So I sat down with my mother - Pupils’ independence in the context of doing school related project work
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Abstract: Swedish educational policy underlines the importance of pupils’ independence. In the course plan for project work, PA 1201, pupils’ independence is described as an essential skill which the pupils are expected to learn to master and which the teachers are expected to assess. Both from a pedagogic and a political perspective this is motivated, by arguing that independence is a central competence in the modern information society. In this paper we use socio cultural theory and Foucault’s theory of subjectivity to explain how pupils’ independency is transformed into something else, when they work as prescribed in PA 1201 (working in groups, guided by course plans and instructions). Our results derive from analyses of i) filmed sessions were pupils interact in groups while writing on computers and of ii) entries in the pupils’ logbooks. Techniques from sequential art are used in order to provide fully adequate transcripts. Our findings demonstrate that the pupils’ definitions of independence differ from those of the course plan in several aspects: i) the use of certain recourses is not considered to show lack of independence, ii) doing things your self is considered being most independent and iii) to follow (be controlled by) instructions, even if this means violating your personal unique thought, is considered a prerequisite for passing/getting good grades and as such a necessary adaption to the school context, sooner than a sign of dependency. Consequently we argue that pupil independency should be regarded as phenomena chiseled out within a community of practice rather than a personal capacity and as a technique for receiving higher grades rather than an important personal skill.
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1. Being independent in a collaborative assignment?

![Figure 1 External assistance](image)

X, Y and Z are planning their project. They have had some trouble getting started. In the transcript represented by the video-frame above, X comments on suggestions included in their mind map. He claims that these suggestions are the result of a brainstorming session he and his mother carried out that morning. His way of speaking about his mother’s assistance, demonstrate that this mode of working with school assignments does not present a problem.

Our analyses show that X’s accounts of what it means to him to carry out project work align with the widely held view that work in a knowledge society is carried out in collaboration. People need to form “social networks” or “communities of practice” in order to perform well. His accounts also align with normative policy statements on learning common to most OECD-countries in which it is assumed that school pupils must learn to carry out their work as communities of learners. An equally important assumption is that people living and working in an information society need to be able to perform independently and take on individual responsibility for assignments.

In the Swedish school system project work may be seen as a site for training how to work collaboratively. Students doing project work also need to be assessed according to signs of independence. Here we have decided to translate the Swedish word självständighet as independence. However the meaning of being independent while working collaboratively seems problematic for both pupils and teachers. What counts as a sign of independence when you are working in a group on doing projects work? Is it self regulation or maybe doing things individually?
Should students come up with creative solutions or appear to original authors. This suggested paradox forms the starting point for our study, where we attempt to elucidate how students’ reason about independence in the context of school related project work.

2. Situating students’ “own work”

Students’ “own work” has become an important issue in the current discourse on Swedish education. No only is it underlined in bills, curriculum and policy documents but it has also become an important catch-phrase in media. It is also being used by researchers in order to categorize a mode of work that has become more common in all stages of the Swedish education system. When the students are involved in “own work” activities they are supposed to master a high degree of liberty of choice and to take a high degree of responsibility for planning and carrying out assignments. This stands in contrast to more traditional work forms which to a higher extent are planned and supervised by the teacher. In the current political discourse on education students’ “own work” has been used, by the minister for education and the minister for higher education and Research, as an explanatory factor for the supposed failure of Swedish senior high schools to live up to expectations to remain at the top of international assessments of student performance (Leijonborg & Björklund, 2004). Partial support for this can be found in a number of studies. Österlind (1997, p 130-134) argues that students’ own work is a mode of working that affords freedom for those with an upbringing that fit such a value system but also increased pressure and dejection (p. 99).

Rather than being an individual, solitary activity students’ “own work” is often embedded in a collaborative activity where the students rely on a number of resources. Their management of these resources may in itself present difficulties, and the students often spend considerable time on reasoning about the meaning of assignments and instructions (Vinterek, 2006). In political debate students are often considered left on their own to learn and the absence of the teacher is criticized.

Two trajectories for looking upon project work and arguing for and defending it as independent, autonomous and self regulated work deserve to be highlighted. The first trajectory is related to Dewey (1916/1999) and the progressive pedagogy movement who criticizes traditional pedagogy and suggests that pedagogical objectives should: i) be anchored in real activities, ii) be formulated by students and iii) allow students to work with methods that align with the formulated objectives. This credo is often regarded a source of inspiration for project work and a cure for a lack of initiative and intellectual originality. This argumentative line is clearly seen in the course plan for project work.
Project work aims at developing the skill of planning, structuring and taking responsibility for a larger piece of work and providing experience of working in project form. (Skolverket, 2000).

The other trajectory, which aligns project work to societal changes and changes in the organisation of labour, is also manifested in writings about project work from the National Agency for Education (2001). This trajectory emphasizes that project oriented work forms are becoming more common and that project competence and the ability to work with others are highly appreciated by employers. Project work is thus seen as a positive response to labour market demands. However critical remarks are made by authors who compare the isomorphism between labour market governmentality and educational aims and critically discuss for whom and under what circumstances this is beneficial (cf Österlind & Sörling, 2005; Hjort, 2008, Dovemark, 2004).

3. Independence in project work

In compulsory as well as higher education in Sweden independence, individual responsibility and self-regulation is required (Higher Education Ordinance, SFS:1993:100; LPF94; LPO94) and students are supposed to be assessed and graded accordingly. The difficulty that presents itself is what exactly it is that is to be assessed and this difficulty can be assumed to be a concern for teachers and students alike. In general terms independence and autonomy suggests being able to or even being allowed to do things on your own. Even when we act “on our own”, which is indicated by the latter, we do things under social conditions that impede on independence. One issue of concern for psychological research is what the nature of independence is. To what extent can it be seen as something that occurs on a mental or cognitive level, referring to dispositions of a more general nature? To what extent can it be assessed without reference to a particular domain or situation for instance through psychological testing of an individual’s disposition towards being reflective, self-aware, critical, or having opinions? To what extent can they be seen as practical achievements that exist “in doing” and are displayed in practice? How can students display independence and how can independence be measured let’s say by teachers?

From a socio-cultural perspective (Wertsch, 1998; Säljö, 2000) speaking of student independence or autonomy as a quality of human action presents a difficulty, as categories such as independence generally are considered situated, culturally, historically and socially and hence are preferred to be regarded subjects of discussion rather than qualities having an essence or fundamental nature. Independence becomes something of a paradox since learning takes place under particular circumstances and knowledge exist and is transformed under the very same circumstances. In conclusion the notion of being skilled is also constituted under these circumstances. From this perspective independence can never be
regarded independent of the local discourse or artefacts that contribute to learning. Categories and metaphors are assumed to play an important role mediating between the institution and the individual (Mäkitalo & Säljö, 2002). Lave and Wenger (1991) suggest that the meaning of such categories and metaphors are negotiated through participation in practice and through reification of meaning into object like constructs. Independence may be regarded as such a category.

What it means to be an independent learner presents a difficulty. Vygotsky (1978) argues that supplementation, i.e. that learners can not reach as far on their own as they can with the help of a more experienced tutor, is important to learning. This almost symbiotic dependence, such as in apprenticeship or being part of a dialogic inquiry, is generally favourably presented in literature on pedagogy (Rogoff, 1990). While learning as such might be found for good or bad being a part of a community of practice, a discourse community or an epistemic community is almost solely considered conducive to learning. Only in the rare cases, such as piloting where teacher guidance is considered amounting to leading students through the assignment rather than helping them master it, supplementation is considered to impede learning. Independence from such perspectives is not equal to learning in solitary confinement. Instead independence must be defined as something that is constituted in a particular context.

4. Contextualizing independent work and project work

Foucault (1972) argues that subjectivities (such as independence) can be regarded discursive positions within an order of discourse and as such principles rather than essential human traits. (In some readings of Foucault these are denoted to be writing the subject). In his later works Foucault (2000) argues that individuals engage in self forming activities and draw on discourse orders to turn themselves into particular subjects, which has induced us to ask questions about how students are invited to recognize being independent as an obligation in our analysis. Other questions being: What ethical issues do they raise? (Students are for example, as we see it, bound to ponder over if and how different activities in group work are linked to being independent.) How are students invited to recognize being independent as a moral obligation? Do they turn directly to course plans or are these issues raised in tutoring sessions and discussed with teachers? What do the students try to achieve by trying to be independent? Do they want to become a good student with high grades or do they recognize being independent as a higher value?

Questions such those above are best answered by studying students in action. In this study students have been video-recorded while working in groups with assignments related to a course called, PA 1201, Projektarbete which was established with the explicit purpose of:
developing the skill of planning, structuring and taking responsibility for a larger piece of work and providing experience of working in project form. Project work also aims at applying and deepening knowledge within a knowledge area in a programme or a study orientation (Skolverket, 2000).

PA, 1201 is mandatory and makes up 100 points of the total 2500 upper secondary credits. From an assessment view the student’s “result” include not only the actual “work” or “product” which might be a work of art, such as a show, or an essay designed to answer a research question but also, and of equal importance, “how” the student have carried out the project. The course plan specifies that students shall “demonstrate independence in their choice of knowledge area and in formulating tasks or problems which the project should solve”. To pass with special distinction they shall:

- take own initiatives and demonstrate inventiveness and imagination, not only in formulating problems or tasks, but also in choice of method, tools and materials (Skolverket, 2000).

Our participants are students in two theoretical programs directed towards natural science or social science in a Swedish secondary school. The main characteristic of our students, besides participating in a theoretical program, is that they work within the frames of a physical education and health program. Their school has developed a local entry to PA 1201, called Projektresan (The Project Journey). In their first year in senior high they were introduced to The Project Journey by a one week small scale version of the final course. During year two they spent yet another week preparing for their Project Journey, the graded assignment that they work on during their third year.

5. Methodological considerations

The students were filmed during “The Project Journey”.

Our data consists of 60 hours of video filmed interaction collected over a three year period, additional data being instructions along with entries from the students’ individual and group logs. Individual logs contain notes written by students pertain to their work, such as ideas, changes in plans, parts of the project they are working on and how they use their time while group logs in addition to this contain reflections on group processes.

Recordings were made of student and computer screen activities. Thereafter data streams were merged into one film. A program called Transana was used for transcribing the recordings and adding keywords for analytical categorizations. Below we show how the merged films appear (students made unidentifiable).
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Narrative techniques from sequential art were used to represent interaction. We argue that this technique allows us to describe the dynamics of interaction more efficiently since many are familiar with the conventions of sequential art hence this technique allows us to be more fastidious in our contextual descriptions and work more directly with the interaction.

Transforming films into sequential art strips involve several analytical considerations such as how to cut segments and emphasize movements and considerations on whether we are free to choose frames other than the ones were the actual words were spoken (for a more precise discussion see Eklöf, 2009). However we contend that the analytical considerations made when using sequential art strips are not radically different from those made when using more conventional transcripts. It boils down to decisions about how renderings will influence our analysis.
6. Independence within a community of practice

Students’ lack of exposure to teacher instruction being left without the proper guidance is often presented as a negative aspect of students’ own work in the present political discourse. The transcript below challenges this notion.

Here the students have been busy trying to structure their project. On the screen in front of them is a mind map presenting the structure of their project and on what should be included? X initiates the discussion by pointing to material that he and his mother put together at home during an early “brain storming session”. In this sequence it becomes evident that the involvement of X’s mother as a kind of tutor is not regarded an ethical issue. Y’s insertion “Help, did your mother have time for that” suggest that parents’ time, motivation, and perhaps skills may present obstacles and raise issues to debate but parents as such are obvious resources to be included in the collaborative project. Parents may, under certain circumstances such as when students feel depressed as in the case of X become heavily involved. Y provides a social lubricant stating that “you mustn’t feel depressed” highlighting the importance of doing well. Under these circumstances X’s mother’s estimated 30 to 40 minutes input provides a substantial part of the group’s work through her and her son’s joint effort.

7. Drawing on your peers

Our analysis shows that peers are as important as parents for project work. Pupils measure not only the quality of the final work; solutions are compared and
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discussed every step of the way. Consulting other students is rarely turned into an ethical substance. It is not constituted as being dependent.

In the strip above the students are working on the introductory part of their project work. In the instruction they are given advice on what and how much to write. During this session group members left the room to compare their solution to that of other groups at seven occasions. Problems discussed concerned instruction and technical aspects of word processing (rather than writing).

8. Other collectively accessible resources

All our data (video-recordings, audio-recordings from tutoring-sessions and notes from student logs) clearly demonstrate that students are supplemented by many resources in their work. In some cases students are invited to use these resources through the formal framework provided for project work. This seems to be the case with tutoring sessions and instructions which have been reified as scaffolds in the formal school environment. Occasionally, such as under what conditions they are allowed to use texts, visit web-sites or draw on other sources, the use of resources constitutes a difficulty that needs to be discussed, (cf. Nilsson, Eklöf & Ottosson, 2008). Parents and peers however are never reasoned about as threat to independence. External resources come in handy when students have technical problems. In a log notation friends are described as one who “helped out with the front page” someone who is “good with Internet pages” while a father is described as being “good with computers”. Students frequently refer to Anders, the researcher who monitors the video-taping. One group complain over having poor computer skills but they “fix things with a little extra help from Anders”. Another group account for their participation in the research project stating that “that way they could get help from Anders on different occasions”. Since the student logs are accessible to the teachers such supplementation does not appear to be accounted for as being dependant.

9. Constituting independence as doing on your own

In collective activities the “I” signals the location for an utterance. There is a location for an actor but not necessarily an actor that appears as, or ascribe to being independent. What is done is done together with parents, group members or with respect to the work of others. In some cases one could argue that individual contributions are treated as independent contributions. A group of students declare that:

Figure 6 Log -Independent in solitude

We have divided work in such a way that we have approximately two questions each and this allows us to work more independently, we don't need to depend on each other all the time.
Independence appears to concern doing things simultaneously but individually, rather than being unique, or making unique contributions. Students stress in their logs that “today we have worked independently”, that is, “on our own”. This is phrased collectively but when as in the above example the continued claim is that they don’t “need to depend on each other all the time”, it points in another direction. They “do” as individuals. Frequently independence as “individual doing” is constituted as providing a second opinion. The students “read each others work” to give “their own view”. They plan to read each others’ work “and provide comments on the content”. Their decisions may be thought of as individual or independent even when they are described as acts within a community of practice. In some cases they are presented as individual. This may be the case when a student describes a session as one where she “went to school with a sore throat and a sense of having a high temperature”.

10. Running the show

Students are required to write logs. Their logs illustrate an important aspect of self regulation. They show how students describe what is expected of them in tutoring sessions, in terms of self regulation. To be perceived of as independent students, they state, that they as a collective, need to take the lead.

![Figure 7 Log- taking the lead](image)

They describe independence as an increasing demand stating that “then in the third grade, we, the students, will talk more and the teachers only listen”. This raises the question whether students primarily look at the tutoring sessions as meetings that have the explicit purpose to support their work. Rather they describe it as an occasion where they are being assessed on independence. Thus, they must be prepared and take the lead. Otherwise there is a danger that the teachers will think of them as dependent.
11. Instructions and independence

In the next transcript a group of boys start their writing of the analysis section by checking out what the instructions say. The first boy reads the instructions and then states that they have to use their hypothesis. He goes on to say that they should not include new information in this section. The second boy indicates that he is in agreement. The first boy states that then they can “just start writing.”

![Figure 8 Instruction as a path](image)

A particular way to look at instructions may be argued to be displayed. Instructions tell the boys directly how to go about their business. Being independent becomes knowing how to go on. From another perspective on instructions these invite students to reason about meaning, in this case about how one should write an analysis. Here this invitation does not appear to present a difficulty to reason about.

The next transcript we argue illustrates this other way to treat such an invitation. The students have made some alterations in a text they have taken from a book. They are uncertain about whether they are allowed to do so.

![Figure 9 Instruction as an obstacle](image)
They account for their alteration as an attempt to meet the needs of their readers. This obligation however is severely limited by another duty. They need to follow instructions. Even though they are in agreement that the alteration improves on the text, they decide to reduce their uncertainty by moving their text to “the discussion”. One may say that they are invited by their concern for their readers to present a readable text and by their way of constituting “following instruction” as a demand to follow them to the letter. The difficulty is resolved through the suggestion that they present the alteration in the discussion, a genre they construe as one where they can write more freely and use their own voice. One may conceive of their approach to independence as one of necessity, independence being nothing more then freedom to do what is necessary.

In the next strip three boys reason about an oral instruction that the teacher X has given. Boy number one suggests that they have been given instructions by X to the effect that every main question (hypothesis) should be a special section in their report. The other boys are in opposition, but not on the grounds that X’s instructions should be differently interpreted. Instead they assert that it is a stupid way of structuring their writing. They argue that their structure is superior to that of the instruction. Ideally this can be constituted as an attempt from the students to “do independence.”

The students turn to the teacher’s instructions in order to identify how they should go about their text. They are invited to recognize the importance of following these instructions by presenting this as a prerequisite for good grades. The first boy suggests that they are in danger of receiving a lower grade if they do not follow instructions to the letter. The third boy argues that the teacher has not expressed this as a requirement. To the contrary he has said that their way of writing worked well. Being independent becomes resolving ambiguity.

It would be tempting to argue that the last group of students shows a considerable amount of independence towards the instructions. We would claim however that all of the students engage in self-forming activities in order to be able to go on with their work, but they are differently invited. They draw on a constitution of instructions as clear cut.

They draw on instructions as a foundation for ordering work but one that needs to be reasoned about. They draw on teacher’s assessment of the quality of their present design as rather cool as a means to reconcile their preferred design with the teacher’s oral instructions and reach the conclusion that they can keep their original structure, and possibly get high grades.

Figure 10 Instruction as a challenge
12. The (in)dependence paradox

Drawing on such resources as parents, friends and an occasional visiting researcher do not prompt the students in our material to reason about independence. They do however reason about how to appear in their relationship to their teachers and express worries about being assessed.

"Because this was our first project essay the teachers were more visible and positive towards giving help. In order for us to gain as much knowledge as possible about writing project reports. But later on, in the third grade, I think the teachers will only tolerate that students ask questions a few times. This is good because then one gets the chance to demonstrate that one can manage independent work without teachers help."

Figure 11 Log - a time aspect

Asking for help is constituted as being dependent. The students’ logs show that students think that they can not consult their teachers more than a few times. They link age to independence. It is okay for students to ask when they are beginners but as they get older not asking for help becomes a sign of independence. As can be seen from the course plans for the course PA 1201, teachers must grade students on their ability to work independently and to plan their own work. There is a limit to how much one can ask before one may be perceived of as unoriginal or as a student lacking in independence. The students do not formulate independence as a quality of knowing when to ask and what to ask about, but following their teachers’ instructions as a quantitative aspect.

One would perhaps expect this principle to apply to their final product, the work. Student logs do however suggest that teacher feed back in tutoring sessions do not invite students to reason about how to produce an original work.

"We were almost done with the power point when A and D went to G to an approval for the report. But we didn’t get the answer we hoped for. Obviously there were a number of things that needed to be changed. The introduction was not good enough and we were not allowed to use the words “we” and “one” as often. As we had and all headings had to be turned into questions."

Figure 12 Log - to be responsible
The transcript above clearly illustrates a case where students accept that they are held accountable for how they follow instructions. Students are not seen as invited to challenge teachers’ assessment of their work. To choose another way of writing based on the teacher’s appreciation of their writing as cool, as one group did means taking a risk. To directly oppose a teacher’s assessment one may argue means taking a considerable risk since students are doing graded work. One might argue that the ultimate proof of independence on the part of students would be to challenge their teachers’ opinions but teachers’ assessments do not surface as something to reason about. The impact on grades when disobeying instructions does.

13. Discussion

Students working in the course PA 1201 - Project work in Swedish senior high school are supposed to be graded on independence. The purpose of this study has been to study what independent student becomes, treating independence as a practical achievement that exists “in doing”, leaving aside philosophical and psychological concerns about “the nature of independence”. The political rational behind the introduction of PA 1201 can, as we claimed earlier, be traced back to Dewey and his credo that pedagogical goals should be anchored in real activities, be formulated by students and allow students to work with methods that align with the formulated goals but also in normative political claims about preparation for work life. There are claims that such ideas are common in western policy documents on education and that they give rise to forms of work that stress students’ own work, self regulation and independence (Dovemark, 2004). There are also claims that such work forms meet other needs, anchored in the necessities of schooling. Österlind (1998) argues that these needs require the introduction of other forms of interaction. In her study individualised forms satisfy the need for other forms of control scaffolded through the use of student logs.

In our study we find that students are governed in the name of independence, but it is a highly situated form of independence. Our results clearly demonstrate that the students working in different phases of “the project journey” make use of a number of resources, primarily human actors, but also electronic devices and books. Making use of external human resources is rarely constituted as being less independent. Jackson (1968, p 10) argued that “learning to live in a classroom involves, among other things, learning to live in a crowd.” From a socio-cultural perspective it may be differently stated. We spend most of our time in organizations, acting within organizational structures communicating with institutional categories. Learning in itself is overwhelmingly to learn in collectively organized settings with the help of resources provided in these settings. What has changed since 1968 viewed through our material seem primarily to be what students consider to be accessible resources and possibly what space that can be referred to as their classroom. Governance in the name of
So I sat down with my mother, IFIP WCCE 2009

independence does not seem to prevent “our students” from using human or technical resources to supplement their learning.

In the “prepare for work life trajectory” governance in the name of collaboration is as important as governance in the name of independence. Howard (1999) makes a principled claim that there is a difficulty with the constitution of agency within collaborative theory that presents itself clearly in discourse on writing. We see Howards claim as relevant to a discussion of our students’ practice doing project work. She argues that the "prevailing episteme” of the independent cogito holds sway even in collaborative theory”. It is precisely at this point, she argues, that social constructionism falls prey to the fallacy of the autonomous writer and we would venture to any form of autonomy.

In social constructionism the author is in dialogue with the social environment but is still an autonomous agent, capable of individual action – and solitary writing. (Howard, 1999, p. 38).

The notion of students “own work”, thus remains firmly embedded in social constructionist theory as described by Howard. It provides the basis for regarding independence as “doing individual work” and also for a connection to notions such as entrepreneurship in “the prepare for work life trajectory.” From such a perspective it seems reasonable that our students’ most important displays of independence concern independence as “doing”.

If one, as in socio-cultural theory, take into account that individuals in human cultures are supplemented through the use of artefacts ranging from institutions to single devices the construction of independence in collaborative, settings appears to provide a dilemma. The difficulty that presents itself in much project work is that students are expected to perform their work collectively in intimate collaboration with their peers but they are supposed to be assessed based on their individual contribution and mastery. This creates what we have termed the “(in)dependence paradox.” In collaborative school-settings the suspicion that individual students hide behind the collective present an argument for scaffolds to be put in place in order for students to demonstrate independence. This can be exemplified through Brown and Cambione’s (1994, 1996) programme called Fostering Communities of Learners. In this programme there is an application of social cohesion theory that the authors claim to be beneficial for learning. What are somewhat intriguing in this programme are the requirements for independence. Students form groups in order to master a disciplinary area of expertise. Aronson’s Jigsaw method is used in a manner that forces students to independently master this area and as their group is divided they have to report on their area of expertise to the new group.

Drawing on Foucault (2000) one may argue that students are invited to become independent through group pressure. Governance, albeit in the name of preparation for work life still takes its’ lead from governance in the name of independence. A difficulty presents itself. How can one be independent in a context where one is required to follow instructions and where one’s work is assessed based on a number of criteria present in bills, course plans, and local
policies and mediated in different practices? Being graded on independence seems to impose a limit on independence of such a magnitude that it seems fair to ask whether students can really be considered to be governed in the name of preparation for work-life. Students in our material are invited to become independent but only within the limits of policies and written and oral instructions.

For students doing project work in Swedish schools this governance presents difficulties to be reasoned about. Student accounts clearly suggest that they need to be careful in their appearance. Does this mean that they actually need to be careful in their appearance? Should for example tutoring sessions be regarded with reference to Jackson (1968) as embedded in the atmosphere of ubiquitous assessment that pervades any educational institution? Students need to get help, but at the same time they declare that asking for help may be perceived of as displaying dependence. They need to be supplemented in tutoring sessions but they declare that they have to demonstrate that they are independent, by leading the discussions and by not giving the teacher too much talk-time.

In the course plan and commentary material independence can be seen to be treated as an essential concept, transcending history and culture. It presents a mode of subjection as a moral absolute, a higher value and a significant quality providing a discursive position that the students are invited to subject to. In Foucault’s terms it would seem appropriate to speak of subjection in “the name of work-life.” Students need to be prepared for a modern society. Independence in our material however is displayed in doing. The apparent paradox of independence as we have called it is expressed in the independence students’ show in doing. Being independent is achieved in acting on others. The limitations that are imposed on their independence are maintained by the very context that is supposed to foster independence. The contextual constraints seem to turn the students’ efforts to answer the call for independence into merely another strategy for receiving as high grades as possible.
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