Subjectivity and change in process of supervision

Bente Vatne
Volda University College, Norway

Kari Søndenå
University of Stavanger, Norway

Abstract

Supervising texts with a bachelor thesis as its outcome, has been prioritized in the Norwegian Early Childhood Teacher Education. The focus has been on recruiting enough supervisors, and on qualifying supervisors. There has not been a similar focus on the bachelor texts as such, and on questions concerning what kind of function these texts should have in professional education. From a Bakhtinian dialogic perspective we value variation and change in student subjectivity as a fruitful, rather than a problematic means of enhancing quality. The current study has two main research questions: (1) what typologies of subjectivity can be identified in student's bachelor texts, and (2) what typologies of subjectivity are given priority and how these priorities respond to the possibility of change. Concerning the first question, students' legitimations have been identified as typologies of uncomplicated and complex subjectivity. As for the second question we observed that individual voices in bachelor students' texts were not given equal status compared with more powerful generic voices that represent sameness. The latter voices are interpreted as articulated intentions in the national curriculum for the Early Childhood Education and Care, and in local curricula. An important insight from this study is that changes in subjectivity is tightly connected to sameness for all bachelor students and educational cannons. Student subjectivity seems to be fixed and finished and in status of adjustment to universal claims. Such insight generates new questions concerning the space for students' lived experience, emotions and creativity in higher education.

Keywords: supervision, changing subjectivity, legitimation of choices, reflexive awareness

Bente Vatne is a professor at Volda University College, Norway. Her main research interests are supervision in Higher Education and early literacy in Early Childhood Teacher Education. She uses sociocultural and Bakhtinian dialogic approaches to education.

Kari Søndenå is a Norwegian professor working at University in Stavanger, Faculty of Social Science, Department of Social Studies and Psychology. Her research interests include philosophical and qualitative research, theory of supervision and subjective and life world dimensions, and conceptions of quality related to bachelor-, master- and doctorate-ness.

ৼৼৡ

"A human being cannot be turned into the voiceless object of some second hand, finalizing cognitive process. In a human being there is always something that only he himself can reveal, in a free act of self-consciousness and discourse, something that does not submit to an externalizing secondhand definition" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 58).

Introduction

Bakhtin's (1984) underpinning of the impossibility for a human being to be turned into "a voiceless object of some second hand finalizing cognitive process" has actualized philosophical-educational challenges in supervision work. The overall aim of this article is to contribute to a growing body of research on subjectivity in processes of supervision. Challenges concerning subjectivity are regarded as the essence in supervision at all three levels in Norwegian academia, at bachelor, master and PhD levels (Bue (1973); Dysthe (1999); Handal & Lauvås (2014); Søndenå (2002); Skagen (2007); Fossøy (2006); Bjerkholt (2013); Birkeland & Carson (2017), and Worum (2014). Supervision is a form of teaching and learning aimed at providing space for meta thinking and questions related to the supervisee's possibility to reflect on her/his own learning as a unique and professional human being. Questions like who this student is at the present time and who this student will become in future as a professional worker, and how a supervisor can contribute to the making of these future professional workers are underlying meta questions in supervision meetings.

We find questions concerning comprehension and mapping students' subjectivity during supervision processes as very important. We argue that subjectivity needs to be discussed more deeply, and in the following we present a study of subjectivity as this is revealed in the process of writing texts, ending up as a bachelor thesis (undergraduate level).

Supervising texts in Early Childhood Teacher Education with a bachelor thesis as its outcome, has been prioritized in Norway. Every student is followed up by a supervisor during a long writing process. The focus has been on recruiting enough supervisors, and on qualifying supervisors. There has not been a similar intensive focus on the texts as such and on questions concerning what kind of function bachelor texts should be related to in professional education. In this study we focus on the aspects of text and supervision. Drawing on a Bakhtinian orientation, we understand a human being as a subject layered with cultural and historical voices, and we view bachelor students' texts as complex multifunctional hybrid texts (Holquist, 2002). According to Bakhtin (1986), it is possible to localize social variation in texts by pointing at the various forces expressed through different voices that are involved. There is an everlasting battle between centrifugal forces that pull in direction of community, common culture, and sameness, on the one side, and centripetal forces that pull in direction of uniqueness and individuality, on the other side. The centrifugal forces are the most powerful ones, and they are ubiquitous - they are always "in presentia" (Bakhtin, 1986). Individual utterances, representing centripetal forces are less powerful and thus they represent a more complex ontological status. In bachelor texts in Early Childhood Teacher Education, the centrifugal forces are related to expectations of common responsibility in the Norwegian welfare society and to authorial expectations expressed in a national curriculum in Early Childhood Education.

The research questions are:

1. *What typologies of subjectivity can be identified in students' legitimations of themes in their bachelor theses?*

2. *What typologies of subjectivity are given priority in supervision and how do these priorities respond to the possibility of change?*

Representing a Bakhtinian dialogical perspective in supervision, we regard analysing variation and change in the comprehension of student subjectivity as a fruitful, rather than a problematic means of enhancing quality. Our interest is to challenge supervisors' interpretative repertoires, typologies of subjectivity as they appear in bachelor students' texts and how the supervision process can contribute to change such typologies. Focussing on student subjectivity typologies in written texts might reduce uncertainty in supervision practices and appeal to deeper theoretical thinking, perspectives and discussions anchored in institutional cultures. This can result in pluralism and tolerance of diverse pedagogies, including both those recognized as authorial, as well as others (Matusov, Marjanovic-Shane & Gradovski, 2019).

Theoretical perspectives

According to Miguens & Preyer (2013), subjectivity can be understood as an issue that lies at the heart of philosophy, as the view of the subject lies at the centre of philosophical pursuits. Husserl's phenomenological tradition, for example, considers that subjectivity's main aim was to clarify the subjective origins of sense in the condition of givenness of things (Miguens et al. 2013). In recent decades, givenness and traditional views on supervision in the field of higher education have been challenged by various late and postmodern theoretical perspectives (Dysthe, 1999, 2006; Skagen, 2007; Kvale, 2007; Søndenå & Gradovski, 2017). This can be regarded as a tension between conceptions representing various perspectives on subjectivity, with subjectivity based in nature, givenness of things, sameness and «being-one» on the one side, and understandings based on «being-multiple» and openness on the other (Deleuze, 1991). In its extreme form, one might say that traditional perspectives in supervision have been based on an idea of "bracketing subjectivity" (Husserl, 2004). This searching for a universal truth for all students has been challenged by perspectives anchored in "cracketing subjectivity" (Deleuze, 1991) and deep searching for lived truths based on individual experience.

Historically, building new knowledge on students' lived experience is a well-known approach in supervision (Lauvås & Handal, 2014). Legitimisation has been linked to the raise of self-awareness and the development of students' individual praxis theory with a view to self-realisation as future teachers (Skagen, 2007). Praxis theory is understood as the subjective values, experiences and theoretical knowledge that influence students' approach to their pedagogical work (Lauvås & Handal, 2014). Skagen (2007) claims that self-realisation has achieved a sacral status in the individual's perception and image of reality, and that this has also influenced the work of the supervisor in higher education since the 1970s and 80s. This implies an optimistic and underlying belief that the supervisor can help to encourage a hidden, but equally fully existent fixed universal subject as «being one», in the meaning of realization of self (Søndenå & Gradovski, 2017).

More recent supervision traditions based on dialogical understandings of subjectivity (ies) challenge the idea of a finalized subject in the sense of «being-one». In the context of supervision, subjectivity is understood rather as something un-finalized that is in continual development, and in the light of a polyphony of both sociocultural and personal experiences (Dysthe, 2012).

However, knowledge concerning what typologies of subjectivity that come into play in supervision and how subjectivity might change during the supervision process, seems to be unclear. An extended focus will contribute to an understanding of how student subjectivity can change and make supervision in higher education susceptible to diversity and to self-authorship. The latter in the sense of enabling a person to interpret and evaluate his own self and his environment, according to Bakhtin (quoted in Rule 2015, pp. 37–38). Following Parker's (1997) outlining of three typologies of subjectivity and Sullivan's (2012) alternative, a dialogical interpretation, we argue that the possibility of change is enhanced when the supervisor's interpretative repertoire includes sensitivity towards a range of subjectivity typologies.

Typologies of subjectivity

In the following Parker's outlining of typologies of subjectivity (1997) is presented. These typologies helped us understanding features of subjectivity as these appeared in the bachelor students' texts. Sullivan (2012) outlines strengths and weaknesses in Parker's outlining. Including Sullivan's critical comments, we pave the way for an alternative dialogical understanding of subjectivity in supervision contexts.

Parker (1997, p. 481) claims that *blank subjectivity* involves giving cultural forms priority and under communicating the importance of representations of self and identity. The term blank subjectivity "deliberately ignores what is going on inside the person or what the history of their particular relationship to the language might be". This dismiss individual experiences as an effect of language or rhetoric. Sullivan (2012) draws on Parker when he refers to a narrow focus which separates the individual from their wider social world. This might result in reducing the complexity of people`s actions and their ability to negotiate social meanings to a few basic casual mechanics, like the writer`s personality. Definitions of blank subjectivity are here interpreted as "the sensing self is missing" (Sullivan, 2012, p.12). Contextualized to our study, the author who is seeking to understand herself is missing, and no personal experience is apparent in these texts. As such, we refer to this typology as an "outside-in" perspective (Bakhtin,1984).

Following Parker (1997), a second rhetorical figure is named *uncomplicated subjectivity.* Integrated in the typology of uncomplicated subjectivity, both the author's awareness of theoretical perspectives and of earlier experiences are excluded and understood as being quite uncomplicated to combine. There is an assumption that the author already acknowledges both his own experiences and the self as fully recognised. We understand uncomplicated subjectivity as a relevant category when students legitimate their choices of theme, both from personal experience and with reference to national political documents or contemporary social challenges. The student legitimates her choice of theme from both an «inside-out-, and an «outside-in» perspective (Bakhtin, 1984).

Parker's (1997) third typology is referred to as *complex subjectivity*. This typology takes seriously both the intentions and the desires of the individual, and the operation of social structures and discourse. Sullivan (2012) underlines the fact that complex subjectivity contains a recognition of the thinking, feeling and desiring subject. As such, complex subjectivity allows for the appearance of personal experience and the person's language is fluid rather than fixed. In line with uncomplicated subjectivity this kind of legitimation might be interpreted as both an "inside-out"- perspective and "out-side in"- perspective (Bakhtin, 1984).

Following Sullivan's critical reasoning (2012), Parker's three typologies do not include awareness of the possibility of change. Parker's placing of the conscious and feeling subject at the centre will ignore the key role of social language or language in use. We might add to this critique, that ignoring change will substantiate the idea of "bracketing subjectivity" rather than the idea of "cracketing subjectivity" and openness towards an unfinalized subject. Sullivan shows how language can be analysed to reveal a sensing self and suggests an aesthetical discourse, representing the potential to *"*shape selves and look at how selves can respond, in different ways, to this shaping "(Sullivan, 2012, p. 43). Based on a recognition of Parker's (1997) three typologies and Bakhtin's esthetical discourse as being fruitful for a dialogical researcher, he suggests a *dialogical subjectivity*. This interpretation of subjectivity involves an understanding of discourse with an embodied subjectivity (Sullivan, 2012, p. 43). Sullivan's perspective, which represents giving priority to *awareness* of the possibility of change, helps us to an understanding of practiced professional agency in a subject-oriented sociocultural framework. Agency refers to a situation where professional subjects and/or communities exert influence, make choices, and take stances in ways

that affect their own work and/or their professional identities (Eteläpelto, Vähäsatanen, Hökkä & Paloniemi, 2013).

Dialogical subjectivity

Matusov, Marjanovic-Shane and Gradovski (2019, p. 266) consider research participants' subjectivities as authorial, encountered, and revealed in dialogic relationships of adhesivity and responsivity with the consciousness of the researcher, or within the researcher's interests, puzzlements, reflections, research questions, subjectivity, voice, biases, and agendas. Based on the definition of a dialogue by the American philosopher Dmitri Nikulin (Matusov et al. 2019, p. 41), *dialogic subjectivity* is understood as an expression of the personal other within ourselves in an unfinalized way. The process of expression of any dialogic subjectivity takes place in a relationship and can be messy and is always unfinalized.

Burkitt & Sullivan (2009, p. 565) describe the Bakhtinian dialogical 'I-for-myself' relationship as involving a reflexive awareness of our own boundless potential – our primary experience of being without boundaries. This relationship also refers to our belief that others never have the final say on who we are (the 'I-for-others'), nor can they ever completely define us with their words or ethical judgements. A human being can never be turned into some voiceless object of some second hand, finalizing cognitive process, as expressed by help of Bakhtin (1984). This reflexive awareness challenges the former presented tradition of developing the students' praxis theory and self-understanding that has dominated the work of supervisors in several decades.

Furthermore, Burkitt & Sullivan's (2009, p. 566) postulate that even the objective definition of us by authoritative groups – such as religious evaluation or scientific classification – is not felt as final and does not wholly define us. There is always a word that others can say about us or that we can say about ourselves that can surpass these other definitions. It is possible to conclude that our dialogical subjectivities shape and develop themselves thanks to a continual exchange between the words of others, both loving and authoritative, and our own words, values, and understandings.

Method and design

This study has been conducted using a dialogical qualitative approach. The approach requires an explanation of the authors' positioning and relationship towards all sampled texts and between the co-authors. Following Sullivan (2012), we as co-authors see and understand ourselves as being in dialogical relations to both the sampled texts, the findings, and to each other. The choice of the approach is explained by the focus of the study and the nature of the research questions that this study wants to find answers to. The chosen approach reflects our ontological, epistemological, and axiological believes as we consider any human's professional development to be a result of a greater dialogue between aspects that are situated in social and professional contexts that this human encounters along the lifepath. This greater dialogue consists of outer persuasive discourse with its voices that influence this human's inner persuasive discourse aimed at shaping of this human's ontological, epistemological, and axiological views. Further, we believe that each human's professional development is unique and that it is shaped by both knowledge and experiences acquired in professional praxis and closely related to the human's private life experiences. Thus, we view any human's subjectivity related to and inseparable from both the professional and private social areas. In order to analyse subjectivity related to the professional development and learning we have chosen a qualitative dialogue analysis described by Sullivan (2012) as it allows us to both identify, describe and analyse our data and thus obtain needed answers to our research questions.

The sampling processes

The sample that has been analysed consists of three texts from 37 bachelor students (undergraduates) in Norway, all in all 111 texts. The students were in their last year of Early Childhood Teacher Education. These texts were collected during two years using the convenience sampling technique, in which respondents were chosen based on their availability (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The texts were uploaded online and were collected at various timepoints during the supervision process. The first two texts were the students' first sketches and their research plans and were written at the very beginning of the bachelor process. They are both pre-texts, written before the supervision process started. The third texts, the students' graded research theses, were written at the end of the supervision process and are post- texts (see table no. 1).

The students did not have individual supervision in relation to the two pre-texts, except for the general lectures preparing them for the bachelor study. Thus, the aspect of change is focussed on a comparison of utterances in pre-texts produced before the supervision process and in the post-text, written after the supervision process. The students were supervised on how to improve the text several times before the final bachelor thesis was submitted. We have focused on the introduction in the student's texts, emphasising the student's legitimation for their choice of theme, before and after supervision.

Table no. 1. The analysed texts

The analysed texts - an overview		
37 students - 111 texts – 3 texts from each student – the introduction in sketches, research plans and their graded theses		
The first sketch (450 words)	Research plan (3000 words)	The graded thesis (10 000 words)
- theme	- theme	- theme
- research questions	- research questions	- research questions
- legitimations	- legitimations	- legitimations
Before supervision - pretexts		After supervision-post texts

The data analyses

As a first step, we started with a review of the sketches, the research plans and the bachelor theses to gain an overview of the data. The introductions awareness to the sketches, the research plans and the theses were read and reread and discussed by the researchers. These readings and discussions gave us a general overview and a common understanding of the data (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). According to Sullivan (2012), reduction of data is necessary for an interpretation and analysis to take place, and thus the data was prepared for a dialogical analysis.

The next step was inspired by Madill & Sullivan (2010, p. 72) who focus on 'key moments. A 'key moment' is an 'utterance' of significance. An utterance is a significant unit of meaning which is different from the sentence (or the line). It is defined by its readiness for reaction (Madill & Sullivan, 2010). Sullivan (2012, p. 173) writes that "an utterance is that which the addressee feels capable of responding to". We started out with key moment (1), trying to identify interesting situations in the students' texts. In this reading we marked legitimations found relevant to our research questions.

The second key moment (2) includes managing interpersonal relations in order to secure knowledge. Following this key moment, we were looking for the students' histories and individual intentions and desires, 'a sensing self' in their legitimations (Sullivan, 2012, p. 30). Analysing the third key moment (3), we were inspired by Parker's (1997) typologies of blank, uncomplicated, and complex subjectivity and Sullivan's (2012) dialogical subjectivity.

As a fourth key moment (4), the texts were read and reread, and the chosen examples were reflected upon and discussed in depth. The next step was to compare the legitimations analysed in pre-texts with the students' legitimations in their final bachelor theses, in the post-texts (see table no. 2). Changes in subjectivity analysed in a comparison between the pre- and post-texts are the core of our interest (Madill & Sullivan, 2010).

Table no. 2. The dialogical analytic process inspired by Madill & Sullivan (2010)

Readings	Purpose/key moment	Analytic strategies	Analytic questions
(1) Reading the introduction to the sketches, the research plan	Key moment 1 Identify interesting moments	Marking relevant and interesting text	*What interesting legitimations are identified in the students' texts?*
(2) Reading and re-reading the introduction to the sketches and the research plans	Key moment 2 To gain knowledge of the student's individual intentions and desires	In-depth analysis, trying to identify the student's voice.	*What are the students trying to convey/tell the readers in their texts?*
(3) Reading the introduction to the sketches and the research plans	Key moment 3 To identify the student's subjectivity and choose the examples we would present in the article	Discuss and determine whether the student's subjectivity is blank, complex, uncomplicated or dialogical	*What typologies of subjectivity can be identified in students' legitimations? What are the most representative examples?*
(4) Studying the chosen examples and introduction to the graded thesis	Key moment 4 Discuss the construction of subjectivity related to blank, uncomplicated, complex, and dialogical (Parker, 1997; Sullivan, 2012) in the examples	Compare the examples of the student's subjectivity in their post-texts to the examples of subjectivity identified in their pre-texts	*How do bachelor students' legitimations change in the process of supervision?* *What are the most relevant changes in relation to openness and unfinalized?* *subject?*

Localising key moments helped us reduce the data systematically, alongside re-reading and discussions. In this study we present selected examples to identify change in the process of supervision.

Ethical considerations and validity threats

The students received written and oral information about the project. They were informed that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. The students gave us written consent to use their three texts in the research project, and the students are given fictitious names. We have tried to present the analysis of the students' legitimations (voices, perspectives and thoughts) in a respectful manner and the study was conducted in accordance with the standards of the Norwegian Data Inspectorate (Norwegian Centre for Research Data, 2018). The design of the study was sent for consideration of its ethical side to the Norwegian Centre of Research Data in 2018. The study was approved.

One of the researchers has been one of the student's lecturer during the bachelor process. This might have influenced the student's texts and this researcher's reading and interpretation of the data and could be a validity threat. However, one of the strengths in this study is the fact that we are two researchers who have analysed the data together and discussed the examples thoroughly with each other throughout the project.

Findings

Our two research questions are as follows: *What typologies of subjectivity can be identified in students' legitimations of themes in their bachelor theses? What typologies of subjectivity are given priority and how do these priorities respond/relate to the possibility of change?* We found that before supervision most of the participants' texts could be identified as examples of *uncomplicated subjectivity* and *complex subjectivity*. This means that their early sketches and research plans were embodied with utterances concerning both lived experiences, student's own experience from practical training in kindergarten, and theoretical approaches based on curriculums and literature. After supervision process we revealed several changes from uncomplicated to complex subjectivity. In the following we will present examples of identified typologies and how these changed from pre-texts (before supervision) to post-texts (after supervision) to give an answer our first question. To illustrate our findings, we use examples from the students Lisa, Anne, Sally and Mary. The result of our analysis allowed us to identify three typologies of subjectivity. We present the student's research question, then an example of subjectivity as it appears in the pre-text and finally an example of subjectivity as this appeared in post-text. In one of the post-texts, in Sally's text, the research question is reformulated (after supervision), in the others the research question remains the same.

Lisa: From blank subjectivity to uncomplicated subjectivity

Blank subjectivity (pretext)

Lisa's research question is:

> How can the kindergarten be able to promote an inclusive environment, where children enjoy themselves and participate in play?

Legitimation in pre-text:

> According to the Framework Plan (2017), the kindergarten shall contribute to (…). Norwegian kindergartens have a tradition of being outdoors every day. On average, Norwegian kindergartens are outdoors between 30 and 70 % every day (Moser & Martinsen, 2010). White Paper no. 19 claims that not all children have a friend and some children experience bullying, teasing and exclusion from play.

The student's legitimation is based on political documents such as the Framework Plan (2017) and the White Paper no. 19. Documenting the time children in kindergarten, are spending outdoors, she refers to the researchers Moser & Martinson (2010) and as such, and she justifies her choice of topic based on research. There is no trace of the student's voice and as such, the subjectivity is interpreted as blank.

Uncomplicated subjectivity (post text)

After meetings with the supervisor, the typology of subjectivity has changed from blank to uncomplicated subjectivity. Her personal experience and the theoretical perspectives are linked together in an uncomplicated manner. Adopting Bakhtinian terminology, we could say that the student now has developed both an «inside-out"-, and an «outside-in» legitimation for her choice of theme. Lisa's research question is still the same, but her legitimation has been extended and changed:

> According to The Framework Plan (2017), the kindergarten shall contribute to (…). Norwegian kindergartens have a tradition of being outdoors every day. On average, Norwegian kindergartens are outdoors between 30 and 70 % every day (Moser & Martinsen, 2010). White Paper no. 19 claims that not all children have a friend and some children experience bullying, teasing and exclusion from play... It is very important to me, both as a private person and in my profession as a kindergarten teacher, that children are safe and have fun in kindergarten. I myself have experienced that my own children did not enjoy school. It's hard knowing that your child is not doing ok.

Lisa's own voice and an "in-side-out" perspective are now presented as a supplement to the purely "outside-in" legitimation in the pre-text.

Anne: Uncomplicated subjectivity maintained and strengthened

Uncomplicated subjectivity (pretext)

Anne's research question is:

> How can the kindergarten safeguard the identity of multilingual children through work with the children's mother tongue?

Legitimation in pre-text:

> I wish to study cultural and linguistic diversity in the light of identity. Norway is a multicultural and multilingual society in change. An increasing number of inhabitants have linguistic and cultural backgrounds from another country than Norway. The kindergarten is an important arena for meetings between the children. I myself am one of the new inhabitants. Because of my background, I have always been interested in all things that have to do with diversity (…)

This example above shows an imprint of the student's voice, and legitimations are influenced by the student's own background and content from textbooks.

Uncomplicated subjectivity (post-text)

Anne's research question is not changed, and the legitimation is extended by a theoretical (empirical) perspective.

> There are an increasing number of inhabitants coming from foreign countries to Norway. The country is steadily becoming a multicultural and multilingual society. Statistics submitted in 2016 that there had been a 7 per cent increase from the previous year in minority-language children in kindergarten. This is an important factor that has affected my choice of theme. My professional background has raised the interest I have for mother tongues and the identity of multilingual children in the kindergarten. I myself do not have a Norwegian background; therefore, I think that this will be an interesting topic to study.

The student legitimates her interest by underlining the fact that she does not have a Norwegian background, as she did in her pre-text and after supervision. We observe a strengthening of a theoretical empirical emphasis here and a development of the former typology of uncomplicated subjectivity.

Sally: Complex subjectivity – maintained and strengthened

Sally's research question is:

> How do parents of foreign adoptive children experience adaption and development of their child's identity in kindergarten?

Legitimation in pre-text:

> Who am I? Where do I belong? Am I a Norwegian or am I a foreigner? These are typical questions that I and many other adopted children are asking. As an adopted child I experience myself as both – as a Norwegian and a foreigner. I have had the opportunity to get to know both my foreign cultural background and my Norwegian background. There has always been openness at home in Norway, and we have pictures, flags and instruments from my home country everywhere. My parents took me and my sibling to my home country, and we lived there for one year. My research concerns how adopted children connect to their adoptive parent, and how these children relate to staff in kindergarten. These children have already experienced several separations and starting at kindergarten is another one. They might again go through a painful process. I have worked on my research question, I have rewritten and reformulated it. Now at least, I am pleased with the result.

Sally's legitimation for studying adopted children is based on her own experience as an adopted child, with reference to her question of whom she is. Her feelings and intention appear quite strong also in respect of her parents and their efforts to strengthen her and her siblings' identity from two countries.

Complex subjectivity (post-text)

Sally's research question is now reformulated into the following:

> In a retro perspective, how did foreign adopted children experience adaptions to the staff in kindergarten?

Legitimation in the post-text:

> Who am I? Where do I belong? Am I a Norwegian or am I a foreigner? This is typical questions that I and many other adopted children are asking. As an adopted child I experience myself as both – as a Norwegian and a foreigner. I have had the opportunity to get to know both my foreign cultural background and my Norwegian background. There has

always been openness at home in Norway, and we have pictures, flags and instruments from my home country everywhere. My parents took me and my siblings to my home country, and we lived there for one year.

My parents did this to underline that we are a Norwegian family closely related to the country where I was born. They believed that this would help us to understand why we were adopted and make us proud of our background. Adoption from abroad is important to write about for many reasons. These children have often had a tough start in life, coming from areas marked by social need and poverty. It might also be mother's malnutrition during pregnancy, intoxication, inefficient health care and many other things. Children adopted from abroad might also have several different care persons for a shorter or longer period. I have chosen to use Bowlby's theories of adaptions (Broberg, 2014). Furthermore, Jørgensen's (2017) theory concerning vulnerable stages in connection with adoption, and adaption to new close persons, is relevant. Based on these outlines my research question is: In a retro perspective, how did foreign adopted children experience adaption relating to the staff in kindergarten?

In her post-text we interpret Sally's subjectivity as maintained and strengthened. The first part of the text corresponds with the pre-text. In the last part she elaborates on her parents' efforts by underlining what she thinks are her parents' arguments for taking her and her sibling to their home country. Sally also introduces the topic of general adoption from abroad to the text, by highlighting these children's tough start in life. At the end she refers to literature.

Mary: From complex subjectivity to blank subjectivity

Mary's research question is:

How might staff in kindergarten contribute to the development of children's social competence?

Legitimation of complex subjectivity in pre-text:

I am the mother of a child with the diagnosis of pervasive development disorder. It was my boy who ran along the fence in the kindergarten, every single day – up and down – with the same red bucket and blue spade in his hand. An educator with special needs education succeeded in breaking this pattern. She worked very focussed on play as a means of mastering social skills and social interaction with the other children. Today my child master's role plays and plays by the rules. He has even got a best friend and has good relations with other children. For me personally, the experience of the significance of play for my child's development has given me a cause. The goal of my bachelor thesis is for me to achieve a deeper expertise in this area. I would like to develop competence in working with children who need to master social interaction.

In this text the legitimation has a strong trace of the student's voice. She writes from a standpoint as a mother of a child with the diagnosis of pervasive development disorder. This gives her a special interest and she wants to elaborate on this theme to gain expertise to be able to help other children in her work. There is an "inside - out" perspective in her legitimations.

Blank subjectivity (post-text)

Mary's research question is still the same, her legitimation in her post-text is changed however:

> Social competence is a concept that just a few decades ago was seen in connection with children's problem behaviour, mental health, intoxication, well-being and bullying. This has led to an increasing interest in this research field. Social competence turns out to be a "vaccination" against psychosocial stress and can contribute to social inclusion by focusing on positive actions (Ogden, 2011, pp. 64–68). Through this thesis we will look more closely at how staff in the kindergarten can contribute to children's social competence.

Mary now refers exclusively to Ogden (2011), and she changes from "I" to "we". There are no traces whatsoever of Mary's own voice or her own experiences as a mother, her 'sensing self' seems to be missing. The subjectivity is now blank. The legitimation has changed from a complex to blank subjectivity, and the text has now an "outside- in" perspective in the post-text.

Summing up our findings so far, we have identified three typologies of subjectivity in our data: blank, uncomplicated, and complex subjectivity. Most of the participants' texts are examples of uncomplicated and complex subjectivity before supervision. Changes from one typology to another take place during the supervision process, and this reveal supervisors' sensitivity towards students' legitimations in written texts. Supervision sessions might contribute to a changing typology of subjectivity, from blank to complicated, or even strengthen a complicated or complex subjectivity. The latter is shown in Lisa's, Anne's, and Sally's cases. In these examples' students' legitimations of their own choices have become even more fruitful after the supervision process. Leaning on Bakhtin (1986) we may also say that the bachelor texts show a strong emphasis on centrifugal forces and sameness. The same might be argued regarding to Mary's text. In Mary's case however, a complex subjectivity has been reduced to a blank subjectivity after the supervision meetings, and we will return to this in the discussion. Following Sullivan's (2012) critique of Parker's categorization (1997), all three reported typologies of subjectivity are interpreted as excluding "consciousness of the possibility of changing subjectivity, in the meaning of excluding the potential of shaping 'selves' and look at how selves can respond, in different ways, to this shaping" (Sullivan, 2012, p. 43).

Discussion

Most of the 37 respondents, representing 111 texts, show that subjectivity changes from uncomplicated to complex typology of subjectivity (Parker,1997) during the supervision process. Starting out in Sullivan's critique concerning the ignorance of social language and of possibility of change, subjectivity seems to be more or less fixed in the bachelor texts. This testifies the fact that the bracketing aspect (Husserl, 2004) of bachelor students' subjectivity appears as most important in this part of their learning process. Bracketing is here interpreted as aspiration to separate a universal truth and individual experience. Following Husserl's (2004) phenomenological tradition, the bracketing aspect implies high awareness of who we *are* and clarifying the subjective origins of sense in the condition of the givenness of things (Miquens et al. 2003). The cracketing aspect (Deleuze,1991) on the other hand, implies the perspective of becoming something new. In our study bachelor students seem to be forced to tune down individual values and instead adjust themselves to claims from the outside, and what Bakhtin addressed as authoritative forces. This adjustment is particularly identified in Marys text, where the typology is changed from complex to blank.

An explanation to this observed adjustment could be that our respondents have just started on their journey as teachers-to-be and thus their professional subjectivities are just being formed. Their supervisors and the content of education manifested in their textbooks, national documents, curriculums and examples of best practice they are exposed to, are considered as authorial and authoritarian examples to be followed (Matusov, Marjanovic-Shane & Gradovski, 2019). As for now their subjectivities are mostly shaped by the authorial and authoritarian voices of their teachers and texts, since their professional subjectivity is at its budding stage. Similar powerful forces in supervision context are also observed in a former study of newly educated in professional work (Søndenå & Gradovski, 2017). This former study shows that supervision context is dominated by a generic monologue, based on centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1986), while more vulnerable individual voices come into oblivion. Thus, the level of response to the possibility of change, even an understanding of the need for changes, is still quite low. In a dialogical perspective on supervision this does not mean that status quo will remain. Future qualification of the supervisors must include dialogical perspectives (Sullivan, 2012) and enhance the ability to develop supervisors' didactical sensibility and interpreting repertoires.

The understanding of texts in this study implies an understanding of texts as complex multifunctional hybrid texts (Holquist, 2002), and as such, they represent both common powerful voices and more vulnerable individual voices. We observed, in line with Bakhtin (1986), that the powerful individual voices in bachelor students' texts were not given the same priority as the more powerful voices representing sameness. With the Norwegian national welfare system at the centre of the centrifugal forces, these are hierarchical oriented, and represent powerful sameness as a demanded priority. Thus, subjectivity in this study is viewed as related to a hierarchical system where a dialogic subjectivity is not given priority compared to the other forms of subjectivity.

The dialogical perspective of subjectivity (Sullivan, 2012) acknowledges the battle between forces and makes the fulfilment of multi voice-ness possible. The example, based on the change before and after supervision in Mary's bachelor thesis, represents a disquieting result. This case shows the losing part in this battle when subjectivity is reduced from complex to blank. It seems like Mary's life experience is ignored and put into oblivion, and the overall power of centrifugal forces remain dominant. Functions of students' bachelor texts and qualification of supervisors should be even more problematized in the future, and questions related to students' opportunities for change during the process of supervision need to be a prioritized focus. Focusing on dialogical subjectivity will enrichen the quality in supervision.

References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.). University of Texas Press.

Birkeland, Å. & Carson, N. (2017). *Veiledning for barnehagelærere* (4th ed.). Cappelen Damm akademisk.

Bjerkholt, E. (2013). *Åpning av lukkede rom. En kvalitativ studie av innholdet og dialogene i veiledningssamtalen mellom nyutdannede lærere og lokale veiledere* [Doctoral dissertation]. Universitetet i Oslo.

Bue, T. (1973). *Pedagogisk veiledning.* Forsøksrådet for skoleverket i samarbeid med NKS-forlaget.

Burkitt, I. & Sullivan, P. (2009). Embodied ideas and divided selves: Revisiting Laing via Bakhtin. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*(3), 563–577.

Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design. Qualitative, quantitative & Mixed Methods Approaches.* Sage.

Deleuze, G. (1991). *Empiricism and Subjectivity. An essay on Hume's theory of human nature.* Columbia University Press.

Dysthe, O. (Ed.). (1999). *The Dialogical Perspective and Bakhtin. Conference Rep*ort (PLF-report 2). Program for læringsforskning, Universitetet i Bergen.

Dysthe, O. (2006). Bakhtin og pedagogikken. Kva ein tidlegare ukjend artikkel fortel om Bakhtins pedagogiske praksis. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift*, *90*(6), 456–469.

Eteläpelto, A., Vähäsantanen, K., Hökkä, P. & Paloniemi, S. (2013). What is agency? Conceptualizing professional agency at work. *Educational Research Review, 10*, 45–65.

Fossøy, I. (2006). *Basisgruppeaktivitetens intersubjektive rom. Ein teoretisk og empirisk studie av rettleiarrolla og den situerte, kommunikative praksis i ein problembasert læringskontekst* [Doctoral dissertation]. Universitetet i Oslo.

Handal, P. & Lauvås, G. (2014). *Veiledning og praktisk yrkesteori* (3rd ed.). Cappelen Damm akademisk.

Holquist, M. (2002). *Dialogism, Bakhtin and His World* (2nd edition). Routledge

Husserl, E. (2004). *Ideas: General introduction to Pure Phenomelology*. Routledge.

Kvale, S. (2007). Livslang læring og veiledning i det postmoderne forbrukersamfunn. In T. Kroksmark & K. Åberg (Eds.), *Veiledning og pedagogisk arbeid* (pp. 56–67). Fagbokforlaget.

Madill, A. & Sullivan, P. (2010). Medical training as adventure-wonder and adventure-ordeal: A dialogical analysis of affect-laden pedagogy. *Social Science & Medicine*, *71(12),* 2195–2203.

Matusov, E., Marjanovic-Shane, A., & Gradovski, M. (2019). *Dialogic Pedagogy and Polyphonic Research Art. Bakhtin by and for Educators*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Miguens, S. & Preyer, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Consciousness and Subjectivity.* De Gruyter*.*

Moser, T. & Martinsen, M. (2010). The outdoor environment in Norwegian Kindergartens as pedagogical space for toddler's play, learning and development. *European Early Childhood Research Journal*, *18*(4), 457–471.

Norwegian Centre for Research Data (2018). https://nsd.no/nsd/english/index.html

Ogden, T. (2011). Sosial ferdighetslæring for barn og ungdom. *Tidsskrift for norsk psykologiforening, 48*(1), 64–68.

Parker, I. (1997). Discourse analysis and psychoanalysis*. British Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*(4), 479–495.

Rule, P. (2015). *Dialogue and Boundary Learning.* Brill.

Skagen, K. (2007). Et tema av «ytterste viktighet». Om veiledning i det senmoderne. In T. Kroksmark & K. Åberg (Eds.), *Veiledning og pedagogisk* arbeid (pp. 34–55). Fagbokforlaget.

Sullivan, P. (2012). *Qualitative Data Analysis. Using a Dialogical Approach.* Sage.

Søndenå, K. (2002). *Tradisjon og transcendens. Ein fenomenologisk studie av refleksjon i norsk førskulelærarutdanning* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Gothenburg.

Søndenå, K. & Gradovski, M. (2017). Pre-teksten sin rolle i rettleiing av nyutdanna profesjonsutøvarar – ei kronotopisk analyse. *Uniped*, *40*(4), 374–385.

Worum, K. S. (2014). Veiledning, kunnskapssyn og danning. *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift*, *98*(1), 26–35.