

PhD Portfolio

Joakim Frögren

1. Research process.....	p. 2
2. Research method	p. 4
3. Subject expertise.....	p. 6
4. Publication.....	p. 7
5. Teacher training and experience.....	p. 8
6. Conferences and seminars.....	p. 9
7. National and international cooperation with the research community.....	p. 11
8. Cooperation with wider society.....	p. 13
9. Ethical issues.....	p. 15
10. Career development.....	p. 16
11. Supervision/ supervisor(s).....	p. 17
12. Administration, organisation and leadership.....	p. 19

Persons mentioned in the portfolio are:

- Susanne Iwarsson: Main supervisor
- Oskar Jonsson: Additional supervisor
- Roderick Lawrence: Additional supervisor

1. Research process

In relation to my research process and the learning outcomes, I have this far in my PhD come to realise that my strengths but also my weaknesses have both to do with my ability to think individually and outside of the box. This is a strength in the sense that I challenge what I consider the habitual and established ways of doing things, based on my eagerness, willingness to dig deeper and find options that I find better or that are more truthful in relation to what I believe. This ability made it possible for me to challenge the initial plan for the first article, that had to do more or less with an evaluation of a decision support system. After going through the empirical material, I realised that partly due to confusion related to what was meant by such a system and partly because so many other aspects were brought forward in the discussions, I wanted to do something else than what was planned for. Trying to figure out what and how I could find interesting ways of framing the rich content proved challenging, but I can also say that due to this tough journey, I really believe that we managed to write a very good and interesting article from the material. The confusions it brought forward meant a lot of pain and also contributed to my “slow” progress, at least from the outside. But for me it was an unavoidable journey, I think. My strength and problem is that I enjoy digging deeper and looking further, linking concepts from different fields and trying to synthesize. However, this is partly also a weakness since I have such a hard time to stop digging once I have started, it unavoidably causes delays. What I need to work on is to find a balance here in order to make both my journey and the journey of my supervisors a bit easier from now on. Below are some examples of my doings and reflections during the research process so far.

2020-02-18 Splitting the article into two – a drastic decision:

In a certain desperation, I had chosen to split the script into two parts prior to this supervision as I simply did not see how Oskar's focus on the decision support system and my focus on what I interpreted as constituting critical aspects within the frames of one study were compatible. Under the supervision, I realized that such a drastic decision should have been based on greater transparency and responsiveness to supervisors (and other co-authors). The decision has major consequences for, for example, the extent to which the research circle which method is emphasized in the article. I admitted that it was a decision I should have made in consultation with the supervisors and apologized for what happened. However, Susanne and to some extent Oskar also emphasized that the division was good and perhaps even necessary. The problem was mainly that it was done without dialogue with other co-authors. I feel stressed that I am lagging behind in planning and wish I could soon get the script off to a journal. But also think that this article, if it gets good, will shed light on important perspectives and be a good basis for the remaining part of the dissertation. I would like to be true to the participants' wise and multifaceted perspectives in elucidating the problem. It would therefore feel very good if the in-depth discussions about the complexity of the problem could be put into scientific form. There is still a bit left, but we are well on our way after all.

2019-12-11 Criticism of the manuscript for the first article

In supervision today, I received sharp criticism today for the script being far too long; that the structure was not clear; the result is very empty of content linked to the current purpose; content too ambitious in its willingness to deliver theory; the concepts are unclear. The analysis simply did not respond well enough to the

question, the supervisors stated. We concluded that Oskar and I will formulate a result section together and then have a close dialogue on the design of the result. I was advised to check out articles that have used abduction as a way to write and send them to Oskar and Susanne and use them as a template. Analysis's design, Susanne suggested, could be a special section. It is used in quantitative method to talk about where you base your analysis. It is also important, she pointed out, that when I include excerpts of dialogue, I select quotes that involve dialogue, not a monologue, and try to include a greater variety of people who express themselves.

2019-09-01 Reflections after having completed the transcription and getting lost in the analysis

Just as I usually do when my thoughts become too many and too scattered, I formulated an email in which I tried to catch them and sent it to my supervisors. There, I explained that after going through the background and description of the research circle study, transcribing the material experienced that there were some ambiguities about the decision support system that the participants were invited to reason about. The obscurities dealt with the issue of responsibility regarding the development of the "system" and how it should be managed. But above all, the uncertainty was about what the system actually comprised and how connected it was to the "app" that was under development. Since the participants in the research circles - in my opinion - obviously had different understandings of what this system meant and it was the system that they were to a large extent set to discuss during these research circles and which also formed the basis of the purpose of this work package within the project, I explained that I saw it as deeply problematic. I explained that I see a clear and unambiguous use of terms as a prerequisite for a good article and when the meaning of the phenomenon that is mainly discussed namely the "system" is unclear, it poses problems in the analysis of the material. For that reason, I also explained that I found it difficult to find a reasonable purpose for the article and that I had groped and still groped here. Since the purpose was not clear, I explained that I also found it difficult to encode the material.

2. Research methodology

Part of the reason that I struggle and have struggled so much with research methodology is because I consider it hard to follow and describe something that I do not believe in. In relation to using what is often called ‘qualitative methods’ I see a big problem in the fact that how things are done, and how things are referred to as being done seem to differ so much. I will try to explain what I mean here: Sometimes it is said that everyday knowledge is inductive, whereas “real science”, thus mainly natural-science-inspired studies, is deductive. According to what I have come to realise this is mainly rhetoric. It is simply not true. Because in practice (and this goes for the everyday life, as well as for what goes on within the universities), the logic of discovery is one where inductive and deductive ingredients are present at the same time. Peirce called this ‘abduction’; When observable generalizations that are inductively acquired, are confronted with fundamental, global assumptions about the world in the form of general laws. It is from this that generalizing conclusions are derived or “abducted”. Why do I write that here? I think because it was a great insight for me to realize this and it has affected my approach and thoughts when from the time when I was set out to do a content analysis in study I. As my PhD is framed, most of the methods that I will use have already been decided on before I actually started. This is an advantage in one sense because I can get started more quickly with the studies and not have to do so much thinking of my own as if I had to plan the studies myself. On the other hand, my freedom to choose methods and a methodology that I find interesting is then limited. However, since the methodology in the fourth study is not as planned beforehand as the others, I have decided that I will try to explore abduction and abductive analysis there. Furthermore, in preparing for my second study I took the mandatory course in Statistics II. It was challenging for me, to say the least, but I managed to pass it and while taking it also learned quite a bit. I enjoy the fact that I will get to do a more quantitative study, which I am right now working on because it forces me to learn things that I think will also prove useful in the future. Below are some reflections in relation to research methodology that I have made so far:

2018-11-27: Framing the four studies as different methods of practicing User Involvement

Discussing my ISP with Oskar today, he questioned whether the different studies that make up my PhD project, could/should in fact represent different methods of practicing User Involvement, where...

- Study 1 = ‘User Board’
- Study 2 = ‘Research Circle’
- Study 3 = -
- Study 4 = ‘Citizen Science’

We also discussed whether I should evaluate researchers’ attitudes to User Involvement (based on the User Panel Study - questionnaire directed to researchers). Study 3 could in that case give rise to a broader focus, so that I could state that I am not only looking at what goes on at my own research centre. Oskar and I also discussed that with this set-up I could also state that with each study I am directing my focus to a different group of users:

- Study 1: Representatives of senior citizens (User organizations, etc.)

- Study 2: Representatives of key actors in the housing sector
- Study 3: Representatives of researchers
- Study 4: Senior citizens (just representing themselves)

But, I told Oscar that I would like to not just do a descriptive PhD project, but that I would like to focus on capability or competence in relation to working with these groups and how this capability or competence could be put into words or into a model or so, in order to bring something useful to the table with my dissertation. Oskar advised me to take a closer look at WHO's knowledge translation framework, WHO (2012) where he thought that "capability or competence" could relate to questions 3:3, 3:4, 3:5 and 4:3.

2018-11-22: Enchanted by pragmatism and abduction

If I try to summarize what I have realized for so long and where I am, I can say that the reading of Anna Rylander's excellent introduction to pragmatism, Pragmatism and Design Research – An Overview, which Oskar hinted at, was inspiring. The text led me to abduction as a method or approach. It appealed to me because my experience tells me that you as a researcher work that way in practice. You are not completely theory-free when you start and analyze, but you also have no ready theory to start from, but something in between. My understanding of abduction is that it is about having the shadow of a theory ready for you when you get started, but that as you begin to work with the material you discover that that theory does not really match reality and that you then iteratively works in some form of triangulation between data collection, data analysis and the construction of a theoretical framework.

2018-10-17: Can a 'mixed-method' framework be used to frame my four studies?

During the supervision, we discussed whether a framework for all four sub-studies through mixed methods would be possible. I told my supervisors that I read up on mixed-methods and came to the realization that it is very difficult to squeeze my sub-studies into such a framework. Susanne and Oskar thought I would keep the issue of mixed methods alive. I got tips on checking in the journal Journal of Mixed Methods research and see if I could find studies that were similar to what I want to do. Oskar recommended reading on pragmatism and action research, as well as on the Theories of practical knowledge course he had attended.

3. Subject expertise

I think a reading of the document I just produced, namely “A brief account of the PhD project: Involving Citizens and Professionals in Research on Ageing and Health”, proves quite much in terms of my subject expertise. There, I show how I link user involvement to both public administration and production. As I have stated under “Research Process”, I think my problem is not a lack of theoretical knowledge of the subject I am studying. I think rather that I am digging too deep sometimes, and I believe that one of the secrets behind being a successful researcher is to know when you have dug deep enough, and not least if you have dug at the right place. Here I have a lot to learn, but I think the main enemy here is myself and that it is also related to discipline, strategy and tactics. My strategy has been to dig a bit here and a bit there, mainly related to what interests I have and what I associate with the problem I am focusing on. With this “strategy”, one will after enough digging, sooner or later be able to connect the holes through some tunnels and end up with a really big hole after some time. It is not the best strategy, but not the worst either. In order to “succeed” I think that I will need to become a bit more street-smart and strategic in my digging if I am going to succeed with this journey. I will work on it from now on. Below are some posts containing some reflections in relation to “Subject expertise”:

2018-09-26: ‘Collaborative research’ – thought after reading a book on the topic

I read a book on collaborative research in a Swedish context with examples of a number of projects in which researchers collaborated with actors from different disciplines and, above all, with actors outside the academy. The reading of the book gave both insights and raised new questions, which good books often do. The book was strongly focused on the humanities and it became clear that humanistic and social science research is to a greater extent non-instrumental and contributes rather with new approaches and insights than with direct solutions to specific problems. Some of the questions it raised were: When should one collaborate and how can collaboration develop into what they call this “mutually nurturing relationship”? What focus do I want in my dissertation: do I want to be descriptive or prescriptive?

4. Publication

What is a good publication? To me a good publication is one that challenges my thinking and even if it is about one specific topic, it is also simultaneously about another – broader and more philosophical. For this reason, I wanted and still want to write and publish articles myself that live up to those ideals. In the same time, I also realise that I should probably not be too ambitious, because it will slow down my progress too much, and as they say, the best dissertation is the one that gets ready. I suppose like with everything it is about finding a good balance. Below are some of my reflections throughout this journey so far in relation to publication:

2019-04-19: Discussion about order of authorship on article

In the light of the effort I put into transcribing and analyzing the data on which article 1 is based as well as linking it to appropriate theory, I suggested to my main supervisor Susanne Iwarsson and my co-supervisor Oskar Jonsson (who is supposed to be the first author of the article), that I thought that it should be a shared authorship. Both Susanne (co-author of the article) and Oskar thought it was very reasonable and it was decided that we will do so. I really enjoy and appreciate that I can have such an open dialogue about this potentially sensitive topic. I think the key to success here in order not to fight over authorships, is to decide on these matters as early on as possible, before most work is already done and, if the situation changes, announce it as soon as possible. I believe that this culture has been established here and that is what makes such matters easier.

2018-12-11: Discussion about order of authorship on article

Today we discussed what the author's order should look like in the first article to be included in my dissertation. We came to the conclusion that Oskar will become a first author, I will be a second author and Maria will probably be the last author. I think that it was pro-active to have this discussion and make this clear as early as possible so that people now what to expect and to get. If not, I think there is a higher risk of conflicts.

5. Teacher training and experience

When asked about if I was interested to teach as part of my PhD, I initially said yes and felt thrilled about it. And one part of me still would like to teach. Part of the problem though is that since I have a cognitive science background and am relatively new to health sciences, it is not obvious what I should or could teach. In addition, since I am a bit behind in terms of how far I have come and what I need to produce before I finish, I actually do not know if I will have any time for teaching, and one part of me feels quite happy about that too, since I will then have better possibilities to simply focus on my own studies. Since I do not have an teaching experience I have so far not been able to reflect upon this topic that much so far. Below I included a post about delivering a message to an audience. I think that is the closest I have come to practicing teaching so far within my PhD:

2019-03-15: Training how to communicate a message to an audience in the best way

As part of the Knowledge in collaboration course we got to practice how to communicate a message to an audience in form of a 'pitch'. This is not exactly teaching but I think some of the advices and techniques can be useful even for teaching. I had prepared a pitch about the advantage of using a distributed version control system in academic writing as a means to continuously track how one's writing had evolved over time and be able to easily go back to earlier versions of a specific text. The feedback I received from the teacher and my fellow course participants on my pitch/presentation was that I was talking and moving too fast; that I should keep it shorter and more simple; that the images had too small text and thus was hard to follow; that I could make red lines around the area where I wanted people to look. In the last slide, I was suggested to remind the audience of my main message. I realised that part of the problem with my presentation was the fact that I hade chosen something a bit too complicated (namely the advantages with using a certain version control system in academic writing) and that added to the difficulty of making myself understood. Again, and like so often, having thought things through and being well-prepared make things easier.

6. Conferences and seminars

When it comes to seminars and conferences, I think that I during the almost two years I have been a PhD student at Lund University have been quite privileged. Below are my reflections on some of the seminars and conferences that I have taken part of so far:

2019-10-24 SWEAH Conference

After having been part of the planning team for this conference and involved in meetings since this spring it honestly felt like a big relief when the conference was here, but most of all when it was over. Of course, it was fun to meet old faces and new faces, but I must confess that I was also more nervous than I had expected when taking on the role as presenter for some of the invited speakers. One thing I learned is the importance of practice when it comes to giving talks. I will remember that till the next time.

2019-06-13: Seminar with the 'Ageing & Health research group' discussing my first article

At the start of the seminar, Susanne explained that the aim with article seminars in general is to get support to position the paper in the thesis and to get feedback on the article. I gave a short introduction in which I tried to frame the thesis within a larger context. Thus, I initially explained my view of user involvement as having twofold roots. On the one hand it related to democracy for service users and a means to assure civic rights. On the other it related to design or research process and was a means to assure quality of the knowledge, product or service. The feedback I received concerned the terminology (Avoid 'stakeholder'; Use more consistent terms and define them better), title (Add 'wicked problem' to the title); overarching aim (Emphasize 'user involvement' more strongly); introduction (Start intro with 'wicked problem'); methodology and results (Link draft/sketch of DSS with results), to mention just a few things. Overall, it was a good seminar which will hopefully help me to improve the article in the coming months.

2018-11-29: Workshop about participatory photography

Yesterday we had another CASE Scientific Session (CSS) - a seminar series arranged by various members of CASE. This time it was our partners at Ingvar Kamprad Design Centrum, IKDC, who had invited Kate Watson from the association PhotoVoice in UK. She held a workshop about participatory photography, and it was in my opinion the best CSS so far. Normally these courses are three days, Kate explained, but she gave a really intense one-day course based on the same content. It was intense, but I think she managed really well in explaining both theoretical and practical aspects of the methodology. Participatory photography has its roots in Participatory Action Research and is a way of 'giving voice' or 'enabling voice' or an 'equalizer' for the under-represented. It can be seen as 'tools of communication', as both a process and an output. In other words, the description and direction of the method depends on the aim. Journalism, advocacy and research have in common that in these domains some people tell the stories of others. There is a power relation involved almost by definition. Participatory photography tries to invert that power relation. Photos are subjective, but here they should mainly be seen as a means to bring up the story, the thoughts, feelings, values, experiences put into it by the participants. Thus, photos are not that important in themselves, it is the Photo Dialogue that the photos create that is most important. Printing out the photos is a way to make them more accessible. She also spoke about "Democracy of the table space" - to move around a picture is a participatory action that

might be easier to defend in front of others you don't know so well than to just use words. Kate was excellent in the role as workshop leader and you could tell she was very devoted to her topic. I think the workshop brought the participant closer together on a more personal not without for that sake being too intimidating. I really realised the power of communicating through images, but also how different two individuals can interpret an image.

7. National and international cooperation with the research community

Thanks to my affiliation to SWEAH, a doctoral student network for researchers in ageing and health, I have been fortunate to know relatively well what kind of research goes on in ageing and health on a national level. That affiliation has been really important and meaningful to me since it has given me not just new friends and colleagues but also a better sense of where I, and the research that I am doing, belong in the ageing and health research discourse. What I have come to realise is that what I am doing is relatively unique. Most other PhD students in SWEAH study ageing and health in a more direct sense, it seems to me, while I am studying a phenomenon that is more indirectly linked to ageing and health. Moreover, in relation to international cooperation I had hoped to be able to visit some university abroad and be situated there for some weeks or months, but due to the corona crisis such plans have had to be postponed. I do not know if they will become reality, but it would be nice in order to get to have a closer look at a similar research environment in another country. When it comes to cooperation with the national research community, I could also mention our national UserAge program as. At three other universities there are PhD students currently studying different aspects of user involvement. They have also been important to me in the sense that with them (since they are well-acquainted with the topic) I have been able to test my ideas and discuss relevant concepts and through this receive relevant feedback. Below are some of my reflections so far related to National and international cooperation with the research community:

2020-04-23 SWEAH PhD Student Day

This semester's PhD Student Day for affiliates to the National Graduate School on Ageing and Health SWEAH was held online. We had all recorded and uploaded some short online videos in which we describe our PhD projects. Unfortunately, it was very far from meeting away from keyboard since the small talk in the coffee breaks could not be replaced online. It is surprisingly often the informal small talk that I have enjoyed the most with SWEAH and that kind of talk also usually bring out new and innovative ideas to a larger extent than when discussions are held in more formal settings.

2019-10-09: UserAge presentation in Gothenburg

All participants in the UserAge program met in Gothenburg for a few days of work together. For me it was the first time I met several of the program's participants "away from keyboard" so to speak. The other three doctoral students had already presented their research to the group since they started their doctoral studies somewhat earlier than me. I presented my PhD project to the group, which consisted of researchers from other universities but also representatives of the user board. After presenting to different groups earlier, I thought it went really well this time. I think this was due to the fact that I managed to find a good balance between academic and everyday language that allowed everyone to follow without sacrificing scientific precision.

2019-06-04: Presentation for other researchers at the Department of Health Sciences

Presented my PhD project for other doctoral students (and supervisors) at the Department of Health Sciences as part of a new initiative from the department management. It went okay, but I realized that I need to get better at relating the dissertation work to UserAge and the project that I am part of when presenting to other

researchers. My presentation was a little too “free” in relation to the form in which I was expected to hold my presentation. Oskar subsequently came up with a proposal to have a matrix containing the various studies and what they cover in order to clarify which aspects of user involvement a particular study covered. I thought it was a great idea and will develop one as soon as possible.

8. Cooperation with wider society

Cooperation with the wider society is in a sense part of the phenomenon that I am studying and thus it feels a bit strange to discuss how my doctoral studies and what I have learned so far relates to this topic. One thing that I can say is that through the opportunities that I have had so far to present my research to various groups of people, I have learned that while researchers tend to expect a talk that relatively strictly follow the expected script, when reaching out to the wider society it is important to keep it more simple, not go too much into methodological questions and to use many illustrative examples. Once I get my first article published, I think it would be interesting to try to turn that article into a shorter text in Swedish that could be published in a paper or journal to the general public. Below are some of my reflections related to the cooperation with the wider society:

2019-11-07: Presenting my research to the general public at ‘The CASE day’

Today, I presented my research to the general public at one of the university’s library as part of ‘The CASE day’, a yearly event organized by our research centre with the aim to reach out more broadly with our research. Wise from experience when presenting to CASE’s User Board, I did not dig too much into scientific detail, but tried to make things as simple as possible by being concrete and providing a lot of illustrating examples. The event was recorded on video and is now available on YouTube.

2019-05-17: Presenting my research to CASE’s User Board

Presented my research to CASE’s User Board today. I found it surprisingly hard to come across with my message. I realised that they do not seem to find it interesting when things become too abstract. In other words, for the future when presenting to a comparable group I will not put as much emphasis on scientific questions and not dig too deep into the descriptions of the methodology.

2019-03-14: My thoughts about collaboration

During the course ‘Knowledge in collaboration’ one of the tasks was to reflect upon our attitude towards collaboration. Here are my answers to the questions we were asked:

My attitudes towards collaboration, entrepreneurship and innovation

- *I see collaboration as a necessity for humans in order to survive. After all, human beings are social animals, and no man, or woman, is an island. We are all here at this moment in time due to our ancestors’ efforts as well as our family’s and friends’ love, care and support. When it comes to entrepreneurship and innovation, I believe that it is a combination of a talent or gift and hard work. Some humans have a strong drive or motivation to solve problems or come up with creative ideas that contribute to the common good. Others are fine to just enjoying life without having the eagerness to bring something more to humanity than their everyday work efforts.*

What is my role, my opportunities for collaboration?

- *During my doctoral studies I intend to study the phenomenon 'User Participation in Research on Ageing and Health'. I see this as a great opportunity to learn more about how various stakeholders from within the University as well as from outside of it together can work together and gain insights from each other. In this way I will not be directly involved in this collaboration, but rather study the phenomenon as such, a bit like an anthropologist.*

In what way are my ideas and research valuable to society?

- *My ideas and my research will hopefully lead to new insights about user involvement in research on ageing and health that will be of use in future collaborative efforts in the domain.*

9. Ethical issues

Coming from a discipline outside of health sciences, I have noticed how much emphasis is put on ethics in this field in seminars and in the articles being written. I think it is very positive since it encourages you to reflect a lot. I cannot remember that ethics was brought forward and discussed to the same degree in for example cognitive science. For my upcoming study (Study III), I will take the leading role in writing an ethical application. It will probably be very challenging, but if needed I will get help from my supervisors. I am quite sure that this experience will provide me with new insights related to the research process and what is important to consider within it. Below are some notes that I have taken earlier this year related to ethics.

2020-03-16: Ethical approval formulation delayed due to Covid-19

Due to the situation with Covid-19, Susanne announced that tomorrow's meeting during which we were to discuss the design of study 3 - in order to formulate an ethical approval application - was canceled. Given the study's design, in which adolescents were to cooperate with senior citizen in an indoor setting Susanne announced that it was likely that the study would be postponed for a year. Sad but nothing to do. At the same time, timewise this might actually be better for me since I will then have more time to plan the study design and specify the research issue.

2020-02-18: Ethical approval for study 3

Due to the delay of article 1, the agenda has been reversed with regard to the ethical approval for the citizen science study which now constitutes my study 3. In conversation with Susanne we concluded that it is important that the ethical approval for the citizen science study be obtained so that this study can be done. Probably the only chance for me during my doctoral studies to gain the experience of formulating an ethical approval application. But in order for such a study to be formulated, we first need to discuss the design of that study. We will do this as soon as I have pressed the 'submit' button for study 1. The meeting was set for March 17. Regarding the aim of the study, I suggested that it could be about studying how older people and adolescents work together to solve the task. Susanne said one possibility is that I am part of the help desk, and thus will be able to take part of the problems that older people experience when participating in this project and from the data collected there formulate a specific question. I thought the latter idea was great. Feels good to be able to formulate an ethics review application within the framework of my doctoral studies.

10. Career development

There is a very active ‘Career center’ at the medical faculty that arranges activities to support the doctoral students career development. However, I did not attend any of the activities so far. Even though I understand that time is passing quickly I have so far prioritized to try to acquire the skills I need in order to be able to find a good workflow. I realised early on that I needed to find a better way going from reading the articles of others to writing my own. I discovered that so much that I read got lost on the way. Thus, I am since about a year back now writing and linking notes of relevant ideas that I find in texts or elsewhere using a software called ‘The Archive’. I have so far created about 600 notes, each containing one idea. Moreover, I am writing my texts in a text editor called Emacs, which also functions as a reference manager and pdf reader among other things. Furthermore, I use version control through Git in order to keep track of the changes I make in my texts. These are all examples of investments I have made in order to “own” my working process. One might also look upon them as investment for career development. Below are some reflections that I have made in relation to career development during the first half of my PhD:

2019-02-11: Declared interest to be part of planning group for arranging SWEAH Conf. this autumn

Today I announced my interest to be part of the group responsible for planning and arranging the SWEAH conference this autumn. I think that it will be an exciting journey to have this responsibility and definitely a good experience for the future, not least when attending other conferences and being able what it is like to be on the other side.

2018-11-18: Finding ‘The Archive’ and the ‘Zettelkasten’ philosophy

Today, after a lot of searching here and there on the Internet, I discovered a wonderful knowledge work program called The Archive, based on the note taking principles of the German sociologist Niklas Luhmann. Such an intuitive program, so nice! I think I will love this software and I hope that it is a beginning of a long journey in which I can become a learner for real, not just a collector of things, which I have been to a large extent so far in my life.

2018-10-26: Thoughts about the reading-to-writing process

I have realized that I need to become better at reading and processing text; to go from reading to writing in a smoother way. Right now it is too much to cut and paste and then change the wording. It is not a sustainable system. What is required is that when I read, I process, reformulate and write down in some way. But it is an ability that requires practice and the right tools and techniques.

11. Supervision/ supervisor(s)

These last few months I have been so busy writing various texts that I did not have time to write proper agendas and protocols for the supervision that I get. My supervisors early on established the rule saying I should hand in an agenda at latest a day before supervision, take notes at each supervision and in the protocol sent out afterwards include a reflection of my own. Even though I was not used to such formal supervision procedures, I really started to see the point after a while since it has made it possible for me to more easily retrospectively trace decisions being made and to better remember what I should prioritise. Furthermore, for quite some time my supervisors and I discussed the potential of a third supervisor and I was very happy that Rod Lawrence whom I had met in Stockholm a few years back agreed to take on the role. So far, I have really achieved great support from my supervisors, and they have showed great understanding and trying to be as supportive as possible. Still, with this support it has been a challenging process writing the first article as described by some of the posts under “Research process”. Below are some reflections that I have made in relation to supervision/ supervisors:

2019-05-13: Supervision – The third supervisor accepted to take on the role

Susanne informed that we received a positive response from Professor Roderick Lawrence to assume the role of assistant supervisor. He is now Professor Emeritus but still active researcher. Susanne has sent him my doctoral plan. She informs him that it is necessary for Lawrence to come to the half-time review (August 2020) and to the public defense, but that correspondence in general can be done mainly by mail and by zoom. We decide that he will not be involved in the first study but from the second study. We will offer him the role of active authorship in study 2, which will be of a more general nature. I am really happy that he agreed since with his expertise in transdisciplinary research, I am convinced that he will be able to be supportive in bringing in a wider perspective to the topic. I am interested in trying to relate the thesis more explicitly to transdisciplinarity and I think that I can get a lot of help from him in doing so.

2019-04-29: Relation to supervisors

During today's MDR meeting, I got to know that there was an infected conflict between a PhD student at the Medical faculty and his/her supervisor which has led to the supervisor being fired. Relations to supervisors in general were discussed and I realised that I am privileged to be able to have such a good dialogue with my supervisors. For many other doctoral students at this faculty, the supervisors are Principal Investigators (PI:s) of major studies and therefore very busy and did not have so much time for them.

2019-04-19: Supervision – A third supervisor suggested

During today's supervision, we continued the discussion of trying to find another assistant supervisor. After a discussion about various possibilities, we jointly decided to ask Professor Roderick Lawrence. I met him on one occasion earlier, when he held a workshop for the graduate school SWEAH's doctoral students. Then thought he had a broad perspective and wise thoughts on transdisciplinarity and collaborative research and hopes that he will be able to help me see my dissertation from a slightly wider perspective and thus complement my other supervisors' skills.

2018-12-11: Supervision

During the supervision I described it as “frustrating” not to come up with a theoretical framework that linked the four sub-studies, and to some extent it is. But what I find in retrospect is that at the same time, I enjoy and understand that this is an iterative process that takes time and must take time and that it is interesting to delve into these issues. However, I think it was good that Susanne so clearly stepped in and asked me to start with the concrete work in sub-study 1 (former sub-study 2). Feels good to get started with it and as she says, self-confidence will probably be strengthened when I get to submit and publish an article. It also feels good that I am not a first author there but can get some guidance from Oskar and Maria

12. Administration, organisation and leadership

I was happy to quite early on find out that the medical faculty has a doctoral council (MDR) where important topics that relates to doctoral students are brought up and discussed. Being a part of this forum has made me realise that we who are PhD students in health sciences constitute only five percent of all doctoral students at the medical faculty. I am now engaged as a representative in two boards. However, I have found it a bit tricky to understand and know what is relevant to whom in terms of reporting to, and from MDR:

2020-04-07: CASE Steering committee meeting

During today's CASE Steering group meeting we reflected on the activities and outcomes of 2019. I expressed that I had especially enjoyed the Photovoice workshop held as a CASE Scientific Session, and that I had heard others likening it very much as well. Furthermore, we discussed we had a strategic discussion on the the management structure and activity plan for the next 3-year period, discussed the planned activities for 2020 and in particular the CASE day and which would be the necessary changes in relation to COVID-19. I suggested that the CASE day could be arranged as an interactive activity outdoor in the spirit of Pokemon Gó, but nothing definite was decided. Instead we agreed that it would be better to wait and see for some time before a decision would be made.

2019-05-07: Appointed as doctoral student representative in CASE steering group and Department board

Today I was officially appointed a PhD representative for the CASE steering group, which is the position that I have unofficially held for a few months now. I was also elected PhD representative for the Health Sciences Department board for 2019-2020. Susanne informed me that this could also give me the right to prolong my doctoral studies to some extent. I think the main challenge in this role is to gain an understanding of what the doctoral students at the department level think and consider important.

2018-12-11: Taking on the role as PhD representative in the CASE steering groups

During supervision I announced that I was considering taking on the role as PhD representative in CASE steering committee after Lizette (the former representative leaves) leaves in February 2019. I explained that I thought that it could be a good exercise for me and also a way to get to know a bit more from the inside what is going on and what activities are planned for etcetera. Susanne explained what the group is doing and what is expected of a doctoral representative. I will contact Ingrid to get the instructions for the steering group. Prior to each individual future meeting, I will then try to consult with other doctoral students to see if they wish that he brings something to the steering group on their behalf.

2018-09-11: Attended my first MDR meeting today

The 'Medicinska doktorandrådet' (MDR) or 'The PhD students' council of the faculty of medicine' in English, is a forum for all PhD students at the Faculty of Medicine at Lund University and they had announced by email that they would have their first meeting for the semester today. It felt good to meet other

PhD students but I also realised that most of them are working in labs and doing research quite far from what I am doing. Sometimes they spoke a language I did not understand (due to the terms being used) so I had to interrupt and ask what they were discussing. All of them were very nice though and it felt good to get a bit updated on what is going on at a Faculty level that is of relevance for us PhD students. I will continue to attend those meetings.