

Syddansk Universitet

Academization of Danish semi-professionals How and with what consequences?

Bøje, Jakob Ditlev

Published in:
Nordic Studies in Education

Publication date:
2012

Citation for pulished version (APA):
Bøje, J. D. (2012). Academization of Danish semi-professionals: How and with what consequences? . Nordic Studies in Education, 32(2), 84-97.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Bøje, Jakob Ditlev: Academization of Danish semi-professionals: How and with what consequences? *Nordic Studies in Education*, Vol. 32, pp. 84–97 Oslo. ISSN 1891-5914.

Academization is a phenomenon which plays an increasing role in the training programmes for the semi-professions. In Denmark academization has been researched from a predominantly student perspective, as an analysis of how abstract forms of knowledge dominate competencies for care and nursing among female students. This article examines academization as a discursive phenomenon. It shows how academization has been produced through historical developments of the educational policies surrounding the semi-professional schools. Furthermore, the article discusses what consequences academization may have as a knowledge/power structure for the production and repression of professional identities.

Keywords: academization · semi-profession · pedagogue · governmentality · genealogy · policy analysis

Manuscript received: May 2011 (peer reviewed)

Jakob Ditlev Bøje, Department of Psychology and Educational Studies, Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark.
E-mail: jdb@ruc.dk

Academization of Danish semi-professionals

How and with what consequences?

JAKOB DITLEV BØJE

During the last decade the education system for Danish semi-professionals (teachers, nurses and social workers, etc.) has been transformed from being a locally based system, with schools in almost every province, and with close relations between those schools and the institutions in which the coming semi-professionals would normally find work, towards larger, fewer and more university-like institutions, the so-called University Colleges.¹ As a result, a debate about the academization of practically oriented occupations has taken shape.

This debate is complex. It includes opinions and perspectives from various actors within and outside the directly affected educational programmes. For the public, academization seems to carry mostly a negative meaning in that, for example, newly qualified nurses have been criticised for not being able to perform even the simplest operations such as putting on a bandage, while instead they are fully qualified in reciting «great thinkers» such as Harbermas or Foucault (Dahlager, 2006). In some of the more elaborate critiques, academization is seen as an expression of middle class power: apparently it is their project, with all its connotations of group work, competency

development, responsibility for own learning, theory of science studies etc., which working class students and more practically oriented occupations are now enrolled under and suffer from (Jespersen, 2011).

Within the schools for teachers, nurses, social workers and pedagogues etc. one cannot so much find a debate about academization, but rather a discussion – a didactic discussion, that is. The question which seems to preoccupy the schools and primarily the teachers is what kind of curriculum the educational programmes should contain and be constructed upon: what types of subjects? What types of teachers? Which balance between practical training (*praktik*) and theoretical input? Which kinds of pedagogy? Etcetera. (see, for example, Weicher, 2003; Beedholm & Olesen, 2005; Holck, 2005; Steensen, 2006).

At the moment, though, it would seem that the didactic discussion has been replaced or at least surpassed by a power struggle between the University Colleges, the state and the old universities regarding the right for teachers to undertake research in the subjects which they teach (e.g. Pedersen & Olesen, 2008; Beedholm, 2008). The teachers at the old universities already have this privilege, and want to protect it as their monopoly, while the teachers at the University Colleges do their best to obtain a slice of the cake.² In a wider perspective the struggle between the different fractions of teachers, who have the same basic education, is a struggle over institutional competitiveness, since both types of institutions need to attract students in order to survive on the national education market.

Among Danish researchers academization of practically oriented occupations has been studied from a number of different perspectives and with accordingly different explanations and even solutions to the problem. Tine Rask Eriksen (1999, 2003, 2004, 2005) has on several occasions studied and dis-

cussed the process of academization. She analyses academization from a gender perspective, and in that light she identifies a so-called negation of female competencies for care and nursing. Seemingly, the educational programme for nurses in particular is structured in such way that the abstract forms of knowledge, derived from the old universities, over time negates and implodes the biographically acquired competencies for care and nursing among the predominantly female students.

From another theoretical perspective (critical theory, Frankfurter School) Kirsten Weber (2001, 2002, 2004) arrives at a similar conclusion. She analyses the process of academization as connected with professionalization strategies among the implied occupations, which, according to a sociological definition, still rank as semi-professions (cf. Etzioni, 1969). The problem with professionalization, according to Weber, is that this strategy leaves the everyday experiences of the welfare professionals under-thematized, and as a result they as individuals have to deal with ambivalence and insecurity.

From yet another theoretical perspective, Bourdieuan sociology, Søren Gytz Olesen (2005) has studied the process of academization among pedagogues³ as a process of capital movements (in the symbolic sense of the word). On the one hand, the recruitment pattern for the educational programme of pedagogues has changed in a way where the students' class background has generally decreased over time; on the other hand, and possibly as a reflection of a devalued student body, the educational programme has tried to increase its symbolic value by attaining a university-like status. Inevitably, this double process opens up for new kinds of selection and stratification processes among the students.

In this article I want to address the question: how did the academization of Danish

semi-professionals become possible and what might be the consequences? What types of policies, problematizations, explanations, technologies, institutional relations and rationalities have helped push forward the phenomenon of academization? In short, how has academization been created from within the institutional and political dynamics of the education system itself?⁴ This way of investigating academization is inspired by newer types of governmentality studies (e.g. Foucault, 1991; Rose, 1999; Miller & Rose, 1990; Dean, 1999; Fournier, 1999; Moos, 2006; Hjort, 2007). As such, the article can be viewed as a genealogy on academization as a phenomenon created on the basis of new ways of perceiving and governing education. I am not suggesting a genealogy in the way Foucault himself carried out his studies, i.e. as so-called *longue durée* analyses.

86

The time span I will be covering in this article is much shorter (approximately 1960–2010), and I do not share the same focus on the development of historical ideas. However, Foucault's way of employing the study of history in order to understand or de-stabilize something in the present (academization) is shared, and that is what turns the article into a specific type of, if you like, policy genealogy.

What comes to light when using this particular approach to the study of academization is the way in which processes in the education system have been, and still are, dependent on wider political reforms, yet somehow seem to be autonomous from these. On the one hand, different political parties (left/right) have clearly left their marks on the education system through time; on the other hand, those marks never seem to happen as a complete revolution of the existing, as something which happens out of nowhere.

Rather, reforms tend to be constructed in what Gustafsson (2003, p. 62), with refer-

ence to Fairclough (1992), calls an intertextual chain. That is, they take point of departure in the existing, and they gradually add changes to that. Thus arises what Dean (1999, p. 58) refers to as a folding back of the ends of the government of the state upon its means. My argument is that academization as an advanced liberal phenomenon has been co-produced through such folding and complexity enhancing processes.

The article will take its point of departure in a specific educational programme for the semi-professions, namely that for pedagogues, and from here on develop more general observations concerning other educational programmes and the education system as such. The reason for this is twofold: first, pedagogues are the group of semi-professionals I have the closest knowledge of on the basis of previous studies (Bøje, 2010). Second, pedagogues constitute one of the latest groups of the so-called semi-professions (their origin can be traced back to the expansion of the welfare state in the 1960s) which make them a case where it is possible to still study the modernization processes of the education system in a condensed form. Had I, for example, chosen to take a point of departure in Danish school teachers, it would be more difficult to identify epochal breaks with their *raison d'être* – or, as they like to call it themselves, their professional ethos.

Methodology

Writing genealogy means giving up writing history as such. Genealogy is not a totalitarian kind of history which seeks to write the past «as it happened», but rather seeks to construct and actively reconnect specific events from the past in an attempt to rewrite the present (Foucault, 2000; Villadsen, 2004). In that way writing genealogy is equivalent to assuming a more modest view

on history which stresses evolvement through discontinuities and continuities in a multidimensional space.

Furthermore, genealogy shares, and is indeed a part of, what has been termed the discursive turn within the social sciences. This means that the researcher who writes genealogy is not interested in writing the true history of, for example, the human subject and its ontology, but rather focuses on the epistemological perception, articulation, explanation and prescription of the subject over time. In connection with this article the same epistemological preoccupation is reflected in a focus on how academization and more broadly education has been articulated, problematized, perceived and solved over time.

As such, I am not claiming that the academization of Danish semi-professionals has been created solely through articulations and new ways of regarding the business of education; but the argument is that new ways of perceiving and articulating education have been co-constitutive of academization as a present phenomenon by legitimating new purposes of education and making them seem plausible as truth claims (Rose, 1999, p. viii).

Finally, writing genealogy as part of an increasing body of governmentality studies means subscribing to a certain conception of power/knowledge. In this conception power is not seen or analysed as something which emanates from a sovereign juridical-political apparatus, e.g. the state, but rather as something which is present at all levels and among all human bodies as both a productive and repressive force.

In line with this, the article analyses power/knowledge relations between, in this case, the state, the semi-professions as occupations and the training programmes of the semi-professions. The idea is that as those relations proliferate and become more and

more complex over time, it gradually becomes more difficult for the state to act as a sovereign power and govern the semi-professions without the knowledge and governance of the semi-professions themselves, i.e. their training programmes.

As already mentioned, the article is inspired by newer types of governmentality studies in addition to Foucault. In particular Mitchell Dean (1999, p. 20 ff.) and his more sociological interpretation and continuation of Foucault, i.e. his *analytics of government*, has informed the analyses. From Dean I use the notion of a fold, a fold upon the power relations of the state. Dean himself describes how such a fold might be seen, or conceived of, in relation to neo-liberalism and what he denotes as advanced liberal government where the state folds back, so to speak, the ends of its government upon its means. The paradigmatic case for Dean is when the state invents quasi markets for its internal affairs in order to create a more liberal and flexible state as opposed to an expensive and bureaucratic welfare state.

For the analyses of this article a folding process is seen as taking place each time the power relations between the state and the semi-professions as occupations become interrupted and mediated by a training programme or, subsequently, a proliferation of that training programme into a new kind of authority or institution. For such an authority/institution to arise, however, problematizations need to be made in the first place, that is, problematizations of the existing power relations. According to Dean (1999, p. 27), problematizations are «specific situations in which the activity of governance comes to be called into question, the moments and situations in which government becomes a problem». In the analyses such specific situations and moments are typically found in commissions, green papers and white papers which call the existing forms of

government into question and thus create a foundation which new types of authority, institutions and knowledge/power relations can be constructed upon.⁵

Some remarks on sources and readings/analysis

The sources in this paper consist mainly of political texts in the form of green papers, white papers, bills and departmental orders.⁶ This choice of sources may seem a bit odd compared to Foucault's preference for «small texts». However, and as mentioned before, this paper does not pretend to be a genealogy in the normal, Foucauldian, long *durée* sense of the word. Instead, it presents itself as a policy genealogy with a specific focus on how academization has been co-produced within the institutional and political dynamics of the education system itself.

For such an argument to be made it is reasonable to delimit the choice of sources to texts written in and by actors of the education system. Furthermore, it is a point in itself that especially the texts deriving from the present or near-present represent the major bases of legitimation for various kinds of educational reform. That is, texts internal to the education system, e.g. green papers or white papers, are to a larger extent than, for example, hearings or interests, articulated by external parties (e.g. teachers, practitioners or students), used as arguments for various types of reform.

The readings and analyses of texts have been carried out in a genealogical order from the present to the past. For presentational reasons, however, the analyses are turned around in the article and constructed in the direction from which we normally perceive history, from past to present. As a pattern, my readings have been informed by the line of discontinuities and continuities represented by the educational reforms themselves. More concretely, I started read-

ing the latest reforms within the field of semi-professional education, and then I wondered what those reforms were problematizations and replacements of. I then found those papers and realized how they were themselves problematizations and solutions to prior regimes of practice and so forth.

Fold 1: Institutionalization of a training programme

In the following I will describe what I call Fold 1 which, in the case of pedagogues, came in connection with the expansion of the welfare state in the 1960s and 1970s and more specifically in connection with the institutionalization of their training programme. Fold 1 is understood as a result of the institutionalization of a training programme, as a means which pushed itself in between the previously direct relations between the state and pedagogues as an occupation. As such, the training programme constituted a new possibility for the state to govern pedagogues via education. One might also speak of the training programme as the initial production of an object which was rendered available to government, and which was later equipped with a more efficient governmentality. More concretely, the programme was an important step towards establishing pedagogues as part of the semi or rather welfare-professions.

Up until the end of the 1960s training for pedagogues was a more or less a private/philanthropic affair. Even though the state had been involved in some of the earlier initiatives in the form of giving certain grants to private colleges, the sector as such had not previously been governed by any kind of law. This changed in 1969 and 1974, respectively. In 1969 the training for kindergarten and leisure-time pedagogues was officially established as a state sponsored and governed programme, and in 1974 the training for social

education workers (working with physically, mentally and socially handicapped people) was established. Some of the reasons for establishing these schools can be read out of the following:

In his proposition the Minister of Education emphasized spelling out these educations in a general law which was based on the fact that they were becoming more widespread and attaining a greater societal significance. Prolongation of the period of study had long been sought, not least by the colleges that train pedagogues, and there was no doubt that current demand relating to personnel would make it both necessary and desirable to implement this improvement in their training as soon as possible. One might then lament on the prolongation that came at a time where there was a pronounced lack of labour. However, during those years there was such an enormous addition to the number of colleges that it would not take long before the sector as such was capable of producing as many students with a three-year education as with a two-year education. Apart from that, our educations and their duration should be arranged according to the demands that are placed on the qualifications of the fully trained and not on the number of people who are, or will be, necessary in the future. (Folketinget, 1968, p. 541; translation J.D.B.)

On the one hand the state was clearly interested in supporting the pedagogues and the entire field of child care/social work at that specific moment in time; firstly by sponsoring the training so that the applicants did not have to pay for themselves anymore (which is implicit in the above); secondly by extending the programme from two to three years; and thirdly by shaping quasi-monopolies for the pedagogues on basis of their training. On the other hand, the state also had a great interest in gaining control over this education since it needed a continuous and fairly well trained labour force for the growing sector

of child care and social work – which in itself was a prerequisite for the economy in the 1960s (Eriksen, 2005, p. 247 ff.).

One might think of this arrangement as a social contract which is, or was, typical for the welfare state: the state grants certain privileges to certain groups of people, in this case mainly women, who had not earlier been formally employed, and in return it gets a well trained and well disciplined labour force. In this way pedagogues, as a profession, can be viewed as a phenomenon produced within the workings of the welfare state, including the creation and institutionalization of a training programme.

If we look more closely at the programme which was institutionalized for the pedagogues there are several features which characterize this kind of welfare rule. One of them concerned the direct relations that were in place between the state and the occupation at that time. Those relations were direct since it was the representatives of the state and the representatives of the occupation who negotiated the terms of the training programme and not, as is today the case, the representatives of the state and the representatives of the schools (in particular the school leaders). For example, there was a board for the training programme consisting mainly of people working within the occupation and/or teaching at the colleges which negotiated all aspects of state regulation. Even departmental orders, which are today a sovereign affair for the Ministry of Education, had to be negotiated with that particular board (Undervisningsministeriet, 1968:§4). Thus, the contract between the state and the occupation was indeed a very «real» one.

As a consequence of the direct relations between the state and the occupation, the aims of the education were very simple. These aims were described as the jurisdictions which pedagogues as a profession could be said to have conquered. For kindergartens

and leisure-time pedagogues the aims were formulated as follows:

According to this law the aim of the education is to train leaders and employees for the work in kindergartens and primary schools, in after-school centres and youth clubs and in other social-pedagogic arrangements for children and youngsters. (Undervisningsministeriet, 1968:§1; translation J.D.B.)

For social education workers the aims were formulated as follows:

According to this law the aim of the education is to train pedagogues for work in crèches, children's and youngsters' homes and thereto related institutions for social-pedagogic work. Furthermore, the aim is to train pedagogues for work in homes for mentally, physically and socially handicapped people. (Socialministeriet, 1974:§1; translation J.D.B.)

Today, the Ministry of Education does not go as far as to specify the exact boundaries within which different kinds of pedagogues, or for that matter teachers, nurses, physiotherapists and so on, are allowed to work. Today the aims are more generally formulated; they are wider, and the complexity of the object clauses has generally increased.

In sum, the texts relating to the pedagogues' foundational training programme reflect a rather direct relationship between the state and pedagogues as an occupation. Nevertheless, the invention of a training programme constituted a first fold of exactly that relationship in that it became an authority/institution which pushed itself in between the state and the occupation. One may also say that the training programme became a new knot of knowledge/power relations which would subsequently form a plateau for new problematizations to be directed towards.

Fold 2: Modernization of the education system

Fold 2 constitutes, initially, such a problematization of the pedagogues' training programme. This time the folding happened not in singula, though, as an exclusive process for the pedagogues as a group within the welfare state. Instead it happened for teachers, nurses and social workers, etc. as well as part of a modernization of the education system and as part of a modernization of the welfare state in general. Taking a point of departure in the pedagogues, though, Fold 2 may be constructed around some specific developments of their training programme.

For the pedagogues the modernization of the welfare state did not have any major effects on their training programme until the beginning of the 1990s. There were cut-backs during the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, but on the legal plane nothing happened until 1991. At that time a major reform of the training programme took place along the lines of what Katrin Hjort (2002) has called the modernization discourse. The following quote, which stems from the bill, gives an indication of this:

For the last couple of years, the pedagogic workspace has been characterized by objectives such as prevention, decentralization, integration, normalization, flexibility, self-management, use of own resources and deinstitutionalization. The traditional boundaries between sectors and disciplines are being undermined which means that pedagogic work is increasingly being done across the traditional groupings of children, young people and adults and across institutional types. A workspace under continued development and restructuring accelerates demands for qualifications such as flexibility and adaptability among the pedagogic workforce. Today a considerable slip of work has already taken place across different groups of people with different pedagogic educa-

tions, and the decision to have free movement across the workspace has already come into force – except for primary teaching. This development is likely to continue during the forthcoming years, and consequently there will be a greater need for pedagogically educated people with broad, general qualifications – qualifications that ensure high quality standards in the work with different groups of children, youngsters and adults, in different work settings and with qualitatively different work tasks. (Undervisningsministeriet, 1991, p. 10; translation J.D.B.)

The text contains a range of problematizations, explanations and strategies. There is talk about prevention, decentralization, integration, normalization, flexibility, self-management, use of own resources, de-institutionalization, high quality standards and so on. What these signifiers have in common is the fact that they point towards a horizon which is constructed as a positive opposition to what existed before, namely the inflexible, centralistic, expensive and inefficient nature of the welfare state.

The unification of the educational programmes led to more broadly defined aims. The aims of the programme were no longer stated as the specific jurisdictions in which different kinds of pedagogues should work; instead they were formulated along the lines of the qualifications wanted by employers and politicians: flexibility, general ability, accountability and so on. Still, the previously formulated expectations of pedagogues as welfare-professionals did not disappear as such; pedagogues were still expected to take care of children, youngsters, physically and mentally handicapped people and so on. It is therefore more precise to say that the new aims were added to the old ones and as such played a part in the edifice of what I call Fold 2.

As a feature which was not exclusive to the pedagogues, but gradually came to apply to all semi-professional schools, the reform

introduced new principles of management. In everyday language these principles went under the name «objectives & framework management» (in Danish: *mål- og rammestyring*):

With the introduction of a new system for economic as well as pedagogic governance (objectives & framework management), the management of the training programme for pedagogues will from now on follow the same rules as the rest of the higher educations. The bill more or less follows the same governance model as the one that applies to the law for home economics /.../, the law for needlework teachers /.../ and the bill which has been proposed for teacher education of 30 January 1990. (Undervisningsministeriet, 1991, p. 10 f.; translation J.D.B.)

In practice the new system functioned by means of boards with an external majority (overrepresentation of employers, officials, municipal representatives and so on), taximeter rates (money per student and not, as previously, money per school) and audit requirements. In Foucault's scheme of things, the new type of governance may be regarded as the production or intensification of a more efficient governmentality among the implicated parties, especially the new school leaders with responsibility for the economy and audit requirements.

The invention of a training programme was, as previously mentioned, a first step in the direction of creating an object which pedagogues, among others, could be governed through; the invention of new types of governance and governmentalities, based on problematizations of the welfare state, can be seen as another step in the same direction. Through that step another fold of the relation between state and occupation was created, and consequently new forms of authority, institutions and knowledge/power relations arose. In the same vein, new, and

for the educational programmes, external aims were inscribed into the programmes.

Fold 3: Modernization within the education system

Fold 3 is seen as arising in connection with the invention of University Colleges, as referred to in the introduction. Whereas Fold 2 developed through the modernization of the education system, that is, through what might be called an external gaze on the education system and the public sector in general, Fold 3 seems to have developed within the education system through a gaze internal to the system. As such, Fold 3 can be said to have developed through the governmentality which had previously been installed in the semi-professional education sector. Moreover, Fold 3, as embodied by University Colleges, again carries new aims for the semi-professional training programmes, including the discursive and technological conditions for academization.

The invention of University Colleges can be traced back to their predecessor, the so-called Centre for Higher Adult Education (CVU). CVU emerged around 2000, and as an institutional compound it was an innovation compared to the earlier types of locally rooted, semi-professional schools in Denmark. CVU was born along with two other structural components: the Danish School of Education (DPU) and a new bachelor degree for «medium-cycle higher educations» (Undervisningsministeriet, 2000).

As such, the invention of CVU was part of a threefold reform, a so-called law package, which constituted a new way of policy-making within the field of semi-professional education: a new level of regulations was created above the normal regulations for the individual training programmes, including the regulations relating to governance which were produced in connection with Fold 2.

One of the most utilized arguments for establishing CVUs appears for the first time in the green paper entitled «The Educational Institutions of the 21st Century» (Undervisningsministeriet, 1998). Here the following is said about the existing institutions, and, more indirectly, about the institutions to come:

The many mono-institutions are typically a product of the post-war period with its clear-cut focus on professions-orientation and functionality. They reflect an era where the demands of the labour market were predictable and relatively static. The training programmes could thus be directed towards job functions (professions) which were clearly defined in advance. This was stressed by the fact that the primary aims of the training programmes were to give the students abilities within clearly defined occupations, rather than to give them communicative and personal qualifications. Today the aims of the educational programmes are much wider, and it is therefore urgent to ask whether mono-institutions still have a reason for existing on their own. The new job demands and demands for qualifications, which follow the technological developments and the increasing internationalization, are directed towards interdisciplinary approaches, communicative understanding, teamwork and flexibility. It is harder to promote such abilities in small mono-faculties than it is in larger multi-disciplinary faculties where different subject fields can inspire each other and support the development of personal qualifications which the labour market demands. (Undervisningsministeriet, 1998, p. 6 f.; translation J.D.B.)

What is noteworthy in the above is, first of all, the kind of technical language which is used. Terms such as *mono-institutions*, *internationalization* and *multi-disciplinary faculties* would be hard to find in earlier types of educational texts. This reflects the fact that the green paper, as a genre, did not appear in the semi-professional education sector until the middle of the 1990s.

Prior to that the commissions, which would normally form the background for a new reform, tended to be what could be described as more value-laden papers. For example, they frequently expressed points of views presented by various actors. Thus, the green paper, as a genre, expresses what I call a gaze internal to the education system. Second, the quote contains a clear problematization of the existing institutions due to their size. It is argued that not only are they mono and post-war-like, they are also too small to meet the demands of the labour market in the 21st century. Hence, a reform of the institutional structure is extrapolated as the only way forward.

The realization of CVU was not as easy as that, however. It also required labour from actors within the semi-professional education sector itself. When CVU (and the threefold reform package) was passed by the Danish parliament in 2000, it happened as a compromise between those who were in favour of the new institution and those who were against it. As such, the institution was born with a so-called conditional/unconditional status where conditional was basically the same as a non-committal agreement between schools who would perhaps, or perhaps not, enter into a more binding agreement in the future, and an unconditional status which was the same as entering into a binding agreement from the start.

In the process of transforming conditional CVUs to unconditional CVUs and, as a next step, to University Colleges, actors from within the semi-professional schools have played a crucial role. In particular the new leaders, or, as Michael Apple (2001) and Stephen Ball (1994) refer to them, *the new managerialism*, have played an important role. In 2006 I interviewed one of the leaders, who is now head of one of the largest University Colleges in Denmark, about the task of transforming a conditional CVU into an

unconditional CVU and, ultimately, into a University College. He explained the following:

When the politicians decided on the CVU project they did one very important thing, they ended up by putting a V into it, a principle of voluntary participation, i.e. it is something in which one can, when a CVU is established, choose to participate. And therefore we get, as I see it, a right way of thinking which is implemented in a completely hopeless way into a sector which is torn apart because it can now be all kinds of different things. /.../ My version of things is that I have now worked very hard on establishing a University College especially for teachers and pedagogues – a *pedagogical* University College. This I have done for several reasons, but first of all it is an attempt towards establishing a kind of mother-institution for teachers and pedagogues. My point is that there are so many actors who want teacher education to take place in the universities that it is necessary for a pedagogical University College to show results in the near future. If results are not produced, I think that teacher education will simply be transferred to the universities because some politicians, for one reason or other, assume that this is better. And by results I'm referring to the attraction, maintenance and carrying through of students within the training programmes. If we don't succeed with this, I think that teacher education will be transferred to the universities. We have to do something. We have to become more *attractive* to young people by giving them some of the same things which they can get at the universities – research and development and so on. I think that this is the only way to avoid teacher education being transferred to the universities. (Translation J.D.B.)

The problematization and explanation which is presented here is focused on two interrelated aspects: (i) preserving teacher training as a monopoly for the CVUs (University Colleges) and (ii) to do so by making

the semi-professional training programmes more attractive to young people by assuming some of the privileges, research and development, which have traditionally been allotted to the old universities. By co-producing such a discourse the particular leader became a key actor in paving the way for an unconditional CVU and later a pedagogical University College aimed especially at teachers and pedagogues.

In 2007 University Colleges were introduced under legislation adopted by the Danish parliament (Undervisningsministeriet, 2007). The key explanation behind the new institution was very much in line with the explanation presented by the leader above: the semi-professional education sector had to be innovated in order to attract young people who would otherwise, and to the politicians' regret, apply for the «old» universities. In contrast to the old universities the semi-professional schools could assumingly lead to a steady job because of labour scarcity within the welfare professions, and therefore young people had to be more or less tempted into choosing these career paths. As tempting ingredients the University Colleges offered new opportunities for research and development, new opportunities for qualification and merit, new facilities and methods of teaching, etc. My argument is that by virtue of these very «ingredients» a discursive and technological path has been paved for the academization of Danish semi-professionals.

Conclusion

Looking at academization in this way means viewing it as a corollary effect of the complex and uncertain workings of history, in this case the discursive and technological workings of the education system which also, when maintaining this perspective, reveals itself as a contingent (and rather new) product of history. Academization is not,

then, something someone does to someone else deliberately. Academization is not a male negation of female competencies for care and nursing, as Eriksen (1999, 2004, 2005) sees it; nor is it an expression of the professions' domination and, effectively, underthematization of peoples' everyday life experiences, as Weber (2001, 2002, 2004) perceives it; and nor is it a stratification process based on middle class power towards working class students, as Olesen (2005) researches the phenomenon. Instead academization, studied from this perspective, is a historical product which at the same time is a historical condition for present and future problematizations, reforms, authorities and institutions, etc. Moreover, academization is a condition for the production of new subjectivities where various combinations, or intersections, of social categories such as class, gender and ethnicity may play a part in the formation.

The analyses from this perspective thus open up for seeing and understanding some of the productive as well as repressive consequences of academization. One very visible consequence is that academization, being itself an enlargement of the aims for semi-professional training programmes, is an enlargement of the possibilities for creating semi-professional identity. Due to academization, pedagogues and similar groups are today not simply pedagogues, teachers and nurses, etc., they are also bachelor students. Or at least they have the discursive and technological means for being so.

Alternatively they can choose to simply become a pedagogue, teacher or nurse, etc. by engaging in the historically more simple forms of knowledge/power relations which characterized the training programmes prior to the invention of academization. As shown in the analyses, the original aims and forms of knowledge/power of the teaching programmes do not disappear as new aims and

forms of knowledge/power arrive; instead the «new» is added to the «old», and as such the «old» still represents a possibility for subjection and subjectivation.

In that there seems to be an unequal balance of knowledge/power, though. As suggested by the adjectives *simply* and *simple*, simply becoming a pedagogue and simple forms of knowledge/power, the old forms of knowledge/power in the training programmes seem to be dominated by the new forms of knowledge/power represented by academization. Hence also pedagogues who choose to become simply pedagogues seem to some extent to be dominated by pedagogues who choose to stress their identities as bachelor students. As such one may note that academization represents a repression through knowledge/power structures as well as an opportunity for professional identity construction.

Notes

1 A similar process has taken place in other Nordic countries, in Holland, and in the UK (Smeby, 2008). At the same time, tendencies towards de-academization, practicisism and de-professionalization can also be identified, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries (Goodson, 2003; Ball, 1994, 2003; Apple, 2001).

2 In Norway, lectures at the Högskolar have 2–10% of their employment reserved for research and development (Sirnes, 1998). Besides that, they can of course obtain a higher percentage of time for research and development through external appropriations.

3 In Denmark a pedagogue is (i) a kindergarten teacher and at times a primary teacher, depending on the recruitment patterns of the schools (pedagogues are a cheaper labour force than «real» teachers), (ii) a social worker who takes care of socially

marginalized people, neglected children and physically and mentally handicapped people. There are many historical reasons for the specific term *pedagogue*, some of which I will discuss in this article, but very briefly the word *pedagogue* is used to distinguish the occupation from the closest and competing occupation, namely teachers (children aged six and upwards). The education for a pedagogue takes 3½ years, and the education for a teacher takes 4 years (for elaboration, cf. Kampmann, 2004).

4 I here delimit myself from international policy developments, e.g. PISA and the Bologna-process, which have without doubt «travelled» (Ozga & Jones, 2006) and played an important role in educational policies in Denmark, especially during the years since 2000 as illustrated by, for example, the accession to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System. The reason for this delimitation is that, when viewed from a historical perspective, the educational policies in Denmark, and in particular the policies relating to the semi-professional schools, have traditionally been, and still very much are, a national question.

5 Nikolas Rose employs a similar «analytics of government» in his *Governing the soul. The shaping of the private self*. He describes a series of analytical tool which he generally uses in the following sequence: problematizations, explanations, technologies, authorities, subjectivities, strategies (Rose, 1999, p. xi f.).

6 Referral is also made to an interview with a leader of one of the biggest University Colleges in Denmark, i.e. someone who is now a key actor in the production of political texts.

Literature

Apple, M.W. (2001). *Educating the «Right» Way. Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Ball, S.J. (1994). *Education Reform. A Critical and Post-Structural Approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ball, S.J. (2003). The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215–228.
- Beedholm, K. (2008). Ret og ressourcer til forskning i professionshøjskolerne. Interview med rektor Harald Mikkelsen. *Gjallerhorn*, 4(6), 68–72.
- Beedholm, K. & Olesen, S.G. (2005). Professioner in spe. *Gjallerhorn*, 1(1), 6–11.
- Bøje, J. (2010). *Differentiering og sortering i pædagoguddannelsen – et uddannelses- og professions sociologisk studie*. København: Københavns Universitet, Institut for Medier, Erkendelse og Formidling, Afdeling for Pædagogik.
- Dahlager, L. (2006). Overlæge: Nye sygeplejersker kan for lidt. *Politikken*, 21/08/2006.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: SAGE.
- Eriksen, T.R. (1999). Akademisering af de praktiske fag. Er vi på rette vej? *Dansk Pædagogisk Tidsskrift*, 47(3), 46–59.
- Eriksen, T.R. (2003). Er videnshierarkierne faldet? Kommentar om forskningstilknudning mellem UNI og CVU. *Agora*, 1(2), 37–40.
- Eriksen, T.R. (2004). Professionsbacheloruddannelsen. Akademisering: Fup eller fakta? *Dansk Pædagogisk Tidsskrift*, 52(2), 60–73.
- Eriksen, T.R. (2005). Professionsidentitet i forandring – fra praksis til teoretisk profession. In T.R. Eriksen & A.M. Jørgensen (eds.): *Professionsidentitet i forandring*. København: Akademisk Forlag.
- Etzioni, A. (ed.) (1969). *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*. New York: The Free Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Folketinget (1968). *Folketingsår bog 1968–69, omtale af lovforslag nr. 219: Lov om uddannelse af børnehave- og fritidspædagoger*. København: Folketinget.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & Peter Miller (eds.): *The Foucault Effect. Studies in governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (2000). Questions of Method. In J.D. Faubion (ed.): *Power. Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984, Volume Three*. New York: The New Press.
- Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to «professionalism» as a disciplinary mechanism. *The Sociological Review*, 47(2), 280–307.
- Goodson, I.F. (2003). *Professional Knowledge, Professional Lives*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Gustafsson, J. (2003). *Integration som text, diskursiv och social praktik. En policyetnografisk fallstudie av mötet mellan skolan och förskolaklassen*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Jespersen, P.M. (2011). Debat: Middelklassens uddannelsesstyrani. *Politikken*, 16/02/2011.
- Hjort, K. (2002). *Moderniseringen af den offentlige sektor*. Roskilde: Roskilde University Press.
- Hjort, K. (2007). Evaluering og videnskabelse – om nye styreformer og professionalisering af lærerne. *Gymnasiepædagogik*, 66, 95–168.
- Holck, D.E. (2005). Læreruddannelse som professionsuddannelse. *Gjallerhorn*, 1(1), 36–44.
- Kampmann, J. (2004). Societalization of Childhood: New Opportunities? New Demands? In H. Brembeck, B. Johansson & J. Kampmann (eds.): *Beyond the Competent Child*. Roskilde: Roskilde University Press.

- Miller, P. & Rose, N. (1990). Governing Economic Life. *Economy and Society*, 19(1), 1–31.
- Moos, L. (2006). Fra politiske demokratidiskurser mod markedsorienterede effektivitetsdiskurser. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 26(4), 322–332.
- Olesen, S.G. (2005). *Rekruttering og reproduktion – om praktikker og italesættelser i pædagoguddannelsen*. Viborg: Forlaget PUC.
- Ozga, J. & Jones, R. (2006). Travelling and Embedded Policy: the Case of Knowledge Transfer. *Journal of Education Policy*, 21(1), 1–17.
- Pedersen, P.M. & Olesen, S.G. (2008). Professionshøjskoler – hvad er meningen? *Gjallerhorn*, 4(6), 53–58.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Governing the soul. The shaping of the private self*. London: Free Association Books.
- Sirnes, T. (1998). Akademisering, diskurskollisjon, habitus og social verdsetting. *Sosiologisk tidsskrift*, 1(2), 107–129.
- Socialministeriet (1974). *Bekendtgørelse om uddannelse til børneforsorgspædagog og omsorgspædagog*. København: Socialministeriet.
- Smeby, J.-C. (2008). Profesjon og utdanning. In A. Molander & L.I. Terum (red.): *Profesjonsstudier*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Steensen, J. (2006). Læreruddannelse mellem akademi og profession – et spørgsmål om høj standard? *Gjallerhorn*, 2(3), 14–26.
- Undervisningsministeriet (1968). *Forslag til Lov om uddannelse af børnehave- og fritidspædagoger*. København: Undervisningsministeriet.
- Undervisningsministeriet (1991). *Forslag til Lov om uddannelse af pædagoger*. København: Undervisningsministeriet.
- Undervisningsministeriet (1998). *Det 21. århundredes uddannelsesinstitutioner. Redegørelse om de videregående uddannelsers institutionelle struktur*. København: Undervisningsministeriet.
- Undervisningsministeriet (2000). *Forslag til Lov om mellemlange videregående uddannelser*. København: Undervisningsministeriet.
- Undervisningsministeriet (2007). *Lov om professionshøjskoler for videregående uddannelser*. København: Undervisningsministeriet.
- Villadsen, K. (2004). *Det sociale arbejdes genealogi. Om kampen for at gøre fattige og udstødte til frie mennesker*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Weber, K. (2001). *Experience and Discourse. Theorizing Professions and Subjectivity*. Roskilde: Roskilde University Press.
- Weber, K. (2002). Professionsuddannelserne i vadestedet – eller senmodernitetens paradoksale kvalificering. *Social Kritik*, 2(81), 56–83.
- Weber, K. (2004). Videnskab eller hverdagsbevidsthed? In K. Hjort (red.): *De professionelle – forskning i professioner og professionsuddannelser*. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- Weicher, I. (2003). Uddannelse(r) i forandring – professionsbachelor og fagforståelse. In I. Weicher & P. Fibæk Laursen (red.): *Person og profession. En udfordring for socialrådgivere, sygeplejersker, lærere og pædagoger*. Værløse: Billesø & Baltzer.