

Please refer to this article in this way: Collin, S-O., Umans, T., Broberg, P., Smith, E., and Tagesson, T.(2016) 'Producing academic theses: The Kristianstad model' in *Scientific Works*, ed. Astahova, K.V., Kharkiv University of Humanities: Peoples' Ukrainian Academy, PUA publishing, Kharkiv. Vol. 22. pg. 441-462

*Sven-Olof Yrjö Collin, Timurs Umans, Pernilla Broberg,
Elin Smith, Torbjörn Tagesson*

**PRODUCING ACADEMIC THESES:
THE KRISTIANSTAD MODEL¹**

Annotation. We present a model of supervising bachelor and master theses that we have developed at Kristianstad University in Sweden. It emphasizes 1.) engagement, in that the research engaged supervisor becomes engaged in both the subject of the thesis and the students writing it; 2.) the Humboldt principle, in that teachers and students collaborate for mutual benefit; 3.) the Socratic method, in that the supervisor drives students' learning through posing questions. The model implies intense and frequent supervision, seminars with students as opponents and respondents, and finally, popular presentation, where the results are presented for an educated public. The examination of the theses have the double function of securing high standard examination and to develop the staff in their supervisory and examinatory skills. The direction of the supervisory team is mainly made through common norms, such as a thesis have to be driven by theory, methodological pragmatism implying that the problem, not the authors preferences, determine which analytical method to use and empirical orientation, that theories needs to be tested or evaluated. The model described has shown good results, both in national evaluations and through number of scientific publications.

С.-О. Коллин, Т. Уман, Р. Броберг, Э. Смит, Т. Тагссон

**ПОДГОТОВКА ДИССЕРТАЦИИ:
КРИСТИАНШТАДСКАЯ МОДЕЛЬ**

Аннотация. Мы представляем модель руководства подготовкой бакалаврских и магистерских дипломов, которую мы разработали в Кристианштадском университете в Швеции. Ее ключевые составляющие: 1) вовлеченность: вовлеченный в научное исследование руководитель

¹ The paper is a part of a project titled "High quality in bachelor and master theses – what is needed in terms of supervision and examination?", partly financed by Excellence funding at Kristianstad University Dnr. 2015-1121-224. David Harrison at Proper English AB contributed with language editing.

інтересується як предметом дипломної роботи, так і студентом, який її пише; 2) принцип Гумбольда, згідно з яким викладач і студент працюють разом для досягнення взаємовигідного результату; 3) метод Сократа: керівник навчає студента, задаючи запитання. Модель передбачає постійну взаємодію викладача і студента, семінари, на яких студенти виступають і опонентами, і доповідачами, і в завершенні – відкрита презентація, де результати демонструють компетентній публіці. Перевірка дипломних робіт виконує подвійну функцію: збереження високих стандартів освіти і покращення навичок керівництва і рецензування викладачів. Робота команди керівників здійснюється на базі звичайних норм: дипломне дослідження керується теорією, саме методологічний прагматизм обумовлює вибір аналітичного методу і емпіричну орієнтацію для розкриття проблеми, а не авторське вподобання, так само як які теорії потребують випробування

С.-О. Коллін, Т. Уман, Р. Броберг, Э. Смит, Т. Тагссон

ПІДГОТОВКА ДИСЕРТАЦІЇ: КРІСТІАНШТАДСЬКА МОДЕЛЬ

Анотація. Ми представляємо модель керівництва підготовкою бакалаврських і магістерських дипломів, яку ми розробили в Крістіанштадському університеті у Швеції. Її ключові складові: 1) замученість: залучений до науково-дослідницької діяльності викладач цікавиться як предметом дослідження, так і виконанням студентами їх робіт; 2) принцип Гумбольда, згідно з яким викладач і студент співпрацюють для досягнення взаємовигідного результату; 3) метод Сократа: керівник навчає студента шляхом постановки питань. Модель передбачає постійну взаємодію викладача і студента, семінари, під час яких студенти виступають в якості опонентів і доповідачів, і, у підсумку, відкрита презентація, де результати демонструють компетентній публіці. Перевірка дипломних робіт виконує подвійну функцію: збереження високих стандартів освіти і покращення навичок керівництва і рецензування викладачів. Робота команди керівників здійснюється на базі звичайних норм: дипломне дослідження керується теорією, саме методологічний прагматизм обумовлює вибір аналітичного методу і емпіричну орієнтацію для розкриття проблеми, а не авторське вподобання, так само як які теорії потребують випробування

чи оцінювання. Описана модель призвела до отримання позитивних результатів як в загальнонаціональних оцінках, так і в наукових публікаціях.

1. Introduction

‘Engagement! Engagement! that is Moses and the Prophets!’ That is the main principle of the Kristianstad model we will present here for the production of student academic theses in the subject of business administration. The academic thesis is the final step in the student’s academic education for the bachelor (‘kandidat’ in Swedish) degree and the one year master program (‘magister’ in Swedish) and the two-year master program. The thesis is where students are to show the competence, knowledge and capacity for knowledge development achieved during their academic education. At the same time, thesis work is an opportunity for the academic staff to develop their own skills and thinking through interaction with students in supervisions and examinations. The thesis work is therefore important for both staff and students, and ultimately for the university.

In this paper, we describe and explain the model of thesis work that we developed while working at Kristianstad University during 2001 and 2008. We therefore term it the Kristianstad model of thesis work.

We believe the model to be a successful model of supervision. Many good PhD students have been recruited and many articles, both practical and scientific, have been published, based on theses produced using the model. It is also worthy of mention that in 2012, all Swedish universities offering education in business administration were assessed by the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education, a government agency. The Agency assessed mainly the bachelor and master theses from all Swedish universities. In this assessment, Kristianstad University’s bachelor program in business administration received the highest possible grade, Very High Quality. Among 26 universities assessed, Kristianstad was one of the top three schools, sharing the leading position together with Jönköping Business School and the Stockholm School of Economics. The master program in business administration received the grade of High Quality, which was the middle grade, and which positioned it in the middle of the rankings of universities offering master programs in the subject area.

Another indication of the models capacity is that one supervisor from the team were engaged as supervisor at The Peoples Academy of Ukraine, situated in Kharkiv. No frictions and no surprises appeared during the process, maybe due to the supervisor and the university sharing the same norm of engagement. At the end, the student and the supervisor was given an award and part of the study were converted by the supervisor and the student into an article (Collin & Gupalova, 2014).

By this time (2012), the founders of the Kristianstad model had left Kristianstad University, but their three PhD students continued to work at the university and to implement, as well as further develop the Kristianstad model together with other colleagues. It cannot be ruled out that the model could be one possible explanation for the success of Kristianstad University in this government assessment.

We will now describe the Kristianstad model, from the start of the course until the dissemination of the results of the theses. We will present some of the more important principles and norms that constitute the backbone of the model, and we conclude the paper by noting some limitations of the model and their potential impact on its future development.

2. The Kristianstad model described

Development of the model started in 2001 when associate professor in corporate governance Sven-Olof Collin and assistant professor in accounting Torbjörn Tagesson were jointly assigned responsibility for bachelor and master thesis courses in auditing and control at Kristianstad University. They were later joined by PhD students Pernilla Broberg, Elin Smith, and Timurs Umans. The Kristianstad model is based on engagement in the students, engagement with other supervisors, and engagement in research. It is on the materializing of these principles that the bachelor and master thesis courses are shaped and run. In this section, we present the process of student work in the model, the examination of the theses and the course evaluation, all of which culminate in the dissemination of the theses and the recruitment of PhD students.

The process

The first step in the process is that student groups (previously groups of three, but now of two students) are asked to come up with an idea or

ideas concerning the topic of their thesis. Students fill in a form and bring it with them to the meeting with the supervisor collegium, which is organised on the first or second day of the course. The supervisor collegium consists of all those who will supervise in the given thesis course. This meeting is called 'the problematization meeting'; its aim is to try, as much as possible, to identify the thesis subject, theoretical problem and the aim of the thesis. Each student group is given 15 minutes for a discussion with the whole collegium. During the meeting students and supervisors jointly assess the feasibility of the ideas that students bring to the table, potential pitfalls associated with the chosen topic, and potential adjustments that might need to be considered to produce a theoretically sound and empirically feasible thesis. The end result of the meeting is, most often, that the students leave with a tentative research question and an aim for their thesis, and the collegium has an idea of who would be the most appropriate supervisor of each group. After all the groups have had their problematization meeting, the supervisor collegium together decide, for each group, the best fit between each thesis and the competencies and research interests of one of the supervisors. In the matching process, the collegium also consider the wish of any student group to be assigned a specific supervisor. If a student group has trust and confidence in one particular person, that is considered to be an asset that should be exploited. At the end of that day, all students are informed of their assigned supervisor. The supervisors then contact the groups to book the first supervision meeting. Thus, at the end of day two, most groups have a preliminary subject for their thesis, which has been reviewed by the supervisor collegium and have been assigned a supervisor.

If there are newcomers to the collegium, for example, new teachers or PhD students, a newcomer will participate in the supervision of a group together with a more experienced supervisor. The two supervisors meet before and after the meeting with the students, so the experienced supervisor can provide direction to the inexperienced supervisor about what to do before the meeting; the inexperienced can ask questions, and the experienced can explain their approach and actions. This method transfers knowledge of supervision and socialises the newcomer to the Kristianstad model.

After the supervisors have been assigned, the first supervision meeting is scheduled. The aim is to have the first meeting as quickly as possible. Students are asked to submit material online before every meeting with the supervisor; they are also asked to submit any work-in-progress some days prior to the supervision. The supervisor reads and makes comments on the material, then returns it online the day before the supervision meeting, where students are assumed to have read through and thought over the supervisor's comments. In this way, the supervision meeting starts with students asking for clarifications of comments or otherwise discussing them. This makes for very well prepared meetings, which increases the efficiency of the time spent together. The downside, of course, is that it is time-consuming for the supervisor to read all the text before the meeting. Yet this commitment illustrates the hallmark of the Kristianstad model: the supervisors' intense engagement in the students and their work.

One very important part of the Kristianstad model is the supervisors' questions. The comments they make on the students' text and during the meeting is in the form of questions or statements that encourage students to reflect. This is the Socratic method of leading students to learn through question-and-answer. By this method, we believe that we stress their independence in knowledge production and understanding. Normally, the supervisor never gives instructions, never tells the student what to do, how to think, what article to read, or how to write. The supervisor tends instead to ask questions such as: 'Why do you do like this?' However, to enable students to answer some questions, the supervisor may suggest they read a particular article.

Another aspect that reflects supervisors' engagement in the supervision process is the frequency of supervision. Given that bachelor and master thesis courses are running full-time for 10 weeks, supervisors have 9 or 10 supervision meetings that last from 30 minutes to one hour each.

During the course, students have two mandatory seminars and one mandatory public presentation of the thesis. The first seminar, titled 'Middle Seminar,' takes place in the middle of the course. Students are arranged in small groups and as an academic seminar, with respondents and opponents. Normally four groups of students form one seminar. The teacher chairing

the seminar assigns the groups to be respondents or opponents. At the seminar, the opponent group makes a short presentation of the respondent group's thesis. The respondent group then has an opportunity to confirm that the thesis so far has been understood correctly and whether there are any additional aspects that should be noted at this point. The respondent group must also point out where in the thesis they experienced most problems, so that the seminar can constructively give support to them. After the presentation, the opponents are expected to provide a constructive discussion and pose questions on the thesis. The students are encouraged not to go into details concerning formalities such as grammar and language; they are encouraged to give these to the respondent group in written form. The main comments by the opposing group on the content of the thesis are also made in writing and are provided to the respondents and the supervisor, who is present at the seminar. After the opponents and respondents have performed their part, the other participating students are invited to give their comments. Finally, the supervisor who chairs the seminar and the examiner, if present, are provided with an opportunity to comment or pose questions. All groups that take part in the seminar are expected to read each other's submissions and provide constructive comments.

Thus, the Middle Seminar provides an opportunity for the students to learn about what their peers are working on and where they are in the process. Most of all, it provides an opportunity for students to help each other in improving their thesis.

The second seminar is titled 'Final Seminar' and takes place at the end of the course. At this seminar, the final version of the thesis is presented, and it is here that the examination process starts. The structure of the seminar is the same as that of the Middle Seminar. However, the opponents are given instructions not to focus on developmental comments, but on comments directed towards dialectics, i.e., the ideal is to create a contrary position, with the purpose to show that the conclusions are not well founded (even though, including the opponents, we all hope that the opponents will fail).

Finally, on the last day of the course, students perform the 'Public Presentation', an occasion open to general public, including friends and

parents of the students, all the staff, firms that have been engaged or are engaged in the program, and media. The students are instructed to be confident, to communicate their results without too much academic jargon and to dress smartly, since this is the crowning of their whole education that started when they were six or seven years of age. It should be the proudest day for the student and for the university. For many students this is the end of their first formal education, before entering into working life and its lifelong learning.

The students make an exoteric presentation of their thesis, i.e., readily understandable by all, not just specialists, and take questions from the audience. Each presentation takes about 10–15 minutes, and the entire class of specific majors in the Business program is present throughout the presentation day. The university offers the students a free lunch at the student cantina, at special tables, in order to honour the group and the last educational meeting with their fellow students. Either the same day or the day after, all students who have graduated from the Business program gather in a magnificent locality, the tradition in Kristianstad being the cathedral, where they are hailed by the academic staff, co-students and their friends and family. In this ceremony, awards are presented for best students and the best theses for each major.

The grand finale of the course is the 'last supper' in the evening where students and the supervisors celebrate together, with dinner and dance, the newly examined business professionals, their past achievements and their future endeavours. It represents a magnificent manifestation of the basic Humboldtian principle, that students and university staff work and learn together, to the benefit of all.

Examination and evaluation

In this section, we describe how the students are examined and evaluated. Within the course, supervisor and examiner are two separate entities, yet together they prepare, in an examination form, a written examination which then lays ground for the discussion between those two entities and the decision of the final grade awarded for the student thesis. Each teacher in the collegium has typically several theses to supervise, and several theses to examine. One objective of the model is to create a

dual role of supervisor and examiner. For example, if one teacher supervises four theses, that teacher will also examine four theses, preferably supervised by different teachers from the collegium. The rotation between examiners and supervisors is an important part of the process of learning from each other, as well as performing a monitoring function of the collegium members. Additionally, and perhaps the most important function, is that members are part of an active collegium where all contribute similar levels of input to create a feeling of working together. This sharing creates the glue that keeps the collegium together.

The student's submission prepared for the Final Seminar together with their performance in defence and opposition provide the grounds for evaluation. The examiner and supervisor conduct the examination and present the grade for the student before the day of the seminar presentation. They each use a separate grading form that is divided into parts for each part of the thesis being examined. Usually the thesis comprises (i) introduction/problematization, (ii) research method, (iii) theory, including literature review and created theoretical model, (iv) empirical method, (v) analysis, (vi) discussion and conclusions. Further, (vii) the presentation is examined, including the 'red thread', reference system and language quality. Additionally, (viii) the originality of the thesis is considered. Finally, (ix) the process of thesis development, how the students worked, planned and generally collaborated as a group is examined by the supervisor, since only the supervisor has this information. Each of the aspects is evaluated on an ECTS² type of grading scale from 1 to 7, where 1 and 2 represent Fail, 3 = Weak Pass, 4 = Pass, 5 = Strong Pass, 6 = Pass with Distinction and 7 = Pass with Excellence. This part of the examination provides the basis for grade setting for the entire thesis, including an assessment of the thesis in its totality. After making these judgements alone and independently, the examiner and the supervisor meet and compare, contrast and discuss, sometimes very intensely, in order to reach a consensus grade. Following the consensus decision, the supervisor arranges a grading meeting with the group, where the supervisor presents the grade and the arguments for

² European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System

the grade, based on the two marking forms and the discussions between the supervisor and the examiner. The students are asked to take these arguments, the forms and the grade, to their own discussion, and if they have any complaints, come back 24 hours later with a written document where they indicate how the grade is not fair. The academic staff member responsible for the course, i.e., the course director, receives this complaint, and can decide, if convinced by the students' arguments, to give the thesis to a third examiner within the collegium to obtain a third opinion. In reality, this happens very seldom.

However, it could happen that examiner and supervisor are unable to come to a consensus concerning the grade, e.g., the examiner argues for a non-passing grade, while the supervisor argues for a Pass. While these situations are rare, they appear. In such situations, a third examiner is called in to give a third view, with the proposal that the third examiner could create arguments that would bring all three examiners into consensus. If that agreement cannot be reached, a simple majority vote determines the final grade.

A student group that is given a non-passing grade receives the two grading forms at the grading meeting with the supervisor. The forms from the examiner and supervisor contain indications of where and how the thesis needs improvement, and may make specific suggestions for this; if necessary, the supervisor will help students to interpret the comments. Students have the right to get their thesis examined three times. The first examination takes place at the end of the course, while second and third examinations take place approximately two months apart. When re-submitting, students are expected to address the comments of the examiners in writing and indicate in the re-submitted thesis where required changes have been made. The supervisor inspects their thesis and, based on the original forms' comments and the students' corrections, can make a judgement that they have reached a passing level. However, students who receive a non-passing grade at the first examination, cannot receive a higher grade than Pass on subsequent examinations.

The course itself is assessed through a written course evaluation. The course director writes this evaluation, using information about the

students, and receiving evaluation information from teachers and students. The main information source is the student evaluation. It consists of two pages, distributed at the Final Seminar, i.e., before the student grade has been presented, on which the student has to assess every teacher they had, all activities and books, and how the course has improved them in particular ways. Since the student evaluation is handed out at the Final Seminar, the response rate is close to 100%. The compiled course evaluation is distributed to all students, all teachers and to the academic administrators and the student union. It ends with suggestions for improvements and/or changes. Additionally it is published on a web page accessible by everyone, not just the course participants. When the course is given the following year, part of the introductory lecture contains a summary of the previous course evaluation and comments about any changes that have been made as a result of last year's evaluation. Thus, the course evaluation is a working document with consequences.

Dissemination of results and recruitment of PhD students

At the end of the process, the authors of the passing theses are asked if they would agree to their thesis abstracts being compiled into an edited volume, where each abstract is presented in expanded form. This volume is edited by one or more of the teachers in the collegium, printed and then disseminated to all participating students, to the main university libraries in Sweden, and to firms and organisations that the university selects. The experience with this volume is that it is much appreciated by the firms and the participating students.

Some selected theses which have shown exemplary theoretical/empirical rigour are typically converted into issue-oriented articles in the national press or/and restyled as a scientific article for the academic press. Usually the supervisor of these theses asks the students if there might be a possibility to co-operate on rewriting the thesis to fit into those two formats. If agreed, the supervisor reworks the thesis, which normally implies, especially for the scientific articles, that 75–95 percent of the thesis is changed. Students normally do not engage in this reworking since by this time they are involved in getting their first working life experience, and the level of scholarly work is on too high a level for them. But they always

appear as co-authors and the order of author names always indicates the work effort put into the article. Including the students in the authors' list, even if the correlation between their thesis and the article is very small, is done both as a respect for their initial work, but also with consideration for the pride the supervisors and the collegium feel, in having students who can produce input material for scientific articles. These published articles represent the Humboldtian principle, the collaboration of student and teacher in research and learning.

It is also important to note that recruitment of PhD students often takes place partly based on the students' performance on the bachelor/master theses. Recruitment is facilitated since the supervisors, due to the intense supervision method, will have already obtained a fairly good knowledge of the capacity of each student. So far, eight PhD students have been recruited in this way: one has recently acquired the title of associate professor; two are assistant professors but close to promotion to associate professor; one is close to finishing her PhD thesis; one is in the middle of her PhD thesis writing; two students are just at the beginning of their PhD studentship, and one is expected to enter the PhD program.

3. Some philosophies of the Kristianstad model

The supervisor's engagement, the Humboldt principle and the Socratic method

Important prerequisites of a good supervisor are knowledge in the subject of the thesis, a good command of methodologies, a good command of all analytical techniques, both quantitative and qualitative, and experience as an active researcher. These capacities are needed for a supervisor to be able to implement the Socratic method. We return to this method later in this section.

Nevertheless, the first and possibly the most prominent prerequisite of a good supervisor is the talent of engagement. Engagement occurs when the supervisor is strongly engaged in research, in the subject, and adheres to the Humboldtian principle of cooperative learning, i.e., to have engagement in the student's thesis and in the student as an individual. Engagement, according to Humboldt, is to have a sincere will to do the

utmost to bring the student to the goal, that is, a thesis that represents the education and the actual capacity of the student.

Through this engagement with the supervisor, the student directly experiences the supervisor's interest, rendering the relationship as one of an almost personal character. Some could claim that a relationship of almost personal character is not to act professionally, since a supervisor should keep arms-length distance from the student. That kind of relationship, however, would be to consciously avoid two basic human principles – belongingness and reciprocity. When the students feel that the supervisor is engaged in them and their thesis, they will feel that they are respected and that they belong to a team, including the supervisor. In this team, there are expectations among the members and no member can disappoint the other members. Thus, the sense of belonging to a team creates incentives of performance (Guimera et al., 2005; Van Der Vegt and Bunderson, 2005) and makes students, as well as supervisors, sensitive to the others' expectations. In a team there is a norm of reciprocity, so when the supervisor gives, this creates a sense of debt which the students need to balance through their reciprocal contribution.

Engagement is an effective means of creating incentives in the supervisory process. But, even while adopting an instrumental view on engagement, one has also to acknowledge the Kantian view of humans, that they are not only means but ends. While one can, to a certain level, pretend engagement, the easiest way to implement engagement in the supervisory team is to select as supervisors individuals who reveal through action that they adhere to the norm of treating students as not only means but ends.

Engagement can be shown in several ways. Some ways are culturally dependent, such as, for example, in Scandinavia, your engagement can be shown by two-way communicating on a first-name basis. When meeting with the students, have some small talk and discuss non-sensitive personal matters. These small gestures are indications that the supervisor cares about the student as a person and acknowledges the student as an individual.

One key way of expressing engagement, which at the same time is the main method of driving the competence development of the student group,

is the teaching method of Socrates. It has to be stressed that the thesis is an independent work. Therefore the ideas and the energy should come from the student. However, the rationality of humans is restricted by certain limitations of the mind. Herbert Simon (1982) termed it 'bounded rationality'. Yet, many humans have more capacity than they realize. It is within the power and the duty of the supervisor to expand the bounds of this rationality. This is not done through telling students how it is or by informing them about all the theories in the world. The work of the supervisor is to let students realize their own knowledge and their capacity to create new knowledge, through leading the student on a path that the supervisor realizes is a good path, but one that the student might not yet have recognized. In the Kristianstad model, the supervisor leads the students by asking questions. The easiest way, and one that can be the starting point of a supervision meeting, is to let the student make a causal statement concerning the subject. Then the supervisor simply says: 'Why?' The student then has to give an answer to justify the causal claim. Through this method the student realizes important things:

1. That to theorize is to reason, it is not to repeat what 'masters' have said; that is, theory is a set of principles and ideas;
2. That not only can theory be found in the literature and from the supervisor, but students themselves can reason in a theoretical way; that is, students can sense their own reason, their independence and capacity;
3. That the supervisor, through asking the students to give answers, is genuinely interested in the students' thinking and reasoning; that is, the supervisor reveals engagement with the student.

This process of questions and answers continues until the supervisor or (preferably) the students, realize that an acceptable conclusion has been reached.

The opposite method would be characterised by the disengaged, authoritarian supervisor, where the supervisor knows everything and only has to install the truth in the mind of the student. The supervision meeting becomes a simple lecture where the supervisor informs the student. Thus the student becomes passive material that is shaped by the supervisor. This method fosters obedience and dependence, quite contrary to the goal

of the desired educational process: to foster reasoning students, who understand that they have the capacity to create knowledge.

In the Kristianstad model of Socratic learning, as a by-product, the supervisor who receives all these answers – sometimes very surprising and original – will be exposed to thinking and reasoning that the supervisor may not have yet experienced and which in turn help to develop their own ideas and cognition. Thus, the Socratic method of asking questions is an active part of the collaborative learning and establishment of a community of practice. It drives the competence of both student and supervisor.

Development and control

The thesis process is designed to focus on developing students during the supervision phase and assessing them during the examination phase. Furthermore, the examination phase especially contains elements of control and development, involving both students and supervisors.

The developmental part of the examination phase comprises the discussions at the Final Seminar including the detailed comments supplied by the examiners on the grading forms, which are explained at the grading meeting. When the supervisor explains what motivated the grade, this should increase the students' understanding of what they have produced. Thus, examination is not only a matter of disseminating a grade, but also furthering students' learning, understanding and competence. Additionally, and perhaps more important, is what happens when a student receives a non-passing grade. Since they have the opportunity to hand in a corrected thesis, they have strong incentives to understand the critique and from that understanding, redevelop their thesis and learn from the failure, which itself can be an important vehicle of learning (Knowles and Hoefler, 1989).

While the quality of the thesis process is partly determined by the students and their capacities, the main productive force that has a conducive influence on the quality of the work is the supervisor. The model has been constructed to evaluate, but more importantly, to develop the supervisors and the collegium.

It starts with the selection of supervisors. Only selected as supervisors are those who are active as researchers and are known to be competent and engaged supervisors. Active in research implies that the supervisors

conduct their own research, publish articles and books, attend academic conferences and serve as reviewers and editors for peer-reviewed journals. To be active as researchers is important since not only do the supervisors know the literature and methodologies, but they also have a fresh and realistic view of the research. The actual title of the supervisor is of less importance. A PhD student, for example, who is doing her own dissertation in the same subject as those she is supervising, could be more adequate as a supervisor than a full professor who has not done any study in the field for the last ten years.

Thus, the competence of a supervisor includes both subject knowledge and methodology, and how to interact with the students. Therefore, when a PhD student arrives in the program, she will supervise in her first year together with a trusted, experienced supervisor. The next year she will perform more independent supervision with the student group, but supervised by the experienced supervisor. Finally, at year three, in the year before the defence of her own PhD, she will normally be given the trust to be an independent supervisor at the bachelor level. This sharing of knowledge and experience is one means of creating competent supervisors.

Supervision of a teacher by an experienced supervisor will also occur in the case of one who is being introduced into the team, but whose capability is not yet known or not yet trusted. Of course, this can be a signal of mistrust, which it is, and may convey to the teacher a sense of unworthiness. But this is a small price to pay, considering that we are dealing with students who are making major personal investments in their education. We cannot afford to lose student development out of concern of a one teacher's feelings of mistrust.

In the grading phase, examiners are rotated, so each examiner will grade theses supervised by as many different members of the supervisory team as possible. While this rotation is part of the system that makes the grading fair in the view of the students, it is also a means of enabling development of the supervisors, the examiners and the collegium. Perhaps above all, it is a means of creating the sense of togetherness, a sense that that everyone in the collegium is engaged in 'doing the course'.

In this process, supervisors are exposed to each other, making it possible

to not only learn from each other, but also to monitor each other. If one examiner gives a '7' on theory development of a thesis and the other one gives a '3', there are, to say the least, ample opportunities for improvement. This divergence has to be dealt with between the examiners, or, if they cannot create consensus, then the team have to deal with the issue. In this process, both the examiners are evaluated and the norms are developed.

In the grading process, norms are circulated, exposed, debated and evaluated, and not the least, being internalized through socialisation. While we hail diversity, we try to create some standards and some norms that are shared in the team. This does not imply rigidity. Since the teachers are active researchers and since new teachers are entering into the group, new norms and new standards are always introduced and debated in the team. Thus, rotation implies not only a development of individual team members, but of the team itself.

This process characterises what Ouchi (1980) terms clan control, where the norms of the group, and norm congruence is an important mechanism of control. While selection is important, and the process of evaluation is even more important, as a mechanism of development and control, dismissing a supervisor should not be avoided, although it is painful to dismiss a friend and colleague. Dismissal could occur because the supervisor does not show the level of competence and the level of engagement needed. But dismissal could also occur when an individual does not share the norms of the team, for example the Humboldtian principle.

4. Some norms of the Kristianstad Model

We give some examples of the norms that are part of the socialisation and that characterise the collegium when the Kristianstad model is implemented. These are only examples, due mainly to space limitations, but also to the difficulty to reveal norms, since they are more easily observable when they are violated than when they are simply accepted and followed.

- The norm of the theory states that a thesis has to be built on a theory interest, indicated through a theory-based problematization. It by no means implies that a thesis cannot have a practical problem as its starting

point, but one has to convert this practical problem into a knowledge problem of a general nature. This norm shows itself clearly at the end of the thesis, where theoretical conclusions are drawn; also in the theory section, where not only established theories are presented and reviewed and discussed, but also one's own attempts at theory development are promoted, such as leveraging a new hypothesis, or in inductive studies, presenting new concepts and explaining relationships.

- The norm of methodological pragmatism (Collin, Johansson, Svensson & Ulvenblad, 1996) states that it is the problem of the thesis and its theoretical basis that directs the choice of empirical method. There are no preferences driven by any epistemological ideology concerning the choice of survey, case studies, induction or deduction.

- The norm of a rigorous empirical method implies that observations are driven by a conscious, well-reflected operationalization of theory or concepts into observable entities. For example, no interview is conducted without an interview guide that is motivated out of theory or based on conceptualization needs.

- The norm of empirical orientation, implies that all theses should have empirical data if they are to be used for inductive exploration or deductive evaluation or testing of theory. Theoretical development or conceptual innovation is asked for in a thesis, especially on the master level, but its relevance outside the theory has to be indicated through empirical confrontation.

- The norm of knowledge contribution states that everyone can make or at least aim at making a knowledge contribution. On the bachelor level, it can be an aim, a hope, an ambition, but at master level it is a must.

5. Pedagogic reflections on the model

We have previously stated that the guiding principles of the Kristianstad model rest on the engagement in the students, engagement with each other in the supervisor collegium as well as engagement in research that is mutually shared between students and supervisors. The idea of engagement and interaction of the model is closely intertwined with the idea of creation of communities of practice put forward in the pedagogic literature (e.g.

Bruffee, 1999). The primary idea of communities of practice rests on the assumption that by creating a collaborative environment where intensive interaction between the learners and the educators takes place facilitates not only students' learning and development but also mutual learning between and among the parties involved (Wenger et al., 2002). Thus, all in all, what the Kristianstad model represents is a manifestation of the co-constructivist perspective on learning, originally Humboldtian orientation, and embedded in the dynamic interaction based process (Biggs and Tang, 2011; Carless et al., 2011). As our description above indicates, the examination process involves a high degree of interaction in the supervisor collegium, where collegiality and collaborative learning are stressed. Yet, the examination serves as an important vehicle in stimulating students' learning. As Entwistle puts it, 'The single, strongest influence on learning is surely the assessment procedure ... even the form of an examination question or essay topics set can affect how students study ...' (1996, pp. 111–12). The continuous feedback from the supervisors and peers during the seminars, as well as constructive assessment of the thesis at the end of the course represent the aim of the Kristianstad model to elevate the importance of the assessment as a learning tool. One has to be honest here as well and say that development of the model in itself has been based on the trial and error basis of the people involved in the model and it is through the ups and downs of our own pedagogic development that the model has emerged, rather than streaming from the pedagogic literature. In a way we have adopted an inductive approach in developing the model especially at the model's infancy which has gradually moved towards a more abductive approach where we have started reflecting over the currently developed model's embeddedness in pedagogic theory and practice.

6. Limitations and development of the Kristianstad Model

The Kristianstad model has some limitations that not yet have been successfully overcome. They constitute therefore possible areas for improvement. We will here mention the size of the collegium, and the implementation in an authoritarian organisational culture.

The size of the collegium was small when the model was developed.

There were at the very start two people, then it expanded to five people. In this small group, socialisation and rotation, two important parts of the model, creating the feeling of togetherness, were rather easy to conduct. It is harder to rotate and to create a sense of togetherness and to socialise individuals into the norms when the size of the collegium is above ten. One consequence that has been experienced is that teachers with a method bias have been included. Since the norm is methodological pragmatism, one-sided methodological views and knowledge present a problem. One development of the Kristianstad model would then be to arrange small methodology seminars, where the individuals in the collegium train each other, especially in those parts where the other individuals have limited knowledge and experience. While being a low-cost form of training, it could be assumed to further the feeling of togetherness in the collegium since everyone has something to contribute to the development of the others. This could be termed the 'method trail', which already exists at Kristianstad University, but in its present form is directed towards developing the method knowledge of the students.

A further difficulty arises when the collegium is subject to the power of the university, where the administration and not the collegium decides about the composition of the collegium and the number of the students attending the course. In today's Swedish university, the principles of a university, mainly the Humboldtian ideas [*magistrorum et scholarium: community of teachers and scholars, and guided by a collegium*] have mostly been abandoned in exchange for factory principles, where the professionals are workers, the students are material that will be transformed from input to output, and the workers have to perform and obey what the former academic administrators, nowadays termed managers, have decided.

This leads to the other limitation of the Kristianstad model, the difficulty to implement it in an authoritarian organisational culture. The above description of today's Swedish university organisations represents one version of an authoritarian culture. In the old universities, a traditional university authoritarian culture could exist, where the chaired professor's statements were rules and laws that had to be obeyed. The Kristianstad model's culture is contrary to these two authoritarian cultures, since it is

based on reason and consensus and on the collegium being directed by its norms. Whatever the chaired professor says, if the supervisor and the examiner have reached consensus on a grade, that will be the grade. Afterwards, the professor or someone else in the collegium could create a debate, where the professor has one voice and the other individuals of the collegium have one voice each. The hope is that arguments rather than power play will be how decisions are reached.

This problem can be addressed by an inclusive strategy of the collegium. Through including more teachers in the collegium, socialising them into the norms, developing them in the noble art of supervision and training them towards methodological pragmatism, they will experience the advantage of the Kristianstad model, thereby more likely to become its supporters. Then the authoritarian culture could erode and pave the way towards the Humboldtian ideal of a university.

References:

- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university. McGraw-Hill International.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1999). Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2715 North Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218-4363.
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2011). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36:395–407
- Collin, S-O. and Gupalova, Ia. (2014) “Утечка” жінок: Сравнительный анализ мобильных предпочтений украинских и шведских студенток (Female drain: A comparative study of Ukrainian and Swedish students’ preferences for mobility) in Вчені записки: Харківського гуманітарного університету “Народна українська академія”, Том XX., рд. Астахова В.І (Scientific Works: Of Kharkiv University of Humanities “People’s Ukrainian Academy”, vol. 20., ed. Astahova).
- Collin, S-O., Johansson, U., Svensson, K. & Ulvenblad, P-O. (1996). Market Segmentation in Scientific Publications: Research Patterns in American vs European Management Journals, *British Journal of Management*, 7(2):141-154.
- Entwistle, N. (1996). Recent research on student learning, in: J.Tait & O.Knight (Eds.) *The Management of Independent Learning*, pp 97-112, London, Koogan Page

Guimera, R., Uzzi, B., Spiro, J., & Amaral, L. A. N. (2005). Team assembly mechanisms determine collaboration network structure and team performance. *Science*, 308(5722):697-702.

Knowles, J. G., & Hoefler, V. B. (1989). The Student Teacher Who Wouldn't Go Away: Learning from Failure. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 12(2):14-21.

Ouchi, W. G. (1980). Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clans. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(1):129-141.

Simon, H. A. (1982). Models of bounded rationality: Empirically grounded economic reason (Vol. 3). MIT press.

Van Der Vegt, G. S., & Bunderson, J. S. (2005). Learning and performance in multidisciplinary teams: The importance of collective team identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3):532-547.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002). Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge. Harvard Business Press.

25-річчю Академії присвячується...

ВЧЕНІ ЗАПИСКИ

**Харківського гуманітарного університету
«Народна українська академія»**

Том XXII

Харків
Видавництво НУА
2016

УДК 08
ББК 95.4(4УКР-4ХАР)3
В90

Збірник наукових праць засновано 1995 р.

Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію КВ № 7367 від 03.06.2003 р.

*Видання є фаховим з економічних, соціологічних, філософських
та філологічних наук*

Постанови президії ВАК України
від 22.12.2010 р. № 1-05/8, від 26.01.2011 р. № 1-05/01, від 30.03.2011 р. № 1-05/3

*Друкується за рішенням Ученої ради Харківського гуманітарного
університету «Народна українська академія».*
Протокол № 9 від 25.04.2016

Редакційна колегія

*Астахова К. В., д-р іст. наук (голов. редактор); Астахова В. І., д-р іст. наук;
Батаєва К. В., д-р філос. наук; Безхутрий Ю. М., д-р філол. наук; Бесов Л. М.,
д-р іст. наук; Бистрянцев С. Б., д-р соціол. наук; Воробйов Є. М., д-р екон.
наук; Герасіна Л. М., д-р соціол. наук; Городяненко В. Г., д-р іст. наук;
Карабан В. І., д-р філол. наук; Кім М. М., д-р екон. наук; Корабльова Н. С., д-р
філос. наук; Кравченко В. В., д-р іст. наук; Култаєва М. Д., д-р філос. наук;
Лозовой В. О., д-р філос. наук; Мамалуй О. О., д-р філос. наук; Михайльова К. Г.,
д-р соціол. наук; Нагорний Б. Г., д-р соціол. наук; Осіпова Н. П., д-р філос.
наук; Пасинок В. Г., д-р філол. наук; Петровський В. В., д-р іст. наук;
Подольська Є. А., д-р соціол. наук; Посохов С. І., д-р іст. наук; Ребрій О. В.,
д-р філол. наук; Робак І. Ю., д-р іст. наук; С.-О. Коллін, проф.; Самохіна В. О.,
д-р філол. наук; Сілласте Г. Г., д-р філос. наук; Соболев В. М., д-р екон. наук;
Сокурянська Л. Г., д-р соціол. наук; Степанченко І. І., д-р філол. наук;
Строкович Г. В., д-р екон. наук; Сухіна В. Ф., д-р філос. наук; Тарасова О. В.,
д-р філол. наук; Тимошенкова Т. М., канд. філол. наук; Шевченко І. С., д-р філол.
наук; Яременко О. Л., д-р екон. наук.*

Україна, 61000, Харків, МСП, вул. Лермонтовська, 27.
Харківський гуманітарний університет «Народна українська академія»
Тел. 714-92-62; 714-20-07

ISSN 1993-5560

© Народна українська академія, 2016

ЗМІСТ

Передмова	3
«Нам рано жить воспоминаниями...»	5
<i>Астахова Е. В.</i> Модель непрерывного образования: подходы и особенности ХГУ «НУА» (ретроспективный анализ)	7
<i>Астахова В. И.</i> «Бороться и искать, найти и не сдаваться!»	29
<i>Астахов В. В., Бабанина В. Ю.</i> Подготовка современного экономиста: итоги двадцатипятилетия	45
<i>Михайлева Е. Г.</i> Особенности научно-исследовательской работы в условиях непрерывного образования (25-летний кейс Народной украинской академии)	55
<i>Ильченко В. В.</i> Системообразующие принципы обучения в ХГУ «НУА»	71
<i>Чибисова Н. Г.</i> Воспитательная работа – важнейшее направление деятельности Народной украинской академии	84
<i>Овакимян О. С., Зверко Т. В.</i> Гражданская позиция молодежи: опыт Народной украинской академии в исследовании проблемы	94
<i>Нечитайло И. С.</i> Конструирование социальной и исторической памяти средствами образования (на примере ХГУ «НУА»)	106
<i>Корниенко В. Н.</i> Инклюзивное образование как инновационная составляющая модернизации высшей школы в Украине (из опыта ХГУ «НУА»)	118
<i>Подлесный Д. В.</i> Инновационная деятельность приватной высшей школы: опыт начала XX в.	127
<i>Миколенко Е. П.</i> Партнерство между университетами и бизнесом как условие формирования конкурентных преимуществ выпускников	136
<i>Артеменко Л. А., Полина В. С.</i> Опыт формирования компетентностной модели специалиста на занятиях по английскому языку в ХГУ «НУА»	144

<i>Яриз Е. М.</i> Реализация воспитательной цели в процессе преподавания иностранного языка на примерах традиций ХГУ «НУА»	156
<i>Смолянкина С. В.</i> Особенности изучения иностранного языка в НУА через призму студенческих лет и преподавательского опыта	164
<i>Закриничная Н. И.</i> Подходы к обучению иностранному языку (обобщение 25-летнего опыта ХГУ «НУА»)	170
<i>Помазан І. О.</i> Розмаїття ракурсів вітчизняної культури (з 15-річного досвіду проведення тижнів української культури в ХГУ «НУА»)	175
<i>Ануфриева И. Л.</i> Диалог культур в учебно-воспитательном процессе	182
<i>Свищева Е. В.</i> Трансформация методики преподавания математических дисциплин студентам экономического профиля обучения	188
<i>Красуля М. О.</i> Дослідження мотивації студентів молодших курсів ХГУ «НУА» до занять фізичною культурою	195
<i>Михайлова Л. В.</i> Опыт преподавания английского языка на специализированном факультете	203
<i>Комир Л. И.</i> Интегрированная кафедра в системе непрерывной экономико-правовой подготовки выпускников (из опыта НУА)	207
Актуальні проблеми розвитку освіти	215
<i>Бирченко Е. В.</i> Концепт социальной ответственности бизнеса в деятельности частных высших учебных заведений	217
<i>Усик Е. Ю.</i> Социальные сети как инструмент развития корпоративной культуры вуза	231
<i>Козыренко В. П.</i> Информационные образовательные технологии в условиях социальных трансформаций	241
<i>Подольська Є. А., Назаркіна В. М.</i> Сучасні виклики та ситуація в галузі вищої освіти Харківського регіону	249
<i>Иванова О. А.</i> Интеграция вуза и бизнеса при подготовке студента-экономиста	258

<i>Герасіна Л. М.</i> Інтеграційні процеси в європейській вищій школі: соціально-історичні передумови Болонського процесу	265
<i>Батаєва Е. В.</i> Потребительство и анти-потребительство в образовательных практиках современных студентов	278
<i>Бондарь Т. И.</i> Теоретико-методологический анализ культурно-образовательной среды в учебном заведении	289
<i>Удовичка Т. А.</i> Соціальні функції приватної вищої освіти: історико-компаративний аналіз	299
<i>Решетняк О. И.</i> Модель формирования образовательных кластеров с целью повышения конкурентоспособности региона	314
<i>Еременко Ю. В.</i> Понятие «одаренность»: проблемы интерпретации, восприятия, социальной поддержки	321
<i>Тимохова Г. Б.</i> Анализ развития виртуальных институтов образования	329
<i>Потапова Ж. Е.</i> Прием сравнения и антитезы в произведении Марии фон Эбнер-Эшенбах «Der Vorzugsschüler»	339
<i>Снежкова М. Г.</i> Мотивация студентов на начальном этапе изучения иностранных языков	347
<i>Меркулова Т. К.</i> Оценивание уровня сформированности языковой компетенции студентов	355
<i>Кочубей Н. В.</i> Когнітивні технології та постнекласичні освітні практики: спроба концептуалізації	364
<i>Томашевский Роман.</i> От дошкольника до профессора университета (учителя, которые нам встречаются; учителя, которых мы должны встречать)	375
<i>Ковальчик Малгожата.</i> Персонал университетов третьего возраста – нестандартные учителя	396
Сучасне суспільство в контексті гуманітарного знання (соціологія, філософія, історія) та проблеми економічного розвитку	405
<i>Цыбульская Э. И.</i> Институциональное регулирование процессов формирования и функционирования интеллектуального капитала	407

<i>Васюренко В. О.</i> Формування механізму управління інтелектуальним потенціалом підприємства	417
<i>Вишневский М. И.</i> Образовательный потенциал социальной философии А. А. Зиновьева	429
<i>Sven-Olof Yrjö Collin, Timurs Umans, Pernilla Broberg, Elin Smith, Torbjörn Tagesson.</i> Producing Academic Theses: The Kristianstad Model	441
Студентська трибуна	463
<i>Ушаков Н. Б.</i> История создания и развития факультета «Бизнес-управление»	465
<i>Вороненко А. Д.</i> История становления и развития факультета «Социальный менеджмент»	473
<i>Долганюк М. А.</i> История становления факультета «Референт-переводчик»	480
<i>Тыртышников Е. И.</i> История развития факультета заочно-дистанционного обучения	485
<i>Небосова А. В.</i> Студенческая часовня святой Татианы: история создания и деятельности	491
Слово пам'яті	495
<i>Молчанова О. П.</i> Общественно-педагогическая деятельность преподавателя СЭПШ ХГУ «НУА» Панченко Аллы Григорьевны (1945–2005)	497
<i>Ена Т. Н.</i> Мемориальная книга в музее	505
Наука в НУА	507
<i>Астахова Е. В.</i> Кадровый потенциал современных образовательных систем: состояние и перспективы (по материалам февральской международной научно-практической конференции)	509
<i>Иванова О. А.</i> Традиционный день науки в НУА	512
<i>Подлесный Д. В.</i> О проведении научно-теоретической конференции молодых ученых в НУА	514
<i>Астахова В. И.</i> Еще одна удачная работа	516

<i>Строкович А. В.</i> Роль доверия в развитии экономических институтов	521
<i>Гога Н. П.</i> Слышим эхо минувшей войны	523
Академія очима випускників	527
<i>Дахнова Е. Е.</i> Современные проблемы развития образования глазами выпускников	529
Відомості про авторів	541

В 90

Вчені записки Харківського гуманітарного університету «Народна українська академія» / [редкол.: В. І. Астахова (голов. ред.) та ін.]. – Харків : Вид-во НУА, 2016. – Т. 22. – 556 с.

ISSN 1993-5560

Черговий XXII том «Вчених записок» ХГУ «НУА» присвячений 25-річчю ювілею Народної Української Академії. У зв'язку з ювілейною спрямованістю більшості публікацій довелося декілька змінити традиційну структуру збірника. При збереженні його основних рубрик у ньому відокремлено спеціальний розділ, усі матеріали якого присвячено ювілею, а це означає – дають різнобічний аналіз діяльності НУА по становленню першого і поки ще єдиного в Україні навчально-наукового комплексу неперервної освіти, який здійснює навчання на принципах спадкоємності та неперервності.

Це може бути цікавим тим, хто займається проблемами модернізації національної системи освіти в Україні, становлення і розвитку навчального закладу нового типу, який працює на основі самофінансування.

УДК 08

ББК 95.4(4УКР-4ХАР)3

Наукове видання

**ВЧЕНІ ЗАПИСКИ
ХАРКІВСЬКОГО ГУМАНІТАРНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ
«НАРОДНА УКРАЇНСЬКА АКАДЕМІЯ»**

Том XXII

В авторській редакції

Відповідальна за випуск *О. А. Іванова*
Комп'ютерна верстка *І. С. Кордюк*
Художник *Р. М. Третьяков*

Підписано до друку 07.06.2016. Формат 84×108/32.
Папір офсетний. Гарнітура «Таймс». Друк офсетний.
Ум. друк. арк. 32,32. Обл.-вид. арк. 29,70.
Наклад 500 пр. Зам. № 175/16

Видавництво Народної української академії
Свідоцтво № 1153 від 16.12.2002.

Надруковано у видавництві
Народної української академії

Україна, 61000, Харків, МСП, вул. Лермонтовська, 27.

