the obliteration of the periphery also democratizes the room, making it impossible to for students to obscure each other. It is thus a complex device of both democracy and control, which is exactly the ambiguous essence of weak internal framing.

The horseshoe accomplishes several things in the classroom. It shapes the teaching space, creating a distinct borderline between student/audience area and teacher stage or arena. This is particularly apparent when students are presenting, because they are then required to occupy the teachers position at the blackboard, use the teachers desk, and “perform” in the central arena of the horseshoe, while the teacher sits among the students. On these occasions, once the presentation is done, and the teacher starts giving feedback, the horseshoe reforms itself with reference to the new teachers position - students shift their chairs away from the teacher, around tablecorners if possible. The horseshoe also obliterates the periphery in the theoretical classrooms, which I come to experience on several early occasions, where I have not yet understood that there is not a periphery for me to observe from. The following occurred quite early in my fieldwork:

I am trying to position myself so that I will be able to look at the students. This results in me being seated more or less under a large wall-mounted box containing audio-equipment and computer-cabling(AV in the drawing below), in a way which is quite uncomfortable, and also appears to amuse the students somewhat. I only remain in that position for a brief time, then I move to a vacant spot nearby, within the students part of the horseshoe, ending up at one end of the horse-shoe, close to the teacher PK. [Fieldnotes KSEM I/2]

The room is illustrated in figure 12.4, with me in upper right-hand corner

---

216 On several occasions something like the following occurs: Anna-Louise from the group about to present asks “Do we have to stand up there?”, pointing towards the black board. WEM responds “Yes you do, that’s what I think.” [fieldnotes JSEM II/4]
In my attempt to position myself, so that I can see all students, I am inadvertently moving into the teacher-reserved region of the horseshoe. As I sense the inappropriateness of doing so, I withdraw and end up seated in the corner, where there is in fact no way neither physical nor social for me to remain. The unspoken ordering of the room, imposed by the horseshoe, guides me to my final position, which is in fact not only part of the student-reserved region, but is one of the least popular positions in the room, being close to the teacher - although, as I shall return to shortly, the teachers often promenades through the performance area of the horseshoe, coming into proximity with all students.

By obliterating the periphery and creating a distinct border between teacher’s space and student’s space in the classroom, the horseshoe enforces participation. Both in shape and function it resembles the panoptic devices described by Foucault - all students are facing the teacher and cannot avoid interaction. The surveillance, unlike what Foucault described, is not covert, and thus does not require constant adherence to the code of behaviour, but rather
a capacity to shift into such adherence without warning. The teacher can directly survey the participation of all students, and can initiate “rounds” (q.v. below) where the simple geometry of the horseshoe enforces that all students or groups contribute. All teachers observed *take the stage* - that is, make conscious use of this spatial organisation of the students’ gaze - in some way. The A&A teachers use the stage area literally as a stage - this is where they demonstrate the techniques of the handicraft taught. The theoretical teachers use the stage more as a way of enforcing participation - they promenade back and forth in the stage, and so move close to each student at some point, making use of the stage part of the horseshoe for both surveillance and elicitation of student participation.

One KSEM teacher verbally expounds on this:

> We are talking while EH is photocopying before class one day “It’s so important that I keep focus on the communication. As a teacher I am also a role model to the students. [...] One of the things I try to do is to make sure I move to the far end of the room, so that I communicate directly with all the students” [Fieldnotes KSEM I/1]

Apart from underscoring that her use of the stage area of the horseshoe is no coincidence, EH also states what turns out to be a central tenet of social educator teaching. Direct interaction with the students is important to teachers. As I shall demonstrate below, this is in opposition to both the students simply listening, and enforced participation. The students *must* participate, yet of their own accord, and the classroom is furnished to prod them into participation. The only attempts the students make at resisting this prodding is the reluctance of the students to themselves *take the stage* - stand at the blackboard or in whatever centres the horseshoe, when doing their presentations.

### 12.2.2 The Round

The Round is a move employed by teacher in all theoretical subjects and several A&A. It simply consists in the teacher posing a question and stating that “Let’s take a round on that” or some similar phrase, whereupon each student in turn must respond to the question. As the round progresses, the students often shift from straight answers to the teachers’ questions, and start commenting the previous responses given by other students. The Horseshoe is a prerequisite for this move, as it imposes an unambiguous ordering of the students - a queue, as it were. Rounds allows the teacher to relate pedagogically to each student, switching from controlling the students as individuals to controlling them as persons - the difference (cf. above on invisible pedagogy) being the inherent assumption (and subtle demand) of each student providing a different answer,
the class slowly accumulating a collective construction of individual contribution. Doing The Round asserts the nature of the question or task posed for the round as being endlessly varied yet universally relevant: The students may potentially each have different answers or comments, but each is assumed to have one. In Social Education studies, one such question for a round concerns a presentation and the current employment of the students. I will briefly examine that round, as well as another taking place later in the same lesson, as an example of how the round is being conducted. The following is a transcript of the first part of the presentation-round, taken from the lesson also cited in the previous section.

<1.24>PK:<raised voice>, standing at teacher’s desk> Good morning
Students: Good morning
PK: I’m PK(.) I’ve seen at least some of you(.) sitting out here and (.) being active the last six months (3) Um, and discussing and so on. I’ve looked forward to getting to know you, the word is out already you should look forward to that and eh, they are just <a students laughs> yeah, well, and so I have(.) done, but ehm before we really start, i would like it if you just could say your name and yeah, also where you’re working when you aren’t studying <inaudible> and I’ll try to take some notes
students: <inaudible>
PK: Yes, I know you did this all the time in the beginning<1.59>
Signe: I’m called, i’m called Signe
PK: you’re called Signe
Signe: and i’veeh been here and there but my prime uhm experience is from eh autism
PK: Mmm<taking notes on a sketch of the classroom>
Signe: a daycare center <inaudible> the prime
PK: okay <continues to take notes, briefly looking up when the turn moves on>
Signe: so eh <2.18>
Harry: I’m called harry and eh i’m from kindergarden and after-schoolcenters (1)
Dennis: you can [tell] that
Harry: has worked five years in after school center and then four years in a kindergarden
(4) <2.30> [...]
PK: Mmm <2.44>
Paula: I’m called paula, i’ve worked with daytime nursery and kindergarden children, i’ve done that<inaudible>
PK: <looking up from her sketch and notes>There’s (. ) really a serious portfolio of experience, isn’t it?  [KSEM Field notes I/1-3]

The teacher presents herself, and says that she has heard nice things said about
the class, and thus reenacts a common scene of polite introductions being made. She then initiates the round, asking the students to give their names and place of employment, and adds that she will be taking notes. The note-taking implies that the exchange is not only an exchange of polite greetings, but also serves as a way for PK to assess the class somehow. This is also apparent from PK’s statement concluding the segment above, wherein she asserts the presentation as a portfolio of experience, and an impressive one at that. The students’ responses follow a template that slightly differs from the one proffered by PK, in that they also volunteer their previous working history, which the portfolio assertion serves to encourage. While the tasks this round sets for the students may seem unchallenging, it serves a dual purpose: it establishes a background for comparison of the students by asserting a commonality of social educational work experience, and it then allows the teacher to inspect and assert each student in relation to that background, and thus to each other. Implicitly, this also encourages the students to compare themselves to the other students by way of social educational experience.

Since the presentation round moves from one end of the horseshoe to the other, in the end it arrives at my position:

Dennis: yes, and I’m called Dennis and i’ve worked in a after school recreation centre for six years
PK Mmm
(3)<laughter, some noise, the next person is me>
ME: Yes, well(2) I’m called Jan
<laughter>(3)
ME : Actually, I’ve worked in a kindergarten for two years, and in a special care unit for physically and mentally disabled for five years (.) and then i were a social educational studies teacher for five years at a institute of social education, and now i’m <inaudible>
<laughter>
PK Yes, well, i teach social educational studies, you know<5.03>(.)Yes(.)I’ve done so for seven years this summer(.) Haven’t been that much on open[meaning SSPSE], first time last year, those who are on second year now, um, and on fourth semester last year, so that’s those who <inaudible>
It’s a little different, but fun. <5.20> (2) Um,, other than that, i spend a lotta my time being international coordinator, of this place, […], umm we’ve an international branch(.) which I’m responsible for, […], and that means i don’t really teach that much educational studies, you know, (.) in fact, unfortu-
unately, so I’ve sort of been working to keep in touch with the subject, be-
cause otherwise you lose it(2) I’ve worked for some years in a um what’s it called after school recreation centre(.) in a Leisure time care facility, and at a school as a substitute teacher (2) um yes, both before and after i studied educational studies at RUC (1) Yes (1) then I have two kids, that’s another way to <inaudible>be reminded of what it um what is going on here and
The laughter above indicates that I am out of place in the round. In my presentation - which was made up on the fly - I try to straddle sitting close to the students, and being mostly interested in their perspective with being a former teacher. Comparing what I say, and how long I speak for with how PK introduces herself, my presentation falls somewhere between the genres of her presentation and the students, re-establishing my *implicit-teacher* relation..

It is interesting that neither my nor PK’s presentations make much of university training nor degrees, and that we both do mention social educational work experience. Both of us appear to attempt to lessen the distance between the student position and ourselves, by de-emphasising our theoretical background, and emphasising similarities between ourselves and the students.

A later round, still in the same Social Education Studies lesson, concerns what the students are currently interested in social educationally, and what they think is the most important thing they have learned so far at the NISE. All students are asked to write a few notes on this, and the teachers waits for a few minutes for this. Then she asks for answers, and as the answers come, she waits, hesitates, possibly asks a clarifying question, and concludes by putting the answer on the whiteboard, then surveys the students expectantly. This procedure - which one could call The Half-Round - establishes an expectation within the students similar to that of the round: each student must all have an answer, and these answers may well be different. Yet it then embeds the round in an *Initiation-Response-Evaluation* interaction, which explicates the evaluation of the answer (cf. Sahlström 1999). As such the object of the teachers scrutiny is the class rather than each student, but as the teacher will pick students to respond at his or her own discretion, the authority still rests firmly with the teacher. The procedure also adds an explicit dimension of correctness or appropriateness to the answers given in this type of round. The following transcript, still from the same a lesson, shows the setting up and first teacher-student dialogue in such a round.

PK: Yeah, Uhm I’d like before we even actually sort of start and you’ve read a lot, and tuition plans and get really practical and that sort of thing

Dennis:< Laughs>

PK: to start by asking by, start by asking you what’s the most important you’ve learned (.) in the six months you’ve been here now(1) that’s one,
and the other is what interests you right now [social educationally]<6.34>
If there’s nothing that interests you, that’s a bit of a shame, you could say, i
mean i know that it’ll be christmas holidays soon and um paper and so on
<a few students laugh>
PK: but anyway, what are you curious about [social educationally]
<students mumbling (4)>
PK: do you or isn’t there anything
<Laughing, noise>
PK: i would like, before you answer i would like to ask that you just (.) take
some notes on a piece of paper, just because there’re some[ of you] who’re
fast, and some who just doesn’t have time to think, if someone answers
right away (2) and then i’ll just find a [whiteboard marker] while, so whats
the most important you’ve learned and what are you curious about [social
educationally], yes, then i’ll find a [marker] <7.08> <PK leaves>
<silence, students are writing>
<inaudible mumbling, writing ><8.30>
<PK returns, writes on whiteboard><9.23>
PK: yes <points a student who has raised hand>
Student: is it just educational studies, or all the other subjects or <inaudi-
ble>
PK in the six months you’ve been here, anything, the most important you’ve
learned as social educator students until now
<9.32><Pk leans over teachers desk, writing>
<silence, students are writing> <10.05>
<someone opens door speaks> <inaudible><10.44>
< Someone mubling, laughter, some talk> <inaudible><11.32><PK sits on
teachers desk>
PK Yes (1) Does anybody want to go first?(..) and say what the most im-
portant they’ve learned is?<signe raises hand> PK Yes signe <points at
signe>[KSEM transcript & field notes I/1-5]
Signe: It’s putting some concepts on some well-known(.) actions, or getting
to discuss one’s own practice, [pedagogic] (4) because much of what one’s
read it’s not new [information]
PK no <now at whiteboard>
Signe: but you get confirmation that (2) that what what you’ve been going
around doing for a number of years it hasn’t been like completely hopeless
<12.00>
PK you didn’t say problem areas, you said um known practice <writing on
whiteboard>
Signe: um yeah mmm one’s [social], [social educational] practice (6)
Pk so in fact a confirmation of, you say, that what you’ve been going around
doing, it hasn’t actually been that bad or?
Signe: Yes well putting words the things i’ve been doing, that i’ve done sub-
consciously, because maybe i have the view of humanity, that i have, but
then getting to know, or realising, that it’s based in something
PK mmm
Signe or something like that
PK Could you give an example
<12.30>
Signe (6) Uhm well, we’ve been talking a lot about view of humanity
PK Mmm
Signe that is, from different angles, depending on the subject
PK Mmm
Signe and getting to a definition of the different views of humanity
and what makes you act like you do, and why you think of clients and chil-
dren you’re working with, as you do
PK Mmm
Signe so that’s
PK yes
Signe (3) but an actual example from practice that, that’s maybe difficult, it’s
like(.) many actions during the days
PK Mmm
Signe where your view of humanity shows
PK Mmm (1) You don’t have to give an example
Signe no that  [KSEM transcript & Field notes I/1-7]

PK sets up two questions, and leaves the students to make notes on these ques-
tions for short of five minutes, referencing some students’ possible need to
reflect. Implicitly, the preparation period for the round set-up here indicates
that all students should have prepared answers, and that the questions thus are
answerable by all. But, the referencing of faster students also underscores that
all students should have a chance for answering, and thus that different sorts of
answers are acceptable.

Yet, when PK asks the students for answers, she does select a student
who raises her hand quickly. The dialogue between PK and Signe, which fol-
lows is quite remarkable. Signe responds that the most important thing she has
learned in the last three months is connecting concepts to practice, which PK
responds to by soliciting an example. Signe tries to provide such an example,
but it eventually emerges that she is not able to do so to her own satisfaction,
and the dialogue concludes with PK stating that Signe does not need to pro-
vide the solicited example. In short, PK ends up evaluating Signe’s response to
the initial question negatively. There are three further layers to this interaction,
which need to be examined: first, the tacit understanding PK and Signe share,
that explaining what Signe believes to be the most important thing she has
learned is an answer which is to be evaluated. In short, there are acceptable and
unacceptable “learnings” students may find important, and PK is expected to
employ such a differentiation. Second, the answer which Signe provides is more
or less a general description of the colloquial relation between theory and prac-
tice: there are theoretical concepts encapsulating the practical actions that Signe
is already familiar with. In short, Signe claims that she knows how to *do* from
her work experience - and now she is learning how to rephrase that knowledge
theoretically. As this more or less describes the tacit understanding of how the
SSPSE is organised it is all the more interesting that PK subtly challenges it. PK's
challenge consists in soliciting a specific example. Signe understands this to be
an example of a concept relating to practical actions.

Which brings me to the third layer in this interaction: Signe’s example is enunci-
ated in purely theoretical terms, and she concedes that it does not provide a very
direct relation to practice. Thus, Signe’s understanding of the round implicitly
stresses the relative worth of practically related theory - as opposed to theory
alone - in this particular linguistic market. PK’s evaluation seems to support this
interpretation\textsuperscript{218}.

The three layers I have drawn attention to here are thus first that there
*is* a linguistic market at work in this classroom - a market, in which some utter-
ings are less in demand than others, and that utterings which rely on the stu-
dents’ experience as tacitly qualifying him are not deemed valuable, and neither
are purely theoretical ones. Thus, PK attempts to elicit utterings which relate
to theory, are applied to practice, and in which the application of theory to
practice is made explicit. Such statements I will term *self-contained* social educa-
tional uttering, as they attempt to embed theory and practice within each other,
as a complementary wholeness of thought determining action, determining
thought again. This figure is closely reiterates the shape of social educator train-
ing, where experience in work or work practice is complemented by theoretical
training in the classroom. The shortcoming of Signe’s response to PK’s ques-
tions is thus that she only refers to the theoretical half of this figure, dislocating
it from practice.

That Signe does so, is related to her educational strategy, that of Care-
based Educational Ascension, and to the role that education plays as part of her
biographical narrative. She trusts in education, and has done so all her life, and
places great weight on the educational system’s own badges of merit: grades.
One way reading of Signe’s response to PK’s demand for the most important
thing learned, is that Signe is saying that her practice experiences are subordi-
nate to theory, and she has learned to speak in a theoretical way, rather than a
practical one. This is her relation to education *realized* as discourse, and it ap-
ppears to be an only partially successful recontextualization, as it omits social
educational practice.

Numerous variations on how teachers deploy The Round abound: there
are pure rounds, where each student speaks, and that is all; there are rounds
where each answer is added to a summary on black- or whiteboards, fram-
ing the pedagogy as a collective effort in building a complex answer; rounds

\textsuperscript{218} As does the rest of that lesson, which consists in a group discussion of an article, where PK empha-
sizes understanding the article’s arguments, and when discussing them the application to the students’
previous work becomes central.
where each student is giving opinions, mapping out a span of social educational ideology; rounds where each student must improvise a performance of some sort, thus being required to make an attempt at music, dancing, etc.; rounds where each students must perform a specific task, each of them thus displaying whether they have yet mastered such a task.

The Round frames the pedagogy of the classroom. It is an important part of the internal framing, setting pace and explicating the borders of appropriate performance, when each student in turn comes under scrutiny. However, in several cases - i.e. the first example above - it also serves to firmly approve of external discourses or practices, and to delineate the extend of such outer discourses. In those cases The Round frames the pedagogic context externally. In all cases, The Round serves as a control device, but in a few specific situations, the round slips from control into near-coercion, that is from weak framing and invisible pedagogy to strong framing and visible pedagogy. The following two examples demonstrate situations where rounds solicit a bodily performance, to which the students react in ways that do not occur in the theory classes - by refusing, or by becoming visibly flustered:

In a music class, the students are asked to stand up, while GJ stands at the piano. He starts playing and singing a song, where the verse consists in naming a student to show how the others should dance. Each students is selected going round anticlockwise. Some students show off some street dancing moves, that clearly impresses other students, others does some very simplistic moves, laughing at themselves, and inviting others to share in the apparent joke, that their dancing is. When the turn comes to Rachel, she refuses, asking that she be skipped. GJ ignores this, and continues to sign her name in the verse nonetheless, and shrugs when she does nothing at the point where she is supposed to dance. [Fieldnotes KSEM I/4]

This use of the round stresses participation very much, and something similar occurs in Movement and PE

The students are being asked to demonstrate their flexibility. They do so and as they do the teacher - KH - exclaims how impressive Ann’s flexibility is, and asks the other students to come over and to watch her, whereupon Ann blushes and hesitates, then repeats the exercise quickly. [Fieldnotes KSEM III/5]

Bodily and performative shyness is thus being both discouraged and challenged here, which is similar to the implicit demand that all students contribute in the

---

219 The following two examples are from two Arts and Activities subject (AA) - respectively from Music and from Movement and PE. I include them here in order to discuss all aspects of The Round, but as these sections also serve as a discussion about the theory classrooms in particular, I want to stress that I have not seen any example of similar coercive Rounds in the theory classrooms.
more verbal theory-subject, but in the theory-subjects such a demand is almost always perceived as legitimate by the students. As the above examples show, this is not the case when participation and performance demands are imposed on the students’ bodies. While there is surely an interesting differentiation between verbal and bodily performance to be examined here, I will leave this point, retaining only that the round is applicable to both, and is an effective tool of control, no matter the subject-context, and that the above examples demonstrate situations of strong internal classification and framing.

The Round and The Horseshoe mirror each other as respectively spatial and temporal control devices. They provide easily recognisable pedagogic framing, distributing performance/speech-turns and teacher evaluation in an effective and simple manner. Their central principles are repetition, and individualisation. The repetition exposes all students to each of them making an attempt at realising pedagogic discourse successfully, and the evaluation of each such attempt. The individualisation, one student scrutinized by the teacher at a time, installing, at the same time, concepts of equality (all students can answer/perform), collectivity (all students are contributing), and multiplicity of thought (different students have different opinions). As the examples given above showed, The Round usually involves a lot of teacher feedback, suggestions and so on, slowly eliciting the kind of discourse appropriate for the pedagogical context, and thus establishing what does not constitute an answer, a performance, a contribution or an opinion within the relevant pedagogical context.

12.2.3 The Out-and-Back

The Out-and-Back presentation is a temporal organisation of classroom work which repeats throughout both single lessons and on larger scales: over a day or entire courses. It consists in the teacher performing some initial introduction, possibly lecturing or presenting some point, whereupon he instructs the students in a task they are to work on in groups (going out). After some set time has elapsed, the students are to return to class, and present the result of their work (coming back). This presentation often requires the student to take the stage (q.v. above), and face questions from the rest of the students. The teacher will often either withdraw to a corner of the room, or seat himself somewhere amongst the students - in a word, exiting the stage. This in fact also in part occurs during the Out-phase, where the teacher is only sporadically available to each group. One very direct example occurs in

---

220 One could argue that the example of a Round above, where PK asks the students to write notes to her question is more similar to an Out-and-Back. I think that the very short time used for preparation and the fact the students are to answer an open question, rather than solving a task makes the episode more Round-like than Out-and-Back, but the distinctions are not all that important. The control templates put here are simply templates, and the teachers combine them or improvise from them, whenever they occur in the training.
Social Education Studies at JSEM:

SS has asked the students to go into groups, and has handed out a paper listing some questions to a text the students are supposed to have read. It quickly emerges that only half the students have read the text. SS decides to reorganize the groups so that those who have read are in two groups together, and those who have not are in three other groups. SS says: let that be a lesson - you never know, I might ask you to read something again [Fieldnotes JSEM III/2]

Thus the problem of discussing an article one has not read by way of the Out-and-Back shifts from being an obstacle to participation; to a task three groups has to solve themselves. This is another aspect of the teacher withdrawing from the stage - the responsibility of interpreting and completing the task all but belongs to the students.

The very first day I am at JSEM, one lesson in social education studies starts of with a group of students presenting something they were asked to prepare in a previous lesson.

The students Anna Louise, Jytte, Lennart and Albert are standing at the teachers desk, when the rest of the class and I enter, and take seat along the horseshoe of the class. The teacher HHF is standing off to one side, and Anna Louise starts of the lesson. They are presenting the concepts inclusion and exclusion, and I notice how easy their presentation flows. Noone hesitates, no-one interrupts each other, Lennart puts headings on the blackboard in synch with Anna Louise’s initial talk. After about 15 minutes, the talk ends, and Jytte handles questions from the class. The only moment of uncertainty occurs as they hand over the reins of the lesson to HHF, where Anna Louise and Albert hesitates, and asks HHF: so now is it you who’ll? HHF leads the class in applause, then sits on the teachers desk [Fieldnotes JSEM I/1-2]

This is an example of how a successful presentation mirrors teaching, and makes use of the room in a way very similar to the teachers. The students are familiar with the genre of presentation, from the teachers’ presentations, and thus the Out-and-Back superficially places the students and the teachers as equals, at the same level. Of the students doing this presentation two are students whom I characterised by the Voluntary Diligence strategy (Jytte and Anna Louise), and that they possess the capacity to recognize and successfully realize a recontextualization of social educational pedagogic discourse is strategically unsurprising. Nor is it unsurprising that this performance falls within Albert’s Necessary Knowledge Investment strategic capacity - as this is an opportunity for him to realize an entirely theoretical pedagogic discourse, such as he discussed it in the group interview (chapter 10)
Some more complex examples, which take place during a week of preparation for a written exam in health studies follows. As the Out-and-Back takes place over quite long time, these examples features no full transcriptions; instead I will focus on timing and structure of the teaching. The exam, for which the week is meant to prepare the students consist in them selecting one from three possible set topics: a keyword, a case, or a short article on some relevant topic. The students must, individually and within three days, compose a paper taking leave from these three topics, outlining a relevant question, and discuss this question, drawing upon relevant literature of their own choice.

The preparation week starts off with the teacher RO making a general, one hour introduction to the form of the exam, and outlining some possible important aspects. Then the class is presented with a possible keyword, and asked to propose some possible question for an exam paper based on this keyword. RO puts their suggestions on the blackboard and comments in relation to the aspects he outlined earlier. This takes about another hour, and the class breaks for lunch.

After lunch, RO hand out a sample case, and asks the students to organise impromptu groups of two-three students and come up with some questions and ideas for an exam paper based on this case. They are given the next hour for this, whereupon they return to the classroom, and present the questions and suggestions for a paper, they have come up with. RO writes up all questions on the blackboard, and comments along the way, again relating to the aspects he presented earlier. This takes up the remainder of the day, and at the end of the day, RO hands out a sample article, asking the students to read it for the next day.

On that next day, RO again asks the students to form small groups, and prepare questions and possible outlines of papers. This takes up most of the morning, and just before lunch, RO hands out an entire set of exam tasks, and asks the students to spend the afternoon selecting one, and preparing a short presentation of a questions and an paper outline for the next day. RO checks that all students are in one of the groups, and states he will be available for supervision and questions for the rest of the day.

The following day, the students present their outlines, first the ones who have chosen the keyword, which is by far the most. Two groups have chosen the article and none has chosen the case. After all groups has presented, RO passes out yet another set of exam topics, this time demanding that the groups select either the case or the article.

After the groups have looked over the set for a quarter of an hour, he ask them to decide whether they will prepare an outline on the case or the article, and encourages them to spread themselves so that there are an approximately even distribution.

The students work for the rest of that day, this time preparing a short written outline for the other groups, and the final day is taken up by the case-based outlines being presented and discussed in the morning, and the article-based
outlines being presented in the afternoon. This last session segues into RO taking general questions on the exam and a somewhat fierce debate on what sort of topic is the more sensible/tactical choice. [Fieldnotes KSEM II/1-5]

This latter debate I shall return to shortly. The above period encompasses four out-and-back-presentations. First there is a short round, which introduces the principle of the class collectively trying out various approaches to the exam tasks. Then the students are given progressively longer time to prepare such approaches, and the way in which the approach must be presented increases progressively, going from a question to writing up an outline. As the demands increase, so does the time provided to complete them in, and the entire preparation period thus has a convoluted two-layered structure of repetition: each group presented their collective effort in turn, and the four repetitions of the out-and-back presentation. These repetitions within repetitions allows RO to return to a few specific points repeatedly, effectively inculcating them as the dominant symbolic meaning that the health studies exam hinges upon. From the students’ perspective this structure is hardly repetitive. On the contrary, they are asked to perform, in a very short period, five increasingly elaborate make-believe-exams, and are being publicly confronted with any shortcomings. This is, in fact, a rather gruelling training regime, demanding that the students prepare for the exam, through a sort of learning-by-doing. The Out-and-Back-presentation can perhaps be seen as an generalised version of The Round - as it requires a performances, but grants much more time for both preparing the performance, and for evaluating that performance. It shares the principle of repetition, but not that of individualisation, since it is always conducted with groups presenting. It is a rather curious feature that the out-and-back-presentation is always applied to groups - in particular as the exam the students are being prepared for in the example above is in fact completed individually. Bernstein makes a point of stressing that invisible pedagogy is expensive; it requires a fairly low ratio of teachers to students (Bernstein 2003b:iix). The repetitive structure of both the round and the out-and-back-presentation, and the group as focal point is at one level, a way of enhancing efficiency; there is simply a lot of the time in this period, in which the students provide the content. Along way, numerous topics relevant to health studies are discussed, but excepting the initial introduction, there are no formalised tuition or lectures. All knowledge on health studies that RO wishes to impart to the students, he passes on by way of discussing the group presentations. He is thus providing a very weak framing, both internally and externally. From the teachers point of view, however, this organisation of the work can also be understood as deploying project pedagogical teaching methods, on a very short temporal scale. These interpretations of the period: repetition as efficiency tool, gruelling training regime, or project pedagogy do not mutually exclude each other. Rather they are different aspects,
putting emphasis on respectively the NISE economy, the students’ perception and the teachers perception. They give rise to different expectations and the incongruence is difficult to handle. The looming exam exacerbates the differences between the teacher and student expectations, something which I shall examine in detail in the following.

At the very end of the period, RO elected to require of the students that they work on either a case or an article, when it turns out that they prefer the keyword. This suggests that RO considers the three tasks to be similar: they are of equal importance, and constitute a form of curriculum, and thus the students should be capable of handling each of them, choosing the health studies topic they prefer without discriminating between the task type. This is not how the students perceive the tasks, as the following sample shows.

This occurs as part of the final discussion on the last Out-and-Back-presentations, where the last group has presented an outline based on an article. The article concerns eating disorders amongst teenagers, but the group has chosen to discuss whether social educators can prevent eating disorders by being more observant in nursery schools. This gives rise to a discussion of whether one is allowed to write the exam paper on a different age group than the one discussed in the article provided as exam task. RO - the teacher - does not take part in the discussion initially. Mia and Harry are part of the group that presented, Rachel, Thompy, Dennis and Signe are not.

Dennis: I do know you got the task you don’t always want (1) but but (1) i think that it um (1) if you get it you mustn’t change it right but you’ve got a good point (1) like Signe also said
Mia: but I don’t really think we’ve changed anything right it’s just that there so now i’m thinking
Dennis: sure sure but
Mia: you can’t, i mean so if it says this age-groups then you have to work with that one?(1)<4.00><Mia looks at RO>
Dennis: yeah
Mia: then i’d actually like to know if there are other things (. ) so
Rachel: yes
Mia: that could be written in the article that you have to (.)
RO: if, if
Mia: work with?
RO: if it’s about
Thompy: choose the keyword <chattering in the background, laughter>
RO: if it’s about anorexia <more chattering, Rachel laughs>
RO: or if it’s about bulimia then thats the pivot (1) um selfworth selfesteem i’m damn well expecting that in sort of (1) nursery schools leisure time activity centres that’s some of the thing that one would work on (. ) generally [...]
Rachel: but what do you suggest i mean i mean RO i can see it sounds
great doing workshops and then you can do
RO: I don’t understand why you argue that
Rachel: in depth and
RO: you have to do that already(.) from zero to six years [of age], that, you
work on self-worth and self-esteem I, I hope you do, you must work on that
then
Signe yesum but that could be part of friendship that’s something you
already go in and
RO: but it’s not all sorts of other things
<Dennis laughs>
RO: this it’s really about eating disorders and it’s that (.) you must transform
into a paper
[...]<other students talking>
RO: Sssh!
Rachel: and your own body and the bodys changing and
RO: yes
Rachel: [...] I mean (1) <6.00> I can’t tell what the role of the social educa-
-tor would be?(1)
Harry: okay (3)
RO:Yes but that the whole point in [the task], i mean, it’s what, what can
you do?
Rachel: mmmm that’s true but now i’m asking you
RO: Yes (3) um (4) [Transcript KSEM II/5]

I would like to underscore the fact that it is Dennis, who questions whether one
can change the age group article aims at. His statements here echo his senti-
ments in the biographical interview completely: Are there rules, and if so, are
they not to be enforced?
Initially RO leaves the class to discuss whether the age group change is in fact
acceptable, but as Mia directs her questions towards RO, he chooses to respond.
Mia’s questions, unlike the two questions later posed by Rachel, demand a di-
rect explication of what RO would consider acceptable deviations from the
setup in the article, and thus these questions concern the exam paper genre.
Rachel’s questions concern what would be a reasonable way for the social edu-
cator to act. RO elects to only address Rachel’s questions, but does not provide
an answer that satisfies Rachel. His answer consists in stating that the answers
provided by the presenting group - working with nursery school children’s self-
estee and self-worth - are inadequate, and is something that social educators
employed in nursery school should always do. But he does not provide any clear
suggestions as to what would in fact be adequate. By abstaining from explicat-
ing his demands, except when they are not being met, RO is making the framing
extremely weak, and this frustrates the students. This leads to Rachel posing her
question to the entire class and another students answering, switching back to
the exam paper context:
Rachel: but do any of you other guys have a (.) um (1) there aren’t any suggestions for how you could go in social educationally and work
Thompy: no, but i’ll tell you how you gotta handle these things. Pick the keyword next monday, don’t pick the article <talking faster> it’s much too dangerous we’ve seen that today
Rachel: nor the case
Thompy: Don’t pick the case. Pick the keyword (1) this is sound advice for all of you pick the keyword next monday
<laughter> [Transcript KSEM II/5]

This reaction, when seen from the outside, seems quite predictable. The students have been forced to work with the two topics they preferred to steer clear off, and are given critical comments with unsatisfying explications very shortly before the exam. Presented with an inscrutable and apparently insurmountable obstacle within the training, the agents abandon their loyalty to the institution forcing the obstacle upon them. Thompy more or less circumvents RO’s pedagogy, completely abandoning the illusio of the training. Risk-assessing the three different exam tasks is precisely the opposite of what RO did, when he forced the students to try either the case or the article. This proposed to consider the tasks equal and similar - Thompy’s conclusive uttering above indicates that from a student’s perspective they are neither similar nor equal, but entail very different amounts of risk. Thus, the altercation above relates to the dual codes of what would be appropriate in social pedagogical work, and what is it that the students are supposed to supply at the exam. These two levels relate to respectively the domain of social education and the domain of social educator training, and at situations like the one above, the contradictions between the domains become pressing. The exam threatens the students’ illusio - and in the case of the students who are employing the care-based educational ascent or the necessary knowledge investment, these challenges are difficult.

The entire exam period construction discussed here also incorporate the concept of the self-contained utterings of theory and practice. The exam asks the students to elucidate a word, an article or a case, in order to test whether they have acquired sufficient knowledge of the health studies subject. When students and teachers explain how a social educator could conceivably go about relating professionally to a person with an eating disorder, the phrases used are work on or work with. The social educator is also said to go in or go behind. These are all phrases that emphasize distance: the social educator is the professional who applies knowledge or tools to a problem. This metaphorical conception of

---

221 This situation was also taken up by the students in the first KSEM group interview, as an example of the teachers being vague, and the strategical necessities this imposed on the students[KSEM I/410].
222 Signe made comments on a previous exam, which were cited in chapter 10, and later in this chapter I shall examine exam supervision situations with Dennis and Jonas, wherein similar situations occur.
social educational work asserts that social educational work consists of identifiable problems and matching tools, which amounts to exactly the same relation between theory and practice that was discussed above: Signe was expected to be able to exemplify her theoretical knowledge practically - whereas the exam in health studies requires the students to locate the theory that matches the exam task. The degree of elaboration of the three tasks differs enormously - from one word to an entire article. Achieving certainty of having made a valid match between theories and exam tasks will seem simpler if the exam task is less elaborate.

12.2.4 Templates of Control

The three templates of classroom control described above was some of the most apparent features of the theory classes, and for that reason I chose to present these together. I will briefly sum up the three templates in this section, and then go on to discuss the general structures of the theory classrooms.

The first template - The Horseshoe - is primarily a spatial control template. It imposes an overt form of surveillance and pressure towards participation on the students, and orders the classroom space, by obliterating periphery, and diverts attention to some form of stage. In short, the students are prodded towards attention, equal participation, equal presence, yet under teacher conduction. As such it is a weak form of both internal\textsuperscript{223} framing and internal classification. The Horseshoe incarnates recognition rules primarily, as all the spatial effects are highly implicit, and only rarely explicated.

The second template - The Round - is the temporal counterpart of The Horseshoe. It also induces participation by inducing a queue-like ordering of the students, yet also allows for teacher scrutiny of each student in turn. It is thus a weakly internally framed, but not entirely weakly internally classified. The classification inherent in The Round explicates turn-taking, so that students can predict when their turn will arrive, and what task this turn entails. Yet, the Round also often involves modification of the task posed at the beginning, as the student responses begin to refer to earlier responses within The Round. The Round also allows - as the two AA-examples demonstrated - for more bodily performances, with the different demands this impose on the students bodily

\textsuperscript{223} As all three templates show up in almost all subjects, neither of them can be said to produce a specific external classification nor framing. External code modalities relate the codes to either external practices, discourses or knowledge domains. These differs very much for the different subjects, as I shall outline here: Social Education Studies and Workshop do not refer to any clearly delineated external knowledge domain. Music, Psychology and Movement & PE does very much so, but in different ways: Music directly referring to musicianship and music performance, Psychology subtly identifying with the university discipline, and the clinical practice of psychology, and Movement & PE referring to a plethora of health, stress and physiotherapeutic sources. The latter three do share the reference to a dominant academic or cultural position, a reference much more murky in Social education studies, and all but absent in workshop.
practices. The round thus stresses the importance of the contribution of each student’s personal contribution and opinion, in relation to a collective effort. This also diminishes the visibility of the teacher authority.

The final template - The Out-and-Back - is both temporally and spatially extremely flexible, yet forms a readily recognizable template nonetheless. It shifts the responsibility for some tasks’ organization and completion from the teacher to groups of students, leaving them to decide for themselves how to proceed and how to interpret the task, implying that there is more to be gotten from doing the task, instead of having the teacher do it, or guide the students through it. Unlike the two previous templates it also translates the teachers’ role, from centre of the lesson to partially and sporadically available consultant. In this way this template is the weakest internally framed and internally classified of the three, since the students can conduct their task-solving in whatever way they prefer - or are able, as the example of groups not having read the text demonstrated. In this way the Out-and-Back also demands that students directly reveal their level of preparation and commitment to the training to each other.

The three templates share the traits that they emphasize the students’ participation and contribution, in fact to the point of demanding and even enforcing participation, albeit mostly in subtle ways, such as obliterating periphery, implicitly establishing a contribution-queue of all students, or by shifting responsibilities to the students. They also tend towards weak classification and framing for the most part, furthering the impression of an open, democratic space of interacting opinions, all of equal worth, and with equal demands upon teacher attention, class attention and time and space allocations. And while this impression may well be completely correct at times, there are also numerous other effects of these templates. First of all, they are all very effective time and teacher allocation devices, allowing limited resources to be allocated to the students in an accommodating, dynamic and democratic manner - yet at the same time it becomes difficult to address the limitations that exist on resources. This is because the second effect of these templates is that they create a perpetual state of both participation and complicity - the induced participation also veiling control and partitioning responsibility. The induced participation also makes the criteria for evaluation of the contributions of each student all the more important to comprehend, yet no more easily discerned. The templates all tend towards invisible pedagogy, by their weak framing and- for the most part - weak classification, and thus implicit evaluative rules. And finally all three templates makes the students utterings and their evaluation visible to all other students. In other words, the students are made acutely aware of their own position, and the positions of other students, making comparison, and hierarchical interpretations easily available. In the analysis of strategies, I examined one relation to which this point is pertinent: As the templates allows the students to compare themselves to other students, and assess their own position in rela-
tion to the other students, there is ample opportunity for Jonas’ to be aware of what it entails being in a group with Signe (cf. Chapter 10). His relation to her as dominant is not one merely formed in the group project, but also one that could form from the numerous opportunities he has had in class to assess her dispositions. Choosing which co-students one wants to work with in a project group constitutes an investment for all involved, and such investments must be made strategically. In an inversion of this relation, Dennis tells me at one point, that he has not been able to find anyone willing to work together with him in an exam project group. Dennis occupies a position that the other students perceive as a bad investment, when forming groups, and they are able to make this assessment, in part because of the induced participation and transparency the control templates engenders.

12.2.5 Theory Classrooms

The templates of control as examined in the previous sections also outlines the linguistic market of the theory class room. One form of linguistic goods that seem to be important is the self-contained social educational uttering; social educational statements encompassing a theoretical reference and applying it to an instance of social educational practice. My usage of the word theory here is the most broadly applicable one imaginable, as all forms of conceptual or literary referencing used in the classrooms. For instance in the same sense that Signe employed view of humanity above, phrases aestethical learning processes, social relations or senses are all employed as theory-markers; that is, as a shorthand reference for an entire implicit and unarticulated complex of concepts.

The instance of social educational practice is less clearly delineated in the examples above, and during the fieldwork I mostly see students intervening and discrediting the practical references made by other students, or by the teachers. An example of this occurs when Rachel repeatedly demands that RO explain what sort of practice he would suggest in the case of the Health Studies exam. In one way, the need for an example is in perfect logic connection with the exam’s demand for self-contained social educational utterings - the students expect an example of related social educational practice. But the absence of such an example epitomises the nature of theory subject exams as an imaginary pedagogical discourse, and the invisible pedagogy employed. Thus, when Rachel because frustrated with RO’s answers, the answer Thompy provides may seem as a deviation into an entirely risk-assessing relation to the exam. But in fact he

224 By this I am not assessing whether the students’ usage of the theoretical markers is appropriate, or the sufficiency of their understanding of the theories referenced. It is simply that in most most cases, such concepts are not being explained or delved into, but simply flagged en passant as relevant to the current discussion, and implicitly taken to be known. Signes usage of view of humanity in the example above demonstrates these traits. In chapter 3, section 3.5.2 Gytz Olesen’s (2005a) concept of theory as a hodge-podge of sundry concepts and references was described and it is a similar use of theory that applies here.
is also taking the nature of the pedagogic discourse literally. Since practice and practical applicability is being dispensed with by the teacher, the only reference left is the educational framing. In more simple terms, learning is replaced by passing exams.

Finally the connection constructed in such self-contained social educational utterings comes in to variants: practical applicability and practical acumen. The former consisting in the theory being referenced as outlining courses of social educational action, the latter the theory referenced as a way of rephrasing social educational actions.

The selfcontained social educational uttering’s traits, in the terms used by Bourdieu to described linguistic interactions are only partially detailed yet. The teachers seek to elicit uttering satisfying both and expressive and a stylistic demand: The expressive demand is that the uttering should contain all three elements, an theoretical marker, an instance of practice, and a connection. The stylistic demands are more elusive, and also seems to differ slightly between theory subjects\textsuperscript{225}. While empathy and pathos appears to be acceptable in psychology, this is not the case in social education studies nor health studies. In all theory subjects the teachers display stylistic preferences towards abstract and general arguments and references to practice being subordinate to theoretical reference, and conversely discourages personal, subjective references.

That such utterings form a valuable medium of linguistic exchange in the theoretical classroom is in part derived from the nature of the training as being itself an intermediary between what is termed by students and teachers as theory and practice, and what I have termed the domain of social educator training, and the domain of social education. And this duality also restates the two professionalization-strategies discussed earlier - social educator professional knowledge being derived from either some tacit practical knowledge originating in the domain of social education, or from the academic knowledge seeping from the domain of social educator training into social educational work.

\textbf{12.2.6 Educational Strategies in the Theory Classroom}

The educational strategies differs in how well-adapted they are for this linguistic market. In the example above, of Signe, her educational capital allows her to adapt to the invisible pedagogy, but her uttering in the example above does not fit completely in with what the teacher solicits, and her euphemisms fall short of success in providing the example requested. Similarly, Dennis’ request for clear rules for exam does not elicit a corresponding response from RO. In Bernsteinian terms, Signe does not possess the realization rules, and Den-

\textsuperscript{225} I have not been able to extract any more precise or thorough stylistic characterizations. While this would surely be possible through a more systematic analysis of all utterings in each theory subject, I have not had time to do so.
nis possesses neither those nor the recognition rules needed to successfully recontextualize practical discourse to the pedagogical discourse of the SSPSE theory classroom. In Bourdieuan terms, they lack aspects of the habitual capacity needed to produce the demanded utterings.

The invisible pedagogy entails an emphasis on eliciting utterings that are self-revelatory and reflexive, and on eliciting performance rather than just correct answer. The Round-examples above all share these traits. The recontextualization rules of the theory classroom impose both a demand that the reference to practical work in social education becomes equipped with theoretical markers, as well as a reflexive-performative dimension.

Yet, amply illustrated by Albert’s sentiments in the analysis of the Necessary Knowledge Investment, such a reflective dimension is in an opposing relation to that educational strategy. Albert thus appears to possess the recognition rules but not the realization rules of the theory classroom.

What I have previously referred to as the catch-phrase of Taking, not Getting the social educator training can now be rephrased as a shorthand of the pedagogical code modalities of the SSPSE classrooms: The recognition and realization rules requires the production of performances that recontextualizes a practical discourse as a theoretical, self-reflective one. Possessing these rules - or in other words the habitual capacity - allow for the production of utterings matching the demands of the linguistic market of the theory classrooms.

Thus, the dominant strategy - Voluntary Diligence - also turns out to be the one most in accordance with the linguistic market of the theory classroom, wherein voluntary participation and diligence even in the teachers absence are highly valued student practices. Diligence of a voluntary kind is more or less synonymous with the catchphrase’s Taking, in this room.

The entirely dominated strategy - Necessary Knowledge Investment - coincides with almost entirely lacking the recontextualization rules, and thus the habitual capacity for adapting to the linguistic market of the theory classes. Finally the third strategy - Care-based Educational Ascent - sits between the two other strategies, domination the latter and dominated by the former. As Signe demonstrates, the members of this class who also possess educational capital, also seem to possess at least the recognition rules, if not all realizations rules required in this pedagogic context. But Dennis possesses neither, and it would seem that the differences between his and Signe’s capacities for producing adequate utterings are much more important than their strategical common ground. In other words - looking at theory classrooms, the educational capital is a more important distinction than the shared features of the Care-Based Educational Ascents Strategy. Thus, while the two classes to whom this strategy was related: Nurses etc and Social Health Assistants are distinctive in the context of admission to the SSPSE, but that distinction is overshadowed by the differences in educational capital within the training.
12.3 Three Other Classrooms

Having above discussed the three control templates and the theory classrooms, I will now go on to examine three other rooms: the lecture hall, supervision, and the Workshop. I have chosen these three rooms because they all differ from the theory classroom in how control (and the control templates) is employed and thus also exhibits different pedagogic code modalities and linguistics markets. My choice of rooms to analyse in the following has thus mostly been guided by a comparison of the activities in the rooms, rather than an estimate of which activities are the most common. Nor do I necessarily believe these rooms to be the most important ones - depending of course on what criteria of importance one chooses to apply. The room selection is almost only to do with maximizing variation.

The rooms I will not be examining in details are Music, Movement and PE, Study guidance sessions and perhaps most importantly, project groups. I will also disregard the many open rooms of the NISE used in breaks and recess, even though these are obviously important rooms as well. Project groups are in my opinion a unfortunate omission, but one that was difficult to avoid. After several attempts - as mentioned in the previous chapter - I decided to stop observing groups, since it proved very difficult to find a way of doing so, that did not disturb the students beyond what I deemed acceptable. As the interviews indicate that the SSPSE student considers their co-students an important point of reference, support both in relation to the training and as community, this is regrettable. I believe my study is short of some important aspects of the training due to this omission, yet I cannot hazard a reasonable guess at what I am specifically missing here.

As to the other omitted rooms, Music and Movement and PE are very similar in their organisation. The most important points to be made about these rooms have already been demonstrated above: these two rooms employ The Round in a sometimes coercive way, and they often draw on very strong external framing, when referring to musicianship, or research of physical aspects of the body. The study guidance sessions are perhaps the weakest framed situations of all, as the topic here is the students’ perception of themselves as students. The content of these sessions range widely and occasionally addresses very personal and difficult issues for the students. But they are quite similar to the two sessions of individual exam supervision I will be discussing below, the most important difference being that the students themselves are the object of the supervision in these sessions.
12.3.1 The Workshop

The workshop - which in Danish is both the name for a group of rooms, and the subject taught in them (Arts and Craft) - is a very different setting than the two rooms previously discussed. The physical area designated The Workshop takes up an entire floor of KSEM (I did not attend any lessons in the workshop at JSEM), and consists of six connected rooms. Most of these contain a mixture of shelves and cupboards with all sorts of materials for handicrafts - paper, wood, wire, tractor hose, wicker branches, string, leather, paint and painting utensils, and so on. There are large washing basins, an entire wall is taken up by woodworking tools, several carpenters benches, a room with non-moveable power-tools (both for woodwork and metal-working). But also sewing machines and utensils, cloth and fabrics, felting utensil and much more.

While the area taken up by the workshop is thus immense, and by far the largest room of the NISE, twice the size of the canteen, and perhaps four times larger than the gym, is also an incredibly cluttered room, in many place with very little space for moving. In the centre of the room, where several of the ways of access to the workshop arrive at, is a large table, with a whiteboard at one end, and twenty-something chairs. All lessons I attended in the workshop started out at this table. Yet the lessons follow a template of their own, very unlike all other lessons. The lessons start out with the teacher doing some short introducing talk, whereupon the students either start up or continue small workshop projects, most individually but also some in groups. It is apparently very much the students who decide themselves what projects they want to work on, and most of the lessons are taken up by the teacher showing the students different handicraft-related knacks, or fetching specific materials or tools, or suggesting ideas for the project the students are working on.

This is also visible from the temporal and spatial organisation of the room - both being very loose and open. The students takes breaks when they want, chatting and small-talking about almost anything while working on their projects. Often they get up and fetch some implement or material they need, and get back or move their project next to some other student, with whom they want to talk while working.

During several of the lessons in the workshop, I chose to record the students and teachers positions in the rooms, at set time intervals (five minutes). These drawings - a set of which are included in appendix 19 - demonstrated how the spatial and temporal organisation fluctuate in a very different way from the theory classroom (and also from the two other AA-rooms, Movement & PE, and Music). At no point does the teacher sit down, nor stays in one place for five minutes. She is constantly on the move, helping students with nume-

---

226 I take a number of photos in the workshop in order to get an idea of what the rooms contain. I have neither included these nor any thorough map of the workshop, as this would make KSEM immediately recognisable to many NISE teachers.
ous different tasks. As she is constantly on the move, the students come to her and queue up, waiting for her to help them. Most need help with finding a tool, or with some technical aspect of their handicraft-project. This is quite similar to how the Out-phase of the Out-and-Back in general looks, but with a much higher frequency in students requests for the teacher’s assistance. Thus, the teachers has very little control over temporal and spatial structures of the lessons, and the relation of dominance between teacher and student is weakened somewhat. The linguistic market is fragmented, in that there is no open and commonly visible market of exchange of utterings - rather, almost all exchanges occur in an informal, intimate relation between one students and the teacher. This means that how the different students act within the market is not visible to the other students - in short some of the transparency of the theory classrooms is absent here.

However, both The Round and The Horseshoe are present, and the teacher can set very canonical class room control structures in motion, when she wishes to do so. In the following this occurs, and it provides a rare glimpse of how the Absent Outsiders relate to the training.

SD: <2.15 SD is standing at the whiteboard> when I’m going home [...] I’m always wondering about how the day went(3) I’m not always happy (1) about these courses(.) on [SSPSE] (3) and that’s because I think it’s a hopeless situation to put(.) you in and put me in so I’d really like to hear your(.) take on it so I can try to take it back and do something about it(3) bit of what I talked about yesterday about some of these processes of work there’s one thing all those different work processes all have in common (1) and it’s that things take time (1) [...]But you won’t have time to get that layer of inspiration and ideas and(.) thoughts [to take] back out to your everyday work which we in fact which I in fact mean to [...] And’ve got this feeling(.) Of course I caused that myself(.) That things get a little confusing because I want to do to many things(.) So I’d like your take on yesterday and if(.) It would be better to say but now you all have to weave a basket or make something from tractor tube or should it be me who says but that’s where we’re going or(.) What would be better(.) For you <4.07> for your [daily work] how to use these workshop lesson <SD sits down, leans back>(3)

Jonas:<4.21> well I think it would be best if you give us some input be-cause or else we just go back to what we know and what we think is(.) Easy<inaudible (12)> maybe a bit more interesting but well it’s a bit funny that, that [we] bring something back home nowum that we never would’ve done like tractor tube <laughing, SD laughs>(2) [Transcript, KSEM III/7-3]

In this transcript of the first part of the dialogue, SD sets in motion something not completely unlike a round. She wants feedback on what the students thinks about her workshop tuition so far, and how they think she should proceed. On
the one hand, she is offering them an opportunity to decide and influence the training - on the other, she is asking them to enter into collusion with her, on making the best of an unsatisfying set-up. The option put forward is that she selects some mandatory project or handicrafts-task, but appears to welcome alternative options. Jonas is the first student to response, and he would like for SD to select a mandatory task, as he fears he will otherwise stick with what he knows. Jonas employs the Necessary Knowledge Investment strategy, preferring having the teacher provide knowledge in return for his investment. His argument that he would otherwise stick with what he knows, is another way of stating that he is expecting to obtain skills and/or knowledge he does not already possess. The next student to comment on SD’s questions however has something different to add.

SD: and what do you want to say Harry

Harry: <4.53>but I want to say that I don’t agree with Jonas (.). But I want to say that what you’re saying that’s what every teacher we’ve had says every one we’ve had says that here, here we oughta have had much more than we’ve got but sorry we don’t have the time and that is fucking annoy-ing to listen to butum it’s, it’s (.). honest talk and you say it now but um when you’re sitting her and pay for your training yourself (.). I’ve kept getting that do I have to listen to what we started hearing now that, that here you won’t really have time to learn anything because there isn’t time it makes you wonder about why it’s put together the way it’s been put together I think that’s pretty

SD:<talking at the same time>that’s also why I’m asking

Harry: annoying andum

SD: for you to be able to

Harry: yes

SD: go on with it [Transcript, KSEM III/7-3]

Harry is an older (45) male student, who has previously worked as a carpenter, but now works in a leisure time care facility. Harry belongs to the Outsider-class, but declined participating in interviews, providing a written, signed explanation on his questionnaire that he did not feel he had the time to participate. He spent the previous day working on a large wooden tool chest on wheels, which he intends to use at his place of work. Harry vehemently protests the context of SD’s question, and appears to be quite upset by it. He is dissatisfied with what he is getting for paying himself for the training - a relation to the training similar to what Jonas has also stated in the group interviews (cf. Chapter 10) - and every time he is confronted with statements like this, he feels that his investment in the training is being devalued. What SD puts as an attempt to accommodate the students is to Harry an affront, since it entails both a devaluation of his investment, and that he takes part in implementing this devaluation.
Harry: and then I think um well yes as to those (.) things well I think sure it's something we can try out
SD: but did you do any <inaudible> yesterday because actually you said yesterday that I don’t care to do that (.) I don’t care
Harry:(1) Oh I didn’t say that (.) But I had a plan that I wanted to do something on out project (.) and I was very decided on that you could say
SD: but it was (.) actually something that you knew already right I mean it needn’t be here(.) as inspiration and
Harry: you could say that but you could also say that if I hadn’t been allowed to do it here then I would never have gotten it done (1) and I want to add that I did it with the ones in my group and I thought the process it
SD:<talking at the same time>: you got something useful out of it okay
[Transcript, KSEM III/7-3]

As he continues from his critique, he ends up half-heartedly agreeing with Jonas. SD then confronts him with the fact that yesterday he was not willing to do anything but what he had decided upon himself: The tool chest, which is a project that in fact he could have worked upon anywhere. He answers in two statements - first stating that he does not have other opportunities to get the chest made, and secondly stating that the context of the tool chest production was a students project group. These two utterings embodies quite different relations to the training. Making a tool chest that is destined for his regular place of work, instead of felting or weaving with tractor tube indicates that Harry is disinclined to do projects that do not serve some other purpose than pure workshop skill acquisition. This is another way of making the most outcome of his investment in the training - no effort must be wasted, and here he is producing something and his investment of time and work in that product is contingent upon that product having an outcome. He then adds the second uttering, that he was working with his project group, and starts to refer to some process of that group, where upon SD completes the sentence stating that be got something out of it. So, the outcome in Harry’s eyes - the tool chest for use at his place of work - is contrasted by the outcome that SD notes - that which he got out of the group and the process in which the tool chest must then be understood to serve as a replaceable, random task.

This transcript shows the linguistic market here valuing utterings that demonstrate the students reflected relation to himself, and an understanding the production of workshop objects are a means of training, and not an end in themselves.

By himself referring to this latter form of outcome, Harry demonstrates that he is aware of these criteria - but he has not been willing to let them dictate his choice of workshop project. His strategy of protecting his investment in the training is closely related to the necessary knowledge investment, as Albert in
particular voiced it when preferring knowledge over reflection. But by ensuring that his workshop product is an worthwhile investment in relation to his work, he could be said to be taking, rather than getting, the training: he chooses what to do and makes full use of the opportunities of the workshop. But the way in which he takes draws upon external practices and is legitimated by referring to external discourses, and SD indicates that this is not a legitimate recontextualization. Harry thus has not completely understood the weak external framing of the workshop, and the related realization rules, which is why the group and the process references are added as an afterthought.

Summing up, Harry and Jonas provides an image of recontextualization in the workshop. The predominant weak framing and classification, and the resulting invisible pedagogy, embodied in the very open and free temporal and spatial structuring of the room, are related to the individual student as object of the workshop work, rather than the various materials. Thus the utterings in demand in this room are not only selfcontained social educational utterings, but rather utterings like the one provided by Jonas in the transcript - utterings relating the workshop as work done by and applied to the student himself, rather than a specific product.

In total, the workshop as classroom is structured around the individual students working on small handicrafts-projects, and the materials, tools and knacks the handicrafts involve. This makes for a very openly structured room, with weak internal classification and framing. There is still a subtle pressure for participation, but the relation to the teacher is structured differently. There are Rounds and Horseshoes, but the dominant activity is the above free individual work. Within this pedagogical setting, however is an emphasis on seeing the work as not only production, but also as a reflective effort, the students indirectly working on themselves. This may be seen as a shared feature of the AA-subjects, as the more coercive rounds conducted in Music, and in Movement & PE also can be seen as demanding the students work on themselves.

12.3.2 Lecture Hall

The lecture hall is one type of classroom is remarkably different from both the theory classroom and the workshop. There are two weekly lectures in the JSEM SSPSE schedule, although during my stays I only got to observe one. In brief, if differs by the lack of the spatial control device of the horseshoe, by a very different stage for the teacher to employ, and by the need for more overt control. This means the subtle tools for inducing interaction and participation are no longer present - or when they are, they fail to function as they do in the theory classrooms. In effect the room tends to de-focus the students, and instead the teacher is brought to front stage. The lack of the subtle control devices in the lecture hall necessitates overt forms of control, if the students are
to participate, and this both shows the teachers’ reluctance to such crude forms of control, and their reliance on the subtler forms in the regular classroom. One could say that the lecture hall, unlike the two previously discussed rooms, does not function as a unified market for linguistic goods - there is not a complete agreements between the students and the teacher as to what they are doing.
together, in this room.

The teachers are not very happy about lecturing, and they say so - to me, but also to the students during lectures. The teachers keep trying to establish participation and dialogue, but neither the room nor the furnishing provide a framework that supports these attempts, and so they flounder. Below is first a map - graph 12.5 - showing the layout of the lecture hall, and the student distribution in it at one such lecture. The absence of the horseshoe is evident, and the large, raised dais and the screen draws the gaze of the students and me both. The projector, which projects PowerPoint presentations and regular slides on to the screen is not functioning well, and all presentations are fuzzy, blueish, and very dim. Therefore it is necessary to dim the lights in the room. The effect of that I have tried to draw in the second map - graph 12.6. Only a small part of the room is lit up, and most of the area where the students sit is in partial darkness.

This partial darkness combines with several other aspects of this class to reduce students participation:

- The teachers uses a wireless microphone for lecturing, and if the students ask questions, the microphone needs to be brought to them, or they have to speak very loudly. On those few occasions where questions are posed by the students, they are muted by the room, and the students must repeat them several times, or wait for the microphone.

- There are between 60 and 70 students present in the room, at the lec-

Both the first term SSPSE students and the students doing first term at the ordinary social educators
ture I observe, meaning that the students are less exposed to the teachers, and the teacher is unable to be equally attentive to all the students.

- The room is very large: the students at the far back are more than 40 meters from the teacher.
- A large number of students have their laptops turned on in front of them, and are working actively on them. During a break I go round the room, and notice that about a third of the students are using their laptop for something not related to the lecture - mostly social networking, or games, but also shopping and a dentists’ online appointment-booking. The other two thirds of the students have either the schedule for this week, the powerpoint-slides for this lecture, or other documents directly related to the lecture and the course.

Thus, this setting - in opposition to the theory classrooms - hampers student access to teacher attention, and to enter into dialogue with the teacher. There is no pressure to induce participation, and neither the spatial nor the temporal structuring of the round or the horseshoe are easily applicable, due to the room’s furnishing.

In short, the teachers relation to the students is very tenuous here, and the students have ample opportunity to avoid the teachers attention, if they so desire. The teachers are very much aware of this, and posits it as an inherent drain on students participation. WEM voices this when she states that “I’m not happy having to do these lectures. I’d rather teach” [Fieldnotes, JSEM II/2-7] - implying that lecturing is not teaching. SS is less hesitant, the only teacher I meet who is not only negative towards the lectures: “At first I thought it was really difficult but later on I came to think, but why wouldn’t they be able to make their own learning reflections at a lecture”[Fieldnotes, JSEM II/1-4]. Thus, the loss that WEM’s reference to teaching implies, is seen by SS as a matter of unfounded assumptions about students. What is definitely lost, however, is the subtleness of control, that was found in the theory classroom.

The teachers’ normal measures of control reveal themself to less effective in this setting, as seen in the following:

WEM is explaining a model for social educational development work, and is defining the ‘Signs’ aspect. She asks the students:” So did you understand that?”

No-one reacts.

WEM says:”Well, could everyone who didn’t understand raise a hand?”

No-one raises their hands. The room is silent, then someone giggles.

WEM says:”All right, those of you who did understand, raise your hand”

More giggling and laughter, no hands are raised.

WEM says:”Ok, noone has understood, and no hasn’t understood. It’s a
difficult situation. [short pause] We have to move on.” [Fieldnotes, JSEM II/2-7]

In this incident, the second request almost feels predestined to produce the absurd situation, as I experience the situation from the students point of view. It exposes the students’ disinterest in WEM’s query, and their giggling show that they are aware of this. The teachers reaction is to state the absurdity, and then note that she cannot do anything about it. But when she next encounters this disinterest she does something else. She has initiated an Out-and-Back session, but students are very hesitant to take the stage and present:

After having worked for half an hour on an exercise, the students return to the lecture hall. WEM asks for some volunteers to present the result of the group work. After a short break three SSPSE students volunteer (Eva, Albert, Anna Louise). They get up on the stage and present for three minutes and sit down again, while the other students applaud. WEM pick up the microphone: “Now that wasn’t that dangerous, was it? Who’s next?” Noone volunteers. WEM says “You may as well get used to getting up here. There’ll be no prizes.” Still noone volunteers. WEM: “If noone volunteers, I’ll just select someone. So you may as well volunteer.” Still noone volunteers. WEM selects some student on front row, they nod and climb up on the stage. WEM comments: “What do you know, you should simply just point at someone. It’s dangerous to sit in the front row, just like at the circus.” [Fieldnotes, JSEM II/2-7]

WEMs use of power228 here becomes completely overt, but also ensures she achieves her goal. However, while the students accept her use of power without hesitation, WEM herself is highly ambivalent about it. She tries hard to entice someone to volunteer, and when this fails, she explains that the consequences of not volunteering to present will be that she forces someone to present. The lecture hall resembles the theory classroom, only both internal framing and internal classification is stronger here. It is interesting to note, that the very visibility of the pedagogy also provides the students with a number of avenues of passive resistance against the subtly enforced participation of the theory classroom. This is not a pedagogy that WEM is comfortable using, as can be seen from her hesitations, and reservations when employing it, and also from the quote where she distanced lecturing from teaching. I believe that this discomfort stems from the fact that the lecture hall demands a form of pedagogy, that run contrary to the ones most often applied by the teachers: In the lecture hall, it is in fact possible to get training without having to take it. The demands

---

228 The concepts of power and control are connected by Bernstein to respectively Classification and Framing. The selection of students to present are not implicitly supported by the relations between the teacher and students, but instead explicitly enforced, by an overt stressing of the teachers dominant position in this room. This is thus a manifestation of power, rather than control.
are being made explicit here, and the content is not constructed in collusion with the students. Yet, as the quote from SS earlier stated, there is no reason that the students should not be able to take control of their own participation in this setting - and in fact, the students use of their laptops demonstrates that they are relating to the training. This also seems to belie one worry that both WEM and SS voice - that many students are completely passive and inattentive at the lectures.

In other words, there is not a complete unification of the lecture hall as linguistic market - the pedagogical code modalities allow for different recontextualization than the one the teachers appear most comfortable with, and which is produced by the pedagogic modalities of respectively the workshop and the theory classroom, or in less theoretical terms: the students recognize the lecture hall as a different form of pedagogy than the one the teachers aim for.

A notable difference from the theory classroom is thus the measures of control available to the teachers. The lecture hall allows for overt forms over power being applied, but the teachers are not comfortable using them. They prefer to apply the subtle control and surveillance options that The Horseshoe and The Round provides. The ineffectualness of these in the lecture hall setting leaves the teachers with few indications of how the students are relating themselves to the training. In short, the teacher try to induce taking, rather than getting, but the lecture hall setting hampers this.

The educational strategies are easily discerned in this room. The SSPSE students choose to sit closely grouped, and the SSPSE students. When WEM tries to recruit a volunteer, three SSPSE students do so, while no ordinary social educator training students do. The lecture hall mimics the concepts of knowledge dissemination at the core of the Necessary Knowledge Investment, and while not inducing participation, neither does it complete hamper it, allowing for the Voluntary Diligent students to participate. And - retaining the finding that educational capital is a more adequate distinction than the Care-Based educational ascent - students with the capacity for perceiving and appraising educational categories may well recognize the lecture setting as originating with dominant educational institutions, such as the universities. Thus, the lecture-hall-setting features aspects that are comfortably related to each of the educational strategies by the students, whereas the teachers are the ones the least comfortable with this room.

12.3.3 Supervision

So far, the theory classroom has been shown to revolve around the production of self-contained social educational utterings, and the workshop revolving around the production of self-reflective utterings. The idea that the students are to take charge themselves of this production, rather than follow in the foot-
steps of the teachers is embedded in both rooms, as a shared *Take, Don't Get*-pedagogic code modality configuration. The lecture hall has a different pedagogic configuration in the lecture hall, and effectively this first means that the control templates enacting the *Take Don't Get*-pedagogy does not work., and secondly means the teachers reluctantly must resort to much more visible pedagogy. This frustrates the teachers, even though such pedagogy does not appear to be at odds with the educational strategies, nor do the students appear have difficulties in adapting to such pedagogy. In the final room of the training I will be examining - Supervision - my analyses thus centres on comparing the utterings which prove valuable in this context with those of the theory class room and the workshop, and comparing the pedagogic code modalities with those of the three other rooms.

Supervision is neither a room created by a specific physical location - as was the lecture hall - nor one connected to specific subjects - as was theory class and workshop. Supervision is a pedagogical template, that reappears in almost all subjects and settings of the SSPSE: Theory subjects, AA subjects, study guidance, work practice, exams, groups projects and individual work, and more. The three control templates cannot be meaningfully applied to supervision setting, primarily because of the low number of students compared - the order in the room resembles a horseshoe on occasion, but none of the spatial control described in the previous sections accompany it, and in the same manner there are no rounds. Supervision does occur as part of most Out-and-Back-situations, but in those cases the supervision is a subordinate part of the Out-and-Back pedagogic construct.

I have chosen to examine two examples of individual supervision, and one short sample of group supervision. The individual supervision samples are part of an preparative course for Arts and Crafts individual exam\textsuperscript{229} at KSEM, whereas the group sample is from a Social Education Studies group project at JSEM - thus I am in total sampling almost all the various settings in which supervision takes place.

The two individuals being supervised as part of their preparation for the individual Arts & Crafts exam are Jonas, and Dennis. The supervision sessions takes place in the arts & crafts’ teachers’ office, which is just adjacent to the workshop. The supervision is scheduled in direct continuation of an arts & crafts-lesson, with half an hour scheduled for each student who has requested supervision. The supervision takes place at the teacher's desk inside the office (there are three desks here, as three teachers share the office). The teacher - HB - is seated behind the desk, with her back to the wall. The students are seated in front of her on the other side of the desk. I am sitting at a different desk in a corner off to the side of the teacher and the student.

\textsuperscript{229} As the reader may recall, Arts & crafts is the name of the subject taught in the Workshop. In Danish the two words used are the same, but for some reason, the official english translations differ.
The office is quite different from the Social Education studies teachers office - there are numerous shelves with various workshop products (I assume) - carvings, felted figures, woven baskets, paintings and sculptures and so on. Some larger objects of a similar nature are standing on the floor, or in the windows. While none of these objects are used in any way while I am in the office, they contribute to a different sense of the office - similar to the cluttered and busy feel of the workshop. Jonas’ supervision session starts off with HB asking, immediately after Jonas has sat down, “What do you want?”. Jonas explains that his project is about two kids at his job at a school. Both kids are new, and “are not part of the children’s community at the school”. So, Jonas wants them to establish relations to each other, and he will facilitate this by building a soapbox car with the two of them. This takes about two minutes, and then HB interjects:

<22.20> HB but (.) Soapbox car with seven to eight year olds that’s your subject right (1) <Jonas nods> so you’ll have to develop your problem statement around that right you know all the words you enter into that you have to explain in your paper (1) and I mean I can’t tell you what you problem statement should be or approve it but you can bring it along and then I could ask you about it and did you think of and will that be in there [Transcription and fieldnotes, KSEM III/9-1]

HB proposes how Jonas can reconstruct his presentation as a particular sort of linguistic object: an exam subject. The students are all expected to submit such a subject to HB within two days, and HB are then supposed to approve these subjects. There are no written guidelines as to how such a subject should be phrased, but by the proposal above indicates two specific components: an target segment, and an Arts & crafts-object. Jonas goes on to ask about what theory he should put in the paper to which HB answers: “how, how is, how can, how does a seven-eight year old think and act it’s sort of a psychological angle to what you do umm what can they actually do what do you expect they can do at that age”. Thus, the theoretical component underlying the subject is a very specific matter of theoretically underpinning the applicability of the arts & crafts object to the target segment. The relation between the components also requires an underlying assumption of social educational intent, as the following quote demonstrates:

Jonas: the soapbox car won’t be the most important part [...] HB: it must be Jonas: yeah I know that but HB: it must be jonas: (1) no but it’s just as much social educational when compared to

230 All quotes are from a transcription [KSEM III/9], which however runs far too long if included in its entirety.
In this quote, Jonas suggests that his paper will focus less on the soapbox car than on the social educational intent of making the car. HB states that while there must always be such a purpose, it is the Arts & crafts-object that must be the main point of the paper. HB has previously also listed a number of specific and concrete points, which the paper must address: the materials used, the paint used for decorating the car, the safety measures needed in relation to the kids using tools and so on. All these very concrete demands connect to the above point, that the soap box car in itself is the subject of the paper. In connection with the description of the subject of Jonas’ paper, it is apparent what object HB is trying to elicit from Jonas: a practical social educational effort applied to a specific group, with theoretical emphasis on validating the applicability, rather than on the social educational intent. This is very similar to the self-contained social educational utterings, although the demands for the theoretical connection is very specific. Comparing it to Signe, when asked in the round about what she had learned, her task was to establish a connection from theory to her practical work - here Jonas’ is faced with the reverse task of establishing a connecting from practical efforts to a theoretical point, that legitimates his effort.

I now turn to Dennis, and his supervision session. It occurs directly after Jonas’ sessions has ended, and the following is a transcript of the first part of the session, after Dennis has entered. Dennis sits in the same chair as Jonas. He comes in, sits down, and asks if HB wants to hear what he is planning. She does, and Dennis begins:

Dennis: I’m planning to start off from something I’ve been doing for the last many years
HB: then I do hope you’re going to develop it further
Dennis: I do that constantly
HB that’s good
Dennis: well I’m not satisfied with the things I’m doing just because it works you know there’s always new thing being added
[...]
HB: is that what you want to do
Dennis: um (. ) yes (. ) No that
Dennis begins by saying that his project is derived from familiar, previous activities. He is immediately told that he should then develop it, and be doing something beyond what he knows, mirroring Jonas’ opinion in the previous section on the Workshop, that one should try to go beyond what is easy and well known, and the teacher is a welcome aid in this respect. Dennis states that he is of course developing what he does, and goes on to explain briefly what his plans are - this explanation is omitted in the transcript above. He is doing some form of continuing roleplaying with the children, and they have so far made costumes and weapons, and now he wants to make a book. At this point HB interjects a question: is this what he wants to do? This throws Dennis briefly and it would seem that he interprets her question as an indication that his project proposal is not sufficient. As he comes to explain that this is in fact what he wants to do, HB poses a new question: What will he call it? Dennis has no immediate response, and HB explains that there has to be a subject she can approve, and comment on. As Dennis has no response to this, HB then goes on to state that his proposal so far is insufficient. Comparing to the transcripts of Jonas above, it would seem that what causes Dennis’ proposal to be insufficient is a lack of both a arts and crafts object, and a target segment. At no point in this session does Dennis state who the audience for his roleplaying activities are.

It seems from HB’s questions to both Dennis and Jonas about the subject, that this is an important point to her in these supervision sessions. As the students are to obtain her approval of the subjects in a short time, this is logical, but as she poses the question to Dennis here, she takes over controlling the dialogue. Jonas provided the building blocks of the subject himself, whereupon HB reconstructed his statements as a subject for him. Dennis has apparently not provided the necessary building blocks of such a subject, and so HB does not provide him with a reconstruction similar to what she provided for Jonas.

Footnote: From the interview, I know that he is doing these activities with the children at his place of work, which is a leisure time care facility. This means that the children are between seven and eleven at the outside.
There is thus an certain part of the work involved in constructing a subject, that the students need to complete on their own, before HB deem it acceptable to complete the subject. It is to be their project and their work, not HB’s, it would seem.

Dennis continues with a meandering monologue, unsure if he should call what he wants to do bookbinding or if there may a better name. To me, it seems he is unsure of what HB expects of him, and hoping to get some further pointers. After about a minute, the following occurs:

HB: it doesn’t seem like there’s enough to work with, does it?  
Dennis: no there isn’t not if it’s um it, it’s too little I mean I would have to (1) I’d though that I would take some more things in (1) um that I’ve done I’d choose to start off from this book by Gideon Zlotnik  
HB<talking at the same time>: what is it that you want to do  
Dennis: but I want to start off from that book  
HB<talking at the same time>: what would you call it [...]  
HB what would you if you were to do some (.) things like those (.) What would you (.) How would back up that um (.) That’s what you should do (.) Why’s it important that you’re doing those things  
Dennis: it’s important that um it, it’s being developed constantly in order to maintain the kids’ creative approach to roleplaying <49.00>  

HB tells Dennis that what he has so far proposed is insufficient. Dennis immediately agrees, and goes on to suggest a book he wants to use. He is thus attempting to provide a theoretical context for his project, but HB interrupts, instead focussing on Dennis’ intentions with the project - what is it that he wants to do? Dennis is apparently supposed to choose a project, and decide for himself what he wants from the Arts and Craft exam; again taking, rather than getting. Her final questions indicate what HB thinks is lacking in Dennis’ project: The social educational intent, that is, the purpose of doing roleplaying and doing a book for roleplay. Dennis’ answer above relates roleplaying to creativity. This is not sufficient to HB, and she suggests something else:

HB< leaning back, turning her side towards Dennis>: I was wondering if you could connect it to the new company plans (.) That they have to do (.) at the institutions (.) So you could connect  
Dennis: easily  
HB: could you connect to one of ‘em what number is it is it called cultural expressions company plans  
Dennis: its called pedagogic curriculum its here on page 169  

232 Gideon Zlotnik is a Danish specialist doctor in child psychiatry, and both a popular author and speaker on children and gender.
The plans HB is referring to are in fact called pedagogic curricula and they were introduced two years previously in nurseries and nursery schools. Dennis is eager to accept this proposal. Now, as it happens, the pedagogic curriculum is in fact not applicable to leisure time care facilities such as the one Dennis is doing his project at. Yet this fact seems to be known only to me, as observer: Dennis has not told HB what kind of institution he will be doing his project in - nor has she asked. I mention this only because it as well as the misunderstanding about company plans - indicates that HB is no longer trying to elicit a subject from Dennis. Both Dennis and HB are slightly inattentive to the actual object of Dennis’ project at this point. This inattentiveness is not random, nor should it be written off to confusion or similar issues. HB is trying to provide Dennis with an acceptable subject, and as he has been unable to come up with one himself, she now applies her own ideas. She is thus shifting from a very weak pedagogy to a much stronger framed one, explicating to Dennis what external discourse he should draw on. Dennis is now the subject of a more visible pedagogy, which comes about because of perceived insufficiencies in his project proposal. Next HB lists how such a paper should be written and what sections it could contain. Dennis responds by immediately and completely subscribing to HB’s suggestion:

Dennis: So I had planned for it to start at why do you do this and it’s about the pedagogic curriculum and then you could go into the cultural expressions [Transcription and fieldnotes, KSEM III/9-4]

Earlier, in chapter 9 on student biographies, I quoted Dennis noting that he had understood that his own perceptions and theories were not in demand at the NISE, but he had a hard time figuring out what was in fact in demand. The above supervision recalls those statements. It seems that students such as Dennis, with little educational capital, apply inadequate strategies to the training. Here Dennis does not possess the capacity that Jonas demonstrated when providing an adequate subject for his exam. He is unable to produce the sort of utterings in demand. This inability leads to exposure to a form of pedagogy which makes him acutely aware of this inability, and to the inadequacy of his strategies.

I previously - in the section discussing the theory classroom - that the Care-based Educational Ascent strategy seemed to be a strategy useful for describing how some students arrived at enrolling at the SSPSE, but it was su-

233 The company plans that HB is referring to are a completely different document, which describes the social educational work of each institution to the municipality. The are not mandatory in all municipalities, nor in all kinds of institutions. HB mentioning them here is a misnomer, which becomes apparent from her mention of Forms of Cultural Expression, which is one of six much-discussed curriculum headlines in the pedagogic curriculum.
perceded by the distinctive effect of educational capital within the training. The above example demonstrates Dennis’ lack of the necessary recognition and realization roles for recontextualizing successfully to this pedagogic discourse.

I will conclude my examination of Supervision by a short example taken from a group supervision session, as part of a social education studies period at JSEM

<34.10>Jytte: also it’s been a problem that (.).it’s been difficult for us to sort out all those philosophers and and psycho, psychologists and sociologist
HJ: yes
Jytte: which is which
HJ: yes
Jytte; And so we’re trying to make this file on all of them [...] and we do that like <inaudible(2) laughing>
HJ: yes but so it goes back and forth sometimes <inaudible (1) more laugh-
ing>
Bea: but Sometimes it does fit with what we’re discussing
HJ:Yes precisely and then you could say that it is_ sort of a scattergun approach what you’re doing right ‘cause it may be that it’s useful for what you’re doing but is might also not be
Jytte: mm hmm
HJ: What you also might like to do(1) was to prepare before you start your collaboration right to try to define what is the goal for [our] work
Jytte: mmmm
HJ: what is it we’ll have to get on top of what do we imagine (.). Suppose that (.). The teacher is thinking when he’s started this I mean what do you think that the teacher thinks that we’ll be getting from this
Jytte: mm mm
HJ: And what do we want from it ourselves (1) so that becomes obvious to you (.). And it could be that what the teacher is aiming for it doesn’t agree with what you need (.). If you feel you are in charge of this theory why should we sit around and mess with it for no we would rather do something else.<37.12> [Transcript JSEM II/2-4]

I have previously encountered references to the file that Jytte and her group is keeping on the various names they are being exposed to, but here HJ provides a teacher’s perspective on this endeavour. Her response to the group consists in three recommendations.
First, she points out that the file the group is making may not be useful in all cases, secondly she suggests that the group instead formulate their own goal for their project, and third, she states that the group could then could select which part of the training they want to use, and in what ways.

Looking at these three points in order, the first one relates to what sort of investments the students’ current strategies consist in, and what sort
of outcome they can expect. HJ states that the students’ outcome may not be optimal, as they do not know for sure whether their work on the file will prove worthwhile. The two following points demonstrates a strategy for determining in advance what should be put in the file, and more generally, how the group can focus their efforts. The two subsequent points in effect provide a most explicit statement of the *Take, Don’t Get* pedagogic code: Deciding which training they do in fact want in this particular project, and pick from what the teacher’s offers in accordance with that decision.

In that context, the file takes on a new meaning. It may seem strategic from a perception of the training as one where there is an explicable curriculum, but what HJ proposes in the two second demands, is that the students construct such a curriculum themselves. Finally, while there is no mention above of social educational work, the theory is something that the students are assumed to need, in reference to what they want to work with. There is thus a dimension of applicability, of theories as a tool to be selected for some purpose, reminiscent - although not identical- to the one in the self-contained social educational utterings.

The common features of the samples of supervision are that they contain almost no aspects of visible pedagogy - the only ones are the ones that come to affect Dennis’ as he proves unable to recontextualize his practical pedagogical discourse to the Arts & Crafts exam. There is, unlike the lecture hall, no way whatsoever to avoid relating to the teacher, even though none of the control templates are applicable to supervision. Supervision - be it in groups or one to one - is a highly flexible pedagogic setting, wherein the pacing and regulation can be adjusted constantly. The demands imposed on the students in supervision are thus implicit and require the student to adapt quickly. Unlike, to the point of being the polar opposite, the lecture hall where the demands relate to a much larger group of students, and thus are much less precise and adaptable.

There are three dimensions of difference between the supervision samples: the number of students, the subject within which they occur, and the fact that some are related to exam, and some are related to a project. The number of students should be interpreted as a generalised continuity between of the opposition between the lecture hall and the supervision: as number of students diminishes, the need to recognize and realize the pedagogic code becomes more pressing to each student. The inducement to participation also increases, as each student becomes more visible to the teacher. This could also be described as the linguistic market becoming more specific, as the number of students decrease. The specific utterings in demand by the teacher relates more to the specific position of each student in the group, and the relations between students also become visible to the teacher. In the case of the exams - which are all individual - the above continuity also applies, but the main difference is
the one evident in the specific demands connected with producing the exam object - in the samples above, this is the subject, and the problem statement. It is however a bit difficult to make a solid argument for which of the demands imposed on Jonas and Dennis above stems from the exam context, and which stems from the supervision being one to one.

There are however quite clear relations between the theoretical subject supervision and the theory class room, and similarly for the workshop supervision. The above group supervision indicated an aspect of applicability, which resembled the one at work in the theory classrooms. In the workshop supervision, there is a slight element of self-reflection in relation to Dennis, in part similar to the one refereed in the workshop classroom analysis. But more to the point, there are not references to a concept of theories remotely similar to the ones discussed in theory classrooms.

### 12.4 Classrooms and the Objects of Social Education

The above discussions have been quite widely ranging and there are numerous nuances and specific points, which the analyses have skirted around. In the following conclusion, I fear it will be necessary to omit even more of the possibly important reservations and less pertinent aspects of the analysis.

I have looked at four rooms in details: theory class, workshop, lecture hall and supervision. I believe the overall relations of these four rooms can be described by two polar contrasts, both of which I have briefly touched upon in the previous sections.

The opposition between theory class and workshop initially must be characterised by the different utterings these two rooms demand. The theory classroom was characterised by a linguistic market where *self-contained social educational utterings* were in high demand. The workshop, on the other hand, emphasized instead demand for *selfreflective utterings*.

Presenting the two as polar opposites are surely too simple, but that the workshop encompasses crafts as a way of relating to one self also relates the *students* to practical social educational work. The selection of workshop techniques is a way for the students to work upon themselves, and this objective took precedence over the production of whatever is being made. In other words the students are here the objects of their own social educational work - applying the workshop to themselves as they shall in the future apply the workshop skills to a social educational target segment.

The concept of theory is a very vague one so far, and has more or less simply been whatever the students chose to refer to as theory. However, the notion of applicability as is was enunciated by HJ in the group supervision
sample above enables further specificity. Theory is a form of knowledge that is applicable to some social educational subjects but not all. It is, in other words a tool to be selected, not an entire position that is adopted. This in fact mirrors the description given by HB to Jonas how to relate a workshop object to a social educational intent should be. Where the application of theory implies that theory is merely a tool for solving a specific social educational issue (whether it be a practical one or one only related to projects within the training) the workshop object and the handicraft and knacks associated with producing such an object is similarly a tool for similarly addressing a specific social educational issue.

In short, the first polar opposite here is the opposition between a theoretical selfcontained social educational uttering, wherein the theory is the tool applied, and a selfreflecting uttering wherein the workshop handicraft is the tool applied.

The second polar opposition is much simpler, as it relates to the opposition between the lecture hall, having a comparatively strong internal classification and framing, and supervision having a weak internal classification and framing. I previously noted Bernstein's statement that invisible pedagogy (C- and F-) is a relatively expensive form of pedagogy. This is directly observable her: the lecture hall with a very low teacher-students ratio, thwarts the teacher's attempts at abandoning the visible pedagogy, whereas the invisible pedagogy thrives in the supervision setting, with a high teacher-to-student ratio. Thus the teacher's reluctance towards lecturing is a protest against visible pedagogy, and when WEM states that she would rather teach she is equating teaching with invisible pedagogy. In the terms of the recurring catch-phrase, supervision encourages taking the training, whereas lectures encourages getting the training.

And as a final corollary, it should also be noted that lectures are most likely making their appearance at the NISE for economic reasons, and thus economy cutbacks implies increasingly visible pedagogy. It is not for me to say whether this is unfortunate or not - not at all. Rather it should be noted that the teachers do occupy a dominated position within the NISE, and this dominated position appears to be related to the preference for invisible pedagogy, indicating structural relations between the deployment of lectures, and the teachers’ aversion to lecturing.

12.5 Classrooms and Educational Strategies

In this final section of this lengthy chapter, I will relate the above dual polar opposition of the classrooms to the educational strategies, as they have appeared in the samples throughout this chapter and as they were constructed in Chapter 10.
The first important point to restate here, is the conclusion that when examining how the care-based educational ascent strategy-holding informants related to the training; it turned out that the amount of educational capital possessed was a more distinctive factor than the shared aspects the strategy entailed. In simpler words, the Care-Based educational strategy seems to express how the students belonging to the classes Nurses Etc. and Social/Health assistants arrive at applying for admittance to the training. The cultural capital of care is a means of making the transversal movement into social educator training, and sustaining illusion in the domain of social educator training. But, once enrolled, the actual training requires practices that are related to the acquisition of educational capital, rather than cultural capital of care. Thus cultural capital of care does not function as capital within the training.

In the following, I will go over the rooms discussed one by one, and sum up the strategies and educational capital in each.

In the lecture hall, the pedagogy tended towards the visible, and thus the linguistic market is somewhat transparent: The recognition and realization rules are made explicit. The Necessary Knowledge Investment strategy was associated with the Complex insiders class, and related in particular to social educator capital. These informants possess a capacity for recontextualizing successfully within visible pedagogy and thus their habitual capacities are fully adequate for the lecture hall. The same goes for the Voluntary Diligence strategy, and for students with very little educational capital - all exhibited by the self-selection of Eva, Albert and Anna-Louise in the Out-and-back segments of the lecture analysed above. There are no informants with relatively much educational capital present at the lecture, but as Eva, with relatively little educational capital possesses the recontextualization rules needed in this context, educational capital is unlikely to be a distinctive form of capital in the lecture hall. Thus, the lecture hall appears to be the site of the form of pedagogy most available to dominated agents, of the rooms I have examined; neither educational capital nor social educator capital seems a prerequisite for recontextualisation in the lecture hall.

The theory class was summed up in section 12.2.7, and the main point was that the dominance hierarchy discussed in chapter 10 was completely homologous to the relative ability of the students to produce the self-contained social educational utterings, that the teachers were attempting to elicit in this room. This of course barring the conclusion that the possession of a relatively high amount of educational capital was more distinctive than the possession of cultural capital of care and the concomitant Care-Based Educational Ascent strategy. As we moved towards the exam settings in the theory classroom, educational capital appears to ensure the necessary capacities, until the demands of exam intrude upon the invisible pedagogy of the theory classroom. Here both students with little educational capital (Dennis) and those with more (Signe)
lacked capacity for sustaining illusio, faced with implicit exam demands within the invisible pedagogy of this room. Something similar occurs in the workshop.

The *workshop* pedagogy attempted to elicit self-reflective utterings from the students, and the pedagogy was mostly invisible. The Necessary Knowledge Investment strategy provides a capacity for recontextualizing successfully within the workshop, whereas supervision placed strains on their capacity for recontextualizing successfully. This was exemplified by Jonas in the section on the workshop and supervision, above. I have not included any samples of students with high amounts of educational capital in the workshop, but I would refer to the position taken up by Signe and Anita in opposition to Dennis, when discussing the AA-subject introduction period (cf. Chapter 10) - and contrast this to the position taken up by Harry, in the section above, and Dennis, in the section on supervision. Educational capital provides the possessor with some capacity for recontextualizing successfully, that is producing adequate linguistic objects, such as the subject-genre demanded in the two samples of Workshop supervision. However the *selfreflective utterings* are a slightly different matter. Space considerations have kept me from including any samples of Signe in the workshop. However, she seems to be carrying over recognition rules similar to the ones she successfully applied to the theory classroom, and this effectively means she does not refer to herself as subject of the workshop practice. Such a practice can be seen in how Signe appears in several of the theory classroom transcripts above. I have no informants at KSEM, to whom the Voluntary Diligence Strategy belongs. And as I did not witness any workshop lesson at JSEM, I am presented with a bit of a conundrum in determining the relationship between the workshop, and the voluntary diligence strategy. I will hazard a hypothesis, based on the part of Anna Louise’s biographical narrative (chapter 9) where she emphasized the importance of cultural nurture: the selfreflective statements in demand in the workshop, and the emphasis on subjective applicability is very much in accordance with her strategy, indicating that the workshop, with the subjective applicability of the handicrafts, and the selfreflective utterings in demand, is related more to the social educator capital than to educational capital.

The *supervision* - being characterized by invisible pedagogy - seems to be the site of the form of pedagogy least available to dominated agents; in complete contrast to the Lecture hall - the only site of *getting trained* - educational capital and social educator capital seems a prerequisite for successful recontextualization during supervision - that is, of *taking* the training. The students with the Voluntary Diligence strategy possess habitual capacities - that is, recognition and realization rules - enabling a successful recontextualization in all the rooms examined, including supervision. This was exemplified by Jytte, in the section on group supervision above. Conversely, the sample of Jonas under Supervision above showed that he was able to produce the self-reflective utterings the
teacher tries to elicit (although with severe doubts as to the workshop context), whereas Dennis’ became the subject of stronger framing and classification, as he was unable to recontextualize successfully. These two sessions indicate how a relative shortage of educational capital means not possessing the necessary re-contextualization rules. While I have not provided any samples of students with relatively high amounts of educational capital, I refer to the discussion of Signe and Jonas in chapter 10 on working in groups, which I believe demonstrates the relation between higher amounts of educational capital, and a propensity for emphasizing the theoretical-academic aspects of the training. Thus, the supervision also demands aspects of social educator capital in addition to demanding educational capital.

As the strategies are really only nothing more than an abstract way or ordering the agents’ practices and relation to the training, it is possible to perform one further analytical trace-back, and connect the classrooms with the form of capital suggested earlier: What forms of capital indicate distinctive different practices in the classrooms?

As discussed above, I believe the cultural capital of care not to be distinctive within the training itself. And, although I earlier differentiated between generalised and vocational educational capital, here I will subsume that differentiation under the opposition between institutionalised cultural capital (i.e. educational capital) and social educator capital. I then arrive at the following summary:

- Lecture Hall: No forms of capital dominant
- Theory Class: Educational capital dominant
- Workshop: Social educator capital dominant
- Supervision: Social educator and educational capital combined for dominance

There are a few to provisos this summary. First of all, the relations between strategies and capital forms are quite complex, and secondly, there are several aspects of capital which should be taken into consideration here. Those Outsiders who were available for interviews and to whom I related the strategy Voluntary Diligence, also showed a particular family relation to economic capital, in having a husband who was able to support them economically during their training. And conversely, Jonas and Albert, to whom I related the Necessary Knowledge Investment strategy, both were in the opposite position in relation to economic capital, having to support their families while completing the training. Thus, the opposition between the dominating Voluntary Diligence, and the dominated Necessary Knowledge Investment also relates to available economic capital. It may be - but I have no empirical way of examining this proposition - that this relation of dominance in fact corresponds to the volume of capital of the informants.
13.1 The Research Questions and the Purpose of the Study

Concluding on this massive and complicated design is less intricate than might be expected. The original purposes of the study, as laid out in the first chapter was this:

1. Describing the students’ transition from the domain of practice to the educational domain: What social biographies do the students bring with them?
2. Describing how the students relate to or draw upon their biography in the educational domain: How does the biography become relevant for the student?
3. Examining how these strategies and the educational domain adapt and relate to each other: What practice is in demand in the NISE, and to what extent is this the practice being supplied by the students?

These purposes led to the final research questions as put below.

1. What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?
2. How are these biographies related to educational strategies?
3. How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?
The association between the methodological modes, and the research questions, as detailed in chapter 2, was this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Research question...</th>
<th>... is addressed by methodological modes...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?</td>
<td>1. Geometric Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are these biographies related to educational strategies?</td>
<td>2. Biographical Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?</td>
<td>3. Group Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Classroom Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13.1: Research questions and methodological modes

Thus the conclusions on each research question can be put as follows in the next sections

### 13.2 Characteristics of the SSPSE Students Social Educational Biographies

The students’ social biographies are characterised by a trajectory component, and a narrative component. The trajectories are spatially organised by the first three principal axes of the space of trajectories: Type of indirect trajectory (Insider | Outsider), trajectory direction (Direct | Indirect) and Trajectory Complexity (Simple | Complex). The individual trajectories can further be classified as belonging to one of five classes: The Straight Ones, The Outsiders, The Nurses Etc, The Social/Health Assistants and The Complex Insiders.

The classes were further associated with the various forms of capital the three axes described, and extrapolated from the narrative structures of the biographical interviews: The Straight Ones possessing primarily Educational capital, The Outsiders possessing vocational educational capital and to varying

1 While I did distinguish between various forms of educational capital in chapters 9 and 10, it was shown in chapter 12 that it was merely educational capital in itself which turned out to be distinctive. The various subdivisions of educational capital are therefore omitted here.
degrees, Social educator capital. The Nurses and the Social/Health Assistants were both possessing cultural capital of care, and the Nurses etc. also possessing educational capital. And finally the Complex Insiders primarily possess social educator capital. It is important to note here, that the Outsiders I interviewed only represent a subset of the outsider-class. Thus, there is a group of male, vocationally trained students, who are missing from the population. These I have termed the Absent Outsiders.

So far, the classification, the dimensions of the space of trajectories and the forms of capital associated with the classes provide the conclusions in relation to the first research question.

13.3 The Relationship Between Biographies and Educational Strategies

Combining the biographical interviews with the group interviews, I constructed three educational strategies: The Outsiders (those I did have the opportunity to interview) were shown to share an educational strategy which I termed Voluntary Diligence - a strategy characterized by a desire to study, and the absence of any outer pressure to complete the training. The Complex Insiders shared a strategy that I termed Necessary Knowledge Investment, and this strategy was characterised by a component of necessity and outer pressure to complete the training, yet conversely a somewhat limited desire for the training. The agents who employ this strategy are dominated by the agents subscribing to the Voluntary Diligence-strategy (the strategies are forms of practice so a dominating strategy should be understood as a dominating form of practice). Between the two, a third strategy is positioned: The Care-Based Educational Ascent. This strategy is shared by the Nurses Etc. Class, and the Social/Health Assistants, and is characterised by a desire for the profession and no elements of necessity, and a relation to the training that is tinted by a perception of care, rather than knowledge (as was the case with the Necessary Knowledge Investment).

The strategies are thus ordered within the space of trajectories as follows: The Necessary Knowledge investment-strategy (and thus the agents possessing a combination of social educator capital and little else, seemingly little economic capital) characterized by necessity is entirely dominated. Dominating it is first the group of agents Care-Based Educational Ascent strategy (and thus agents with cultural capital of care, and varying amounts of educational capital), which is characterised by desire for the training. And finally, dominating both groups
of agents bearing of the two prior strategies are the agents whose strategy - Voluntary Diligence - was characterized by only desire. The polar opposition of desire and necessity is thus related to one axis of dominance between the classes constructed here, and it would seem that this axis is also related to total capital volume of the agents. This is also supported by the fact that the only indications of economic capital available (from the interviews) coincide with this structure: the agents with little economical capital are related to necessity, whereas the agent with access to economic capital are also related to desire. The opposition between desire and necessity - and the related expressions of attitude towards the training thus also express which agents (with which trajectories) are able to sustain illusio - the desire being an expression of sustained illusio. At this point, it becomes necessary to inspect the role of educational capital. When discussing the strategies, the Care-Based Educational Ascent was analysed to possess internal opposition related to educational capital. This opposition was precisely expressed as the ability to sustain illusio, and thus the difference between the Nurses Etc. and the Social/Health Assistants is related to educational capital, and the samples given of the two Social/Health Assistants class-members having difficulties sustaining illusio reiterates the necessity-desire opposition given above.

The above matrix of capital possession, strategic practices, and class-membership is thus the conclusion to the second research question.

13.4 The Relationship Between Strategies and Educational Demands

The final research question addressed the demands students encountered when entering the classrooms, and what relationship the resolution of these demands had with the students strategies, and thus their differing social origin. The demands were examined by way of the Bernsteinian concept of recontextualization and Bourdieu’s analysis of speech as a social practice. Within the four class rooms I constructed - the lecture hall, the theory classroom, the workshop and supervision, different demands were show to be at work; more precisely, the four room contained different linguistic markets, where different utterings were in demand. The capacity for producing such uttering - in Bernstein’s terms the recognition and realization rules - were unevenly distributed between the different classes of students, in accordance with the composition and volume of the capital they possessed. The lecture hall, wherein a visible pedagogy was
found, was the most accessible room, in so far that no unsatiable demands upon the students’ capacities for recontextualization were apparent. The theory class room placed demands upon the students’ educational capital, by demanding self-contained social educational utterings. The workshop demanded recontextualization in the shape of self-reflective utterings, something which seemed to correlate with social educator capital, and thus both the Complex insiders and Outsiders whom I interviewed, and who were associated with the Voluntary Diligence strategy. Both of these rooms demonstrated a primarily invisible pedagogy. At this point it appears that the Care-Based Educational Ascent strategy is superceded by the opposition it already was shown to encompass - the amount of educational capital possessed. The ability to successfully recontextualize in the theory classroom coincides with the ability to sustain illusio in the application of theory in the form of self-contained social educational objects, a capacity related to educational capital. This capacity and possession of the educational capital that it stems from is distinctive, and the cultural capital of care, which is associated with the common origin in the field of welfare work of the Nurses etc. and the Social/Health Assistants is not distinctive with in the class rooms.

The final room, supervision was shown to be the least accessible of the rooms of the training. The supervision demanded both self-reflective and self-contained social educational utterings, thus requiring capacities associated with both educational capital and social educator capital.

The opposition between the lecture hall and the supervision also illustrated an opposition in how the teachers’ were most - or least - comfortable training, and the demands they imposed upon the students. Within the invisible pedagogy of supervision, the students were confronted with implicit demands while explicitly being urged to choose themselves what they wanted their training to be. This I referred to as the students being expected to take the training rather than get it. In the supervision classrooms the teachers tried to elicit student practices conforming to the notion of taking the training. Such elicitation proved much less successful in the visible pedagogy of the lecture hall, a context wherein the students could in fact lean back and get the training, as it were.

The entire construction above constitutes a homologous relation between student trajectories capital volume and composition, on the one hand, and capacities for recontextualizing successfully in different rooms of the training. Put shortly, the capacity for generating successful student practices depends on possessing both educational capital and social educator capital.

The somewhat longer version of the overall homology is this: The students whom I analysed to exhibit the Voluntary Diligence strategy are the ones whose
student practices dominate the domain of social educator training, and because of their social educator capital, they are also dominant in contexts where the relation to the domain of social education is pressing, such as the workshop. The students belonging to the Complex Insiders class also possess the social educator capital dominant in the workshop context, but often lack the educational capital allowing them to sustain the illusio in the theory classrooms. Conversely, students with primarily educational capital are able to sustain the illusio in the theory classroom. It is likely that this precise point could be refined, but the interviews conducted did not provide me with sufficient students representing the educational capital differences for a further analysis of this. Finally, students with neither social educator capital nor educational capital are also lacking the habitus for producing adequate practices in almost all the social educational classrooms.

13.5 News, Confirmations, Denials

The above conclusions make for slightly convoluted reading. In the following, I will try to extract a number of points relating to specific issues raised in relation to social educator training, either as the results of previous research, or by their absence in the body of research hitherto conducted.

First of, the discussion of social educator training as undergoing academization, and the trend of increased academic demands upon the students is confirmed but also shown to be, at least in the case of the SSPSE, mollified to some extent by the demand for social educator capital. This form of capital is not merely the product of experience from practice, as it arose from the analysis of complex trajectories; it underscores that practices stemming from familiarity with numerous different social educational contexts are dominant in specific settings within the training. However, this form of capital was suggested to be the one allowing several informants to repeatedly obtain new jobs within the domain of social education, and in these cases the informants were dismissive of this capacity, seeing it as unimportant, or more often not seeing it at all. For that reason, it seems an unlikely candidate for ensconcing the profession, and in that sense, the students’ position in the domain of social educator training redefines and devalues their position within the domain of social education. However, the differentiation between the strategy taking leave from social educator capital, and those taking leave from the cultural capital of care, (which was associated with the field of welfare work rather than specifically social edu-
cation) also demonstrates that social educator culture has some measure of autonomy yet, although the recruitment patterns hint at growing affinities and connections to in particular the health-proessions. The classroom studies of Dybbroe (2001, 2005a,b) are also partially confirmed here, as it would seem that there are at least a large subset of the students for whom the theoretical classrooms *will* be disenfranchising. However, the fact that the fieldwork of Dybbroe (and for that matter Gytz Olesen 2005a) all took place in provincial NISE should be taken into account here; the effect of theoretical emphasis, invisible pedagogy and teachers abandoning the school template in the training is all the more prevalent in the provinces, where the recruitment reaches further into the indirect trajectories.

There is a series of coinciding dichotomies of the NISE, that run through many of the aspects of this study. The two domains, of respectively social education and social educator training seem to correlate to the two principal strategies of professionalization, the academic and the practical ones, and to the two social contexts in which the SSPSE students find themselves - studying and working - yet which also make up the inner professional logic of the alternance training, as tuition and work practice, and the conceptual logic of theory and practice as complementary sides of training professionals. These dichotomies are all discursively coherent. The interesting bit is their affinity to several of the analytical categories I have constructed in this study: The lecture hall and the supervision settings, or the theory class and the workshop, and educational capital versus social educator capital. The shape of the training, and the opposition between academization and the practical ideals of care permeate not only how the training is spoken of, but reappear as the socially distinctive categories of perception and appraisal active within the NISE.

This conclusion, as well as most of the others found in this chapter points out the need for further studies in not only social educator training, but all professional training, and in particular with respect to the classroom activities and the recruitment structures.

The diversity of the SSPSE students and the specific categories provided here for further exploration are a completely new and important finding. They allow both for discussions of what students the SSPSE attracts, who it does not attracts, and how these students’ different origins and trajectory in the end differentiate them as *students*. And this is perhaps the most important aspect of this study: The differentiation between becoming a social educator, and becoming a student. There are applicants to the SSPSE whose provenance does not provide them with the practices dominating the domain of social educator training. Previous studies on SSPSE student strategies and previous careers
have either described the students at the SSPSE as uninterested in the content of the training (Ahrenkiel 1998) or as their interest in the training being related to specific concerns at their current position of employment (Svejgaard 2006). While the latter in some cases can be shown to be correct, the space of trajectories and the biographical analyses here show the relation between training, and working as unskilled labour, to be very complex. And the findings of Ahrenkiel (1998) cited above are being directly gainsaid by the findings in this study. This is in part due to the 15 years separating the studies, but again, it also relates to the geographical differences, which no previous studies have addressed.

13.6 Corollary Findings

This brings me to the numerous corollaries and secondary findings of this study. The vocabulary of control templates employed in the theory classroom provides some opportunities for reexamining the routines of the training. These templates are in quite wide use, and perhaps it is relevant to consider why this is, and what they do to the training and the classroom.

It is also a interesting and rather surprising finding, that the highly differentiated social educational work experience of the students could not be found to account for any distinctive effects, and it indicates that the SSPSE population is perhaps often thought of as less complicated than it in fact turns out to be.

The study also provides some fascinating glimpses of the differences between the theoretical subjects and the Arts and Activity subjects - the latter being very different from the former. That the AA-subjects in fact in some cases entails highly visible pedagogy, and imposes explicit demands to a greater extent than the theoretical subjects is interesting, and should be studied much more.

Yet the most important finding beyond the stated purpose of the study, I believe to be the structure of geographical competition between NISE. Different NISE in different geographical regions recruit differently - and in those cases where other NISE are located nearby, they seem to cultivate differentiated recruitment strategies. This all stems from the economic threats that the NISE face, and thus this is one effect of the reorganization of the Danish educational system. Yet, the economy also impinges further upon the interplay between students recruitment and geography, because the pedagogy of choice according to the NISE teachers is an expensive one. And it is hardly a coincidence that the classroom with the lowest teacher-student ratio is found in a region where the number of potential social educator recruits are dwindling. The effects of this
is not particularly clear, however. One the one hand, the visible pedagogy allows a number of students to sustain an illusion in the training; students whom the invisible pedagogy disenfranchise. On the other hand, the invisible pedagogy matches the ethos of the profession, and replacing the pedagogy will in turn affect the profession, somehow. This is an obvious area of further study but I would like to explore it a bit further here.

The GDA conclusions indicated a difference in recruitment related to geography; the province NISE seem to recruit a wider range of students, both with regards to previous careers, age and gender. The classes most prevalent in the Provinces are thus The Outsiders, The Complex Insiders and The Social Health Assistants, whereas The Nurses Etc and The Straight Ones are more prevalent in Copenhagen. There thus was a greater part of the student population at NISE in the provinces, whose trajectory diverged from the students hitherto most common at the SSPSE. This is an aspect of current situation of competition and the dual crisis this has forced upon the NISE, where all NISE strive to both recruit students and minimize drop-outs. The crisis has forced the NISE to cast their nets wide, recruiting the students described by in particular the three classes The Outsiders, The Social-Health Assistants, and The Nurses Etc. Looking at the classrooms, the organisation of the schedules and the use of lectures and the introduction of visible pedagogic devices in provinces seem to mirror this recruitment. The amount of invisible pedagogy employed is higher at KSEM than at JSEM, and it seems that many SSPSE students in general expect a quite visible pedagogy, and adapt to it easily, as could in particular be seen in the lecture hall, where the SSPSE students were mixed in with the ordinary social educator students. Students such as Dennis are an outlying case with provides a sobering picture of the implications of invisible pedagogy. His trajectory includes very little in the way of educational and cultural capital, leaving him unable to recontextualize in most classrooms. Instead he searches for structure, and attempts to reinforce his position by pointing out whenever apparent structures are being abandoned or disregarded.

Together, these circumstances combine to create a context at JSEM, which the students such as Dennis feel less precariously related to, but which the teachers are ill at ease in. Whereas the context found at KSEM - much more traditional social educator training setting - is seen as eminently suited for social educator training by the teachers, but puts the students with a weaker educational and cultural background at a disadvantage, both socially and in relation to academic merit.

This translates as saying, that the pedagogical devices employed by KSEM, and in wide use in many NISE, allow a limited subset of students social educa-
tional work experience to enter classroom discussions. The reaction of Dennis is that he has to suppress the theories of his own making, as these are unwelcome in the setting - a literal restriction of what experiences become available in the classroom discussions.

In contrast, the reaction of Signe is that she is basically seeing what she has always done in her practice, as being ratified repeatedly, and thus her relation between the theory of the training classroom and her social educational practice becomes one of pick-and-match. On one hand this is not the usage and employment of neither that the teachers want, and on the other hand, Signe is restricted to supplying the classroom discussion with the aspects of her experience that can been understood as either verifying or falsifying theoretical propositions. In both the case of Signe and the case of Dennis, the pedagogy installs self-limiting behaviour in the students, yet Dennis lacks the capacity for producing an adequate student-practice.

Another point, which would bear much more detailed exploration is the teachers, and their idea of the classrooms and their preference for interaction, subtle forms of control, and invisible pedagogy. This is touched only enough to determine that there is something interesting to study here, and would be well worth going into, but this of course is an entirely different study.

I started this thesis of drawing attention to a glaring omission in existing research on social educator training, which was that of the students studied as students. I should like to conclude by pointing out a similar omission in my own work, that of gender. It is an obviously important aspect of both domains and one that I have never gotten to grips with in this study. There are numerous indications as to how it affects the training and the students, but in the end is has been an analytical theme postponed for too long to make it into the thesis.

13.7 On the Methodology

Finally a comment on the methodology. In my opinion the complex and intricate design has unequivocally proven worthwhile. The geometric data analysis provides me with a set of analytical themes and categories which provides the subsequent analyses with direction and coherence. Does this mean, as the proponents of Mixed Methodology would claim, that my study gives the quantitative analyses precedence of the qualitative?

It does not, for several reasons. Neither analysis has precedence and any assumption to the contrary overlook the all-important determining factor: the
The entire design is precisely a design, being designed by me. I have shown how the implicit teacher-student relation can be revealed in numerous contexts of the interviews and the fieldwork. Similarly, the work done on the statistical data, in order to transform it into an analysable object, suitable for exposure to geometric data analysis also reveal the researcher subjectivity influencing the object - for instance in my extended efforts to discern any structuring effect of the social educational work experience.

There are however several points where I have not been able to realize the methodological ambitions, and a few points where I believe the methodology hampers my analysis. The hampering for the most part stems from the difficulties in maintaining and in particular presenting the complete picture in writing. The methodological connections that are in my opinion self-evident, require restating and repetition at several point in the analyses, and it is quite difficult to judge what presentation is necessary and what is extraneous. These issues of complexity in representations and accounting are all the more challenging as they re-occur whenever the connections between the empirical layers need to be discussed. These difficulties are compounded with the difficulty in making an account of the analysis of the fieldwork. While the interviews contain a limited number of participants, and a limited number of concurrent threads of interaction, such is not the case in the fieldwork. The difficulties inherent in selecting and representing aspects for analysis in the field becomes even more daunting when it is necessary to explain how it connects to the geometrical data analysis.

Other, more conventional unrealized methodological ambitions relate to the set of data available. The absence of data on the students’ parents, and the limited data on their educational careers cannot help but cause suspicions that the capital connections in the analysis above could be more precise. In the end, the data available to me are not exhaustive of the sociological object I am researching. However, in order to obtain such data, a full-scale survey is the only option, and extending this already complex study with such a demanding production of empirical data is completely unrealistic. Similarly the complexity of the design, and the time available for it as well, directly limits the number of informants interviewed, the number of interviews conducted, the extent of the fieldwork and so on.

However, in the final evaluation, the advantages of the mixed methodology do outweigh the difficulties. It would not be possible to establish any relations between the students background, their strategies and the classroom events without this combined methodology. The study establishes a homology between the form of capital associated with the different trajectories, and the dominance relations between students practices in the NISE classroom, and no
such relation has previously been established. This statement, however comes with a methodological caveat emptor. If this combined methodology is a prerequisite of the homological conclusion, is there not a chance that the conclusion derives from the methodology rather than the actual empirical analysis? I would argue that the comparisons above, and in chapter 3, with previous research demonstrates that the homology is not only a product of looking for a homology, as it embraces and confirms a number of findings from previous studies, yet positions them within a larger systematic context. However there are of course aspects that this methodological form prevents me from examining - notably the subjective experiences in their own right, as more phenomenological or hermeneutical approaches would address them. This in particular goes for the social educational experience, which, as it turned out, did not turn out to be central in the geometrical data analysis, and for that reason its role as connection to e.g. the subsequent biographical analyses (where it does feature) is limited. More subject-sensitised analytical approaches - Schmidt (2007) springs to mind - provide an entirely different understanding of the subjective experience of social educational work.

13.8 Usages Beyond the Study’s Purposes

This point about what the methodology prevent me from exploring serves as a fitting segue back to the points about the ostensible studies that this study has not been.

The readers who expected something different from what I have provided here - what might they after all still bring home from this study?

The first expectation I have deliberately failed to meet is the didactic assessment. And while this study does not provide any suggestions for more emancipating pedagogy, nor point out obstacles to learning, nor describe how more students could be supported to complete the training, I do provide a framework for establishing such a gaze upon the training. The space of trajectories, and the classrooms map out a framework for discussing precisely what pedagogy is imposed upon what students, and how this aids or hampers learning, promotes or prevents completing the study, and to what extent it transgresses what limit for personal freedom within pedagogy one might propose.

The second unfulfilled demand some might impose on this study is an assessment of which students will make good social educators. I propose that any such discussion might more sensibly be addressed by examining what sort of
students are currently being implicitly supported in their efforts to become social educators, which are not, and how this distribution came about. Any discussion about whether the students of any education are meeting standards must begin by examining those standards, and their relation to social power relations.

The final, third demand this study has chosen to overlook is the demand for complete representativity. Such representation is always in relation to some, possibly preconceived, sociological context. This study has in my opinion successfully demonstrated that the context of the NISE in relation to recruitment and geography is an important one, and one that enables all stakeholders in social educator training to consider the NISE as not just a set of instantiations of an executive order. Rather, this study proposes an image of social educator training as a diverse set of institutions catering to different groups of students, training them differently, and in time producing - whether it be by choice or by inattention - the future shape, content, ethos and - in the end - fate of the social educator profession.
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## Social Educational Terms in English and Danish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Danish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academy of physical education</td>
<td>gymnastikhøjskole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td>forvaltning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>optagelse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admittance restriction</td>
<td>Adgangsbegrænsning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Leaving certificate for the folkeskole</td>
<td>10. Klasseseksamen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afterschool care worker</td>
<td>Fritidspædagog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afterschool recreation center</td>
<td>fritidshjem:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afterschool teacher (gl.)</td>
<td>fritidshjemslærer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternance training</td>
<td>vekseluddannelse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apprentice</td>
<td>lærling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Crafts</td>
<td>Værksted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and activities subjects</td>
<td>kultur og aktivitetsfag:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Project</td>
<td>bachelor projekt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor project in nursing</td>
<td>Sygeplejerske afsluttende opgave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bachelors in relaxation and psychomotor therapy</td>
<td>Afspændingspædagog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Playground</td>
<td>Byggelegeplads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>Handelsskole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Assistant</td>
<td>Omsorgsassistent(gl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for higher education</td>
<td>CVU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerebral palsy</td>
<td>Spastisk lammelse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare worker (gl.)</td>
<td>borneforsorgspædagog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens Cultural Centre</td>
<td>Børnekulturhus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town Council</td>
<td>Byråd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client</td>
<td>bruger:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Social Work
Commercial/Clerical,
Communication, Organization,
Management(COM)
conscientious objector
continuation school
Coordinated application system for university And college entry
county
craft/trade
craftsman
Continuing education/training
Danish Council on Ethics
Danish Nurses’ Organisation
Danish State Education Grant and Loan Scheme Agency
Danish Students Grant and Loan Scheme
Danish Union of Nursery and Childcare Assistants
Danish/media
daycare
daycare child-minder
daytime nursery/créche
Department of primary and Lower secondary Education
Department of vocational education and training
Disability
Domestic help
Drama
dyslexic
Education grant
Educational childworker and care assistant
enrollment/admission
entrance exam for Advanced Social and health studies
Environmental studies
Sociale Højskole
Handel og Kontor
Kommunikation, Organisation og Ledelse(KOL):
militærnægter
efterskole
Koordinerede tilmelding (KOT)
Amt
håndværk (fag)
håndværker
Efteruddannelse
Etisk Råd
Sygeplejeråd, Dansk
Rådet for Statens Uddannelsesstøtte
Statens Uddannelsesstøtte
Pædagogisk Medhjælper Forbund
Dansk/Medie:
Dagpleje
Dagplejemor
Vuggestue:
Folkeskoleafdelingen (UVM)
Erhvervsskoleafdelingen (UVM)
Handicap
Hjemmehjælp
Drama:
Ordbblind
SU
Pædagogisk Grunduddannelse(PGU)
indskrivning
Adgangsprøve til videregående SOSU
Naturfag:
examiner
executive order
Exemption
folk high school,
folkeskole act
Further Education
General upper secondary
grammar school
group study room
handicraft
health studies
Higher Business Examination
Higher Preparatory Examination
Higher Technical Examination
Home Economist
independent school
integrated house
janitor
keyword
Leaving certificate for the folkeskole
Leisure time care facility
lingual
Lower secondary school
Main Subject
Master's programmes
maternity cover
mathematical-scientific
medical laboratory assistant
medium-cycle college programme
Ministry of Culture
Ministry of Education
Ministry of Justice
Ministry of Social Affairs
Movement and physical education
municipality
Music
National Institutes of Social Education
normal area
Nursery and Childcare Assistant

Eksaminator
bekendtgørelse
dispensation
højskole
folkeskolelov
Videreuddannelse
Studieforberedende udd.
Gymnasium
grupperum
håndværk (aktivitet)
sundhedsfag:
højere handelseksamen (hhx)
højere forberedelseseksamen (hf)
højere teknisk eksamen (htx)
Husholdningsøkonom
friskole
integreret institution:
Pedel
stikord
9. Klasses eksamen
SFO:
sproglig (studentereksamen)
Realskole
Liniefag
Kandidatuddannelsen
Barselsvikar
matematisk (studentereksamen)
Laborant
MVU
Kulturministeriet
Undervisningsministeriet
justitsministeriet
Socialministeriet
Bevægelsesfag:
kommune
Musik:
Pædagogseminarium
normalområdet
Pædagogmedhjælper
nursery school
Nursing Education
Nutritionist
Occupational Therapist
oral exam
outdoor nursery school
Pedagogic curriculum (in daycare)
Persons with disabilities
Physiotherapist
practice
preliminary practice
private school
problem area
problem statement
Professional Bachelor's degree
Psychology
public municipal school
qualifying examination
qualifying for admission
salaried practice
School caretaker
self-esteem
self-worth
Shop steward
short-cycle college programme
Social and health (assistant)
Social Education studies
Social studies
Social worker
Special area
Special care
special education/special needs education
Special School
special upper secondary programme for non-Danish speaking pupils
stand by place
Statistics Denmark
Students Guidance Service

børnehave:
Sygeplejehudannelsen
Ernæringsøkonom
Ergoterapeut
mundtlig eksamen
udflytterbørnehave:
Læreplaner (I dagtilbud)
handicappet
Fysioterapeut
praksis:
Praktik, øvelses
Privatskole
problemstilling:
problemformulering
professionsbachelor
Psykologi:
folkeskole(en)
Adgangsgivende eksamen
Adgangsgivende
praktik, lønnet
Skolebetjent
Selvtillid
selvværd
Tillidsmand
KVU
SOSU
Pædagogik [faget]:
Socialfag:
Socialrådgiver
Specialområdet
Specialpædagogik
Specialundervisning

Specialskole
særligt hf-forløb for fremmedsprogde(tidligere GIF)
Stand-by plads (KOT)
Danmarks Statistik
Studievejledningen
Students’ loans (scheme)  
Study Guidance  
study programme  
subject or discipline  
substitute  
supporting person  
target and framework management  
taximeter funding  
taximeter rate  
Teachers College  
Team Danmark educational program  
temp  
temp, temporary  
term  
The Apprenticeship Board  
The Association of Masters and PhDs  
the college sector  
The Council for Open Education  
The Council of ministers  
The Danish Council on Research Policy  
The Danish Federarion of early childhood teachers And Youth educators  
The Danish Rectors conference of National Institutes of Social Education  
The Danish Union of Teachers  
The Department of higher education  
the dyslexia institute in copenhagen  
The Folkeskole /Primary and Lower Secondary School  
The ministers Secretariat  
The Ministry of Research and Information  
The National Association of Local Authorities in Denmark  
The National Federation of Social Educators in Denmark  
The National Student Teachers Organisation  
The Pastoral Training College  

studielån  
Studivejledning  
studieordning  
fag [i uddannelsen]:  
vikar (fast)  
støtteperson  
mål- og rammestyring  
taxametertilskud  
takst (i taxametersystem)  
Lærerseminarium  
Team Danmark uddannelse  
Vikar (tilkalde-)  
afløser(ikke fast vikar)  
semester  
Lærlingerådet  
Dansk Magisterforening  
Ikke-universitet tertiar udd  
Rådet for Åben Uddannelse  
Ministerrådet  
Danmarks Forskningsråd  
BUPL  
Pædagogseminariernes Rektorforsamling  
Danmarks Lærerforening  
Afdeling for videre gående Udd  
Ordblindeinstituttet  
Folkeskolen(institutionen)  
Ministersekretariatet(UVM)  
Forskningsministeriet  
Kommunernes Landsforening  
SocialPædagogernes Landsforbund  
Lærerstuderendes Landsråd  
Pastoralseminariet
The State Educational Support for Adults
University college
unravelling / determining
Upper Secondary School Leaving examination
vacant place
value added grants
view of humanity
Vocational Training
Vocational upper secondary education
work practice
Youth education programmes 

Statens Voksenudd.støtte (SVU)
Professionshøjskole
udredning
studentereksamen
Ledig plads (ved optag)
taxameterbevilling
menneskesyn:
Erhvervsuddannelse
Kompetencegivende udd.
praktik
ungdomsuddannelser

Danish  
10. Klasseseksamen 

9. Klasses eksamen 
Adgangsbegrensning 
Adgangsgivende 
Adgangsgivende eksamen 
Adgangsprøve til videregående SOSU

Afdeling for videre gående Udd 
afulser(ikke fast vikar) 
Afspændingspædagog

Amt 
bachelor projekt 
Barselsvikar 
be kendtgørelse 
Bevægelsesfag:
bruger: 
BUPL

Byggelegeplads 
Byråd 
børneforsorgspædagog 
børnehave: 

English  
Advanced Leaving certificate for the folkeskole 
Leaving certificate for the folkeskole 
Admittance restriction 
qualifying for admission 
qualifying examination 
entrance exam for Advanced Social and health studies 
The Department of higher education 
temp, temporary 
bachelors in relaxation and psychomotor therapy 
county
Bachelor Project 
maternity cover 
executive order 
Movement and physical education 
client
The Danish Federarion of early childhood teachers And Youth educators 
Building Playground 
City/Town Council
Child welfare worker (gl.)
nursery school
Handelsskole
Handicap
handicappet
Hjemmehjælp
Husholdningsøkonomi
højere forberedelseseksamen (hf)
højere handelseksamen (hhx)
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This thesis concerns the Specially Structured Program for Social Educator Training (SSPSE) - an avenue of recruitment for the social educator profession that, while allowing the enrolled students to complete their training in a shorter, less committing, and economically safer way, also requires them to possess at least five years of social educational work experience. This in turn means that the students arrive at applying for admission to the SSPSE by way of longer, more complex and more demanding trajectories. On the one hand this proffers the SSPSE students as an analytic inversion of the alternance training common to most professional training: They are familiar with the area of work, yet require the scholastic credentials. On the other hand, the SSPSE students indicate what potential recruits there may be for the social educator profession outside of the current recruitment preserves.

The purpose of the study on which the thesis is based, is to describe the students’ transition from the domain of practice to the educational domain, how the students relate to or draw upon their biographies in the educational domain, and examine how these strategies and the educational domain adapt and relate to each other. These purposes are occasioned by the hitherto absence of any studies of social educator training examining the students as students in their own right, rather than prospective professionals, and the all but absolute shortage of studies detailing the theoretical aspects of the training, without assessing it in terms of its practical applicability, suitability, or necessity.

The thesis poses the following three research questions to the training:

What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?

How are these biographies related to educational strategies?

How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

The empirical design brought to bear on these questions consists in four distinct methodological modes:

geometric data analysis of the entire SSPSE student population of 2003-4, classroom observations of two SSPSE classes at a capital and a provincial Nati-
onal Institute of Social Education (NISE), group interviews with students from the classes observed, and individual biographical interviews with those same students.

This empirical construction allows for a unique interconnection between the empirical modes, inspecting the statistical relations between individual, while still retaining the specific data on each individual, and also allowing for the relation between the qualitatively produced data, and the statistical examinations.

The training is understood as sited in both relation to the social educational work, and in relation to the complete Danish educational system - or more precisely, as located in both the domain of social educator training, a subfield of the educational field, and as located in the domain of social educator training, a subfield of the field of welfare work. This double embedding in social space is in part what this study attempts at addressing, by redressing the absence of studies of the social educator training as an educational context.

The geometric data analysis (which in brief consists in mapping out the individuals as geometrical points located by their relative similarity) describes the entire SSPSE student population as structured by three axes of social differences: Trajectory direction, indirect trajectory types, and trajectory complexity; the trajectory consisting of the aspects of the SSPSE students social biography which contributed to countenancing the students’ admission.

The axis of trajectory direction opposes the students for whom admission is acquired due to secondary preparatory training combined with five years or more of nursery, or nursery school social educational employment.

The axis of indirect trajectory types, which is in fact the most important one, opposes students whose trajectory has unfolded entirely within the field of welfare work (the insiders) to students the trajectory of whom entails a transition from some other field of employments. The background of these latter students - the outsiders - entails either working with arts or crafts, or working in shops or offices, as well as vocational training.

The final axis opposes the complex trajectories with the simple ones, complexity here being a measure of the number of components within the trajectory, but not its length.

All three axes should be understood as representing a conventional preserve of recruitment, and an extension of that preserve. Such extension is a pressing need for the National Institutes of Social Education, as their recruitment has dwindled rapidly, even while the NISE have made use of all available measures to prevent this. Thus, the recruitment of students with outsider trajectories,
with indirect trajectories, and with complex trajectories all represent attempts at maintaining the number of enrolled students at the NISE, which, in its turn, poses the questions of how changing recruitment affects the training. Based on the axes of opposition, the geometric data analysis concludes by providing a classification of the 833 students examined. The classification consists in five classes: The Straight Ones, who are the students with neither complex nor indirect trajectories; The Nurses Etc., who are the insiders with a background in health and care work; Social-Health Assistants, which are the ones who have been admitted based on their completion of Social Health Assistant training; The Complex Insiders, who are the students with complex insider trajectories; and finally The Outsiders, who are the students with outsider trajectories. These classes serve as the ordering tool when relating the other three methodological modes to the geometrical data analysis. This is a most important connection to establish, as it allows for the construction of a homology between student trajectories, and the students’ strategies in the SSPSE classroom, and furthermore how the students are being perceived and evaluated within the classrooms. It is the exploration of such homologies, that are the theoretical reasoning behind the empirical design of the study. The outcome of the geometrical data analysis: the space of SSPSE student trajectories, and the classification based upon this space, constitutes the first layer of such a homology.

The second methodological mode - the biographical interviews - attempts to address other aspects of the students’ trajectories, and discern the students’ own perspectives on the trajectories, and the ordering of meaning, and socially distinctive capacities at work within the trajectories. In short, the homological assumption is that the trajectories structure how students make sense of the student position they have arrived at.

One such student is Jonas, a 26 year old male student, whose biographical narrative centers on the move from a small provincial city to the capital. In this move, two forms of capital come to dominate his narration: economic capital - or rather the absence of it - as he needs to secure the basic life necessities of his small family, while his wife is still at high school; and social educator capital (which means the capacity for perceiving and navigating successfully in the professional settings) obtained by employment in numerous, different social educational settings. This latter form of capital is the solution to Jonas’ shortage of economic capital, as it allows him repeatedly to secure employment in numerous different social educational settings. However, this strategical application of his social educational capital leaves him with limited opportunities for education - something he subjectively experiences as important. The SSPSE training thus comes to his attention as an opportunity for training, which does
not deprive him of his job, but instead allows him to train and earn a wage at the same time. Jonas is classified as belonging to the Complex Insiders, and it is the complexity aspect of his trajectory, that describes how he has obtained the social educator capital. The complex-simple aspects of the trajectory complexity dimension of the space of SSPSE student trajectories can thus tentatively be said to relate homologically to the possession of social educator capital.

Another student interviewed biographically is Anna Louise. She is 49 years old, and a mother of six. Her biographical narrative is also structured by economical capital and social educator capital, but unlike Jonas, she has, courtesy of her husbands businesses, ready access to a fairly abundant amount of economic capital. This allows her to work part-time in periods, to be unemployed and taking care of her six children, but also at times requires her to work at her husbands business. She returns on several occasions to working with children, primarily in continuation from some years working as daycarer. Her application to the SSPSE comes about from a suggestion by her current employer, an outdoor nursery school, as a substitution for a number of courses she has been applying for, but not obtained. She ponders that she would most likely not have applied, if she had turned fifty, indicating how the training is not necessary for her, economically or otherwise. Rather, Anna Louise is integrating her family life and professional life, and her choice to enroll in the training comes across as an indulgence. Anna Louise belongs to the Outsider class, and reveals how economic capital is highly influential in the meaning students may ascribe to the SSPSE.

In strong contrast to this, a third student - Signe - connects her biographical narrative to educational capital through and through. Having gone to private schools, and having parents instill the importance of education in her, she completes nurse training while at the same time being enrolled at the SSPSE, and is exasperated with those of her co-students who do not work sufficiently hard at the training. Her emphasis on the educational aspects of the training is also derived from the profession more or less coming to her as an epiphany, and so the training is as integrated aspect of following her calling, rather than a means to an end. Signes educational capital thus combines with the sort of capital her Insider trajectory through Health and Care work provides her with. Signe is a member of the Nurses Etc.-class, and her sojourn as a nurse, in the field of welfare work provides a form of capital which relates to her calling or epiphany, infusing her narrative with a strand of subjective (rather than economic) necessity, and so I have termed this capital Cultural capital of Care. This form of capital provides her with the capacity for sustaining her illusio in the field, and the nomos of the field itself.
The biographical interviews thus connect the three dimensions of the space of SSPSE student trajectories with three forms of capital: the indirect trajectory types dimension relates to cultural capital of care, the trajectory direction dimension relates to educational capital, and the trajectory complexity dimension relates to social educator capital.

The third methodological mode, the group interviews, expands the relation between the space of SSPSE student trajectories and the students’ individual educational strategies by way of the classes. Comparing the students ways of relating to the training and to each other in group interviews, a set of three strategies is constructed. The first such strategy is the necessary knowledge investment, of which Jonas above is a representative. This strategy is characterized by the students deploying it needing to complete the training rather than desiring it and thus the training is explicitly related to as an investment. The training is then understood as imparting knowledge, rather than e.g. subjectively transforming the student. This strategy is in contrast to the strategy represented by Signe, the care-based educational ascension. This strategy relates to the profession (and thus also the training) as desirable rather than necessary, and this relation is framed in terms of caring, rather than knowledge. Finally, the third strategy is the one represented by Anna Louise, the voluntary diligence. This strategy relates to the training as an apparent indulgence, rather than a need or a desire. The training is here an integrated part of a highly personal or subjective coherence, rather than a path of access to economic security, or to the profession itself. These strategies are related to the space of SSPSE student trajectories homologically as the necessary knowledge investment strategy is related to complex indirect insider trajectories and the complex insider class; the care-based educational ascent is related to simple insider trajectories, and both the Nurses etc. and the Heal/Care Assistants class; and the voluntary diligence strategy relates to the Complex Indirect Outsider trajectories. Comparing the interaction of the strategies in the group interviews, it appears that the voluntary diligence strategy dominates the care-based educational ascent strategy, which in its turn dominates the necessary knowledge ascension. Two points must be noted here: first of all, the final class - the straight ones - cannot meaningfully be described strategically, as this class is somewhat under-represented amongst the students interviewed. Also the outsiders are only partially represented - a group of male, younger, vocationally trained students are almost entirely disinclined to take part in interviews. From the classroom interaction and other research on students, it seems likely that these groups relate to the training in terms of respectively self-evidence (the straight ones) and wage labor (absent outsiders), but this cannot be completely confirmed.
In the fourth and final methodological mode, these strategies and classes are employed in a comparison with the inner structures of the NISE, in order to discern what categories of perception and evaluation these strategies are confronting in the actual lessons. The use of classroom is somewhat misleading, as this mode in fact examines four different settings, which share features of how communication, position and discourse is being regulated, as well as more spatial and organizational features. The four rooms explored are theory classes, lectures, supervision and workshop, and the exploration takes the form of examining what kind of linguistic objects are in demand in these rooms. In the theory classes, the teachers are soliciting self-contained social educational utterings - that is, statements describing social educational actions, equipped with theoretical markers, and demonstrating the applicability of theory. The capacity to produce such utterings appears to be related primarily to educational capital but also to social educator capital, as it requires both the capacity for producing an adequate reconstruction of social educational practice, as well as the capacity for demonstrating theory applicability implicitly. In stark contrast to this structure, the workshop solicits self-reflective social educational utterings; statements which demonstrate the application of workshop handicraft techniques, but not in order to produce actual objects of craft. Rather, the purpose is to affect the students’ relation to him- or herself in specific ways, that are the product of applying handicraft techniques. This is associated to a high degree with social educator capital, as it requires the student to demonstrate practical skills and applicability, yet still relate this to his or her own social educational practice. The primary object of work in the social educational classroom is thus the student him- or herself, and the manner in which the students perceive themselves, and relate to their own practices. Neither theory nor handicraft in their own rights are in demand - it is necessary to connect these to the students own practices. Comparing these findings to the opposition between the lectures (very high student-to-teacher-ratio) and supervision (low student-to-teacher-ratio), the most immediate difference is the difference between the highly visible pedagogy (e.g. explicit demands and control) of the lecture hall, and the invisible pedagogy (e.g. implicit demands, apparent absence of control) of the supervision sessions. In the lecture hall setting, student participation is difficult to stimulate, and the room provides numerous avenues of withdrawing participation for the students, whereas the supervision setting provides no such opportunities, and subtly demand student participation. The teachers in the lecture hall are very reluctant to deploy the visible pedagogy, indicating that the demanded interaction should be of a voluntary nature.
In conclusion to the three research questions posed by the thesis;

What characterises the students’ social educational biographies?

How are these biographies related to educational strategies?

How is the relation between strategies and educational demands resolved?

the answers of the analyses can be summed up as follows:

The characteristics of the students’ biographies are structurally ordered by the three dimensions of the space of SSPSE student trajectories: trajectory direction, indirect trajectory type, and trajectory complexity - and these structural dimensions allow for a classification of the student trajectories in five classes: The Straight Ones, The Outsiders, The Nurses etc., The Social/Health Assistants, and The Complex Insiders. The structural dimensions also describe the acquisition of forms of capital specifically related to social educator training, as respectively educational capital, cultural capital of care, and social educator capital.

These forms of capital are discernable as the organizing factors of the biographical narratives of the students, and the forms of capital also relate directly to the three constructed educational strategies: Necessary Knowledge Investment - the strategy of the complex insiders, and the least dominating strategy; Care-based Educational Ascent - the strategy of the nurses etc. which dominates the former strategy; and Voluntary Diligence, the strategy of the Outsiders, and the dominant strategy.

The strategies, and the forms of capital they bring into the class rooms of the SSPSE, are perceived and evaluated differently by the teachers. The theory classrooms demand utterings that require primarily educational capital, whereas the workshop demands utterings that require primarily social educator capital. Thus, the dominance relations between the strategies put above are reflecting the actual demands imposed upon the students within the classrooms. The teachers also demonstrate a preference for the students actively participating of their own volition, stressing the importance of sustaining the illusio of the training. This relates to the indulgent characteristic of the voluntary diligent strategy, and the desire-aspects of the Care-based educational ascent strategy.

These conclusion thus suggests that the nature of the training caters differently for the different groups of students within the SSPSE, and that there is thus a need to understand what sorts of students are currently recruited, and how this may change the training, and in time the profession itself.