



# LUNDS UNIVERSITET

## Ekonomihögskolan

*Department of Informatics*

---

# Public Follow-up Visibility as Information Infrastructure

Bridge Documents and Documentary Governance in Selected UKÄ Oversight Chains

Bachelor thesis, 15 credits, course SYSK16 in Informatics

Author: Kristoffer Danbrant

Supervisor: Nicklas Holmberg

Grading teacher: Nam Aghaee and Benjamin Weaver

# Public Follow-up Visibility as Information Infrastructure: Bridge Documents and Documentary Governance in Selected UKÄ Oversight Chains

**ENGLISH TITLE:** Public Follow-up Visibility as Information Infrastructure: Bridge Documents and Documentary Governance in Selected UKÄ Oversight Chains

**AUTHOR:** Kristoffer Danbrant

**PUBLISHER:** Department of Informatics, School of Economics and Management, Lund University

**EXAMINER:** Osama Mansour

**SUBMITTED:** May 25, 2026

**DOCUMENT TYPE:** Bachelor thesis

**NUMBER OF PAGES:** 56

**KEYWORDS:** Informatics; documentary governance; public oversight; information infrastructure; UKÄ; public follow-up visibility; bridge documents; public reconstructability

## Summary

Denna kandidatuppsats undersöker hur utvalda tillsynsmyndigheter från Universitetskanslersämbetet (UKÄ) och efterföljande offentliga styrningsdokument skapar olika nivåer av offentlig uppföljningssynlighet i svensk högre utbildning. Studien bygger på explorativ kvalitativ dokumentanalys av UKÄ-material om Stockholms universitet, Högskolan Väst, Linnéuniversitetet och Karlstads universitet. Analysen använder en V0–V4-skala och fokuserar på skillnaden mellan V2, synlig förväntan, och V4, stark offentlig uppföljningskoppling. Resultaten visar att V2-fallen innehåller offentliga fynd och förväntade justeringar, men saknar ett senare offentligt bryggdokument i det analyserade materialet. V4-fallen skiljer sig genom att ett senare offentligt beslut eller en reviderad policy uttryckligen återknyter till tidigare UKÄ-material. Uppsatsens bidrag är en informatikförståelse av offentliga tillsynsdokument som spårbara informationsartefakter. Studien bedömer inte juridisk tillräcklighet eller faktisk intern åtgärd, utan analyserar en smalare dokumentär förutsättning: offentlig rekonstruerbarhet.

## Abstract

Public oversight depends not only on public documents, but on traceable relations between them. This bachelor thesis examines how selected UKÄ legal-supervision findings and subsequent public governance documents produce different levels of public follow-up visibility. It asks what distinguishes cases where an oversight report makes expected action visible from cases where later public documents preserve a stronger follow-up link.

The study uses exploratory qualitative document analysis of selected UKÄ material concerning Stockholms universitet, Höskolan Väst, Linnéuniversitetet, and Karlstads universitet. The material also includes the separate follow-up decision concerning Höskolan Väst's commissioned real-estate-broker programme *Fastighetsmäklare* and Karlstads universitet's revised *Policy om bisysslor*. An operationalisation of public follow-up visibility is provided through a V0–V4 scale. The empirical analysis is based on the following variables: visibility, visible expectation (V2), and strong public follow-up linkage (V4).

The results show that V2 cases contain public findings and visible expectations of adjustment, but no later bridge document was found within the analysed corpus. V4 cases differ because a later public decision or revised public policy explicitly links back to earlier UKÄ material. In the chosen chains of documents, the thesis suggests that the documentary condition for public accountability is strengthened when later documents maintain provenance links.

The contribution is an Informatics framing of public oversight documents as traceable information artefacts within a public-sector information infrastructure. The study does not evaluate legal sufficiency or actual internal remediation, but rather analyses reconstructability in the public sphere.

**Keywords:** Informatics; documentary governance; public oversight; information infrastructure; UKÄ; public follow-up visibility; bridge documents; public reconstructability.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background: public oversight as documentary governance . . . . .	1
1.2	Problem statement: public follow-up visibility . . . . .	2
1.3	Key concepts used in the thesis . . . . .	3
1.4	Aim and research question . . . . .	3
1.5	Scope and delimitations . . . . .	5
1.6	Contribution and thesis structure . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Documents as information infrastructure . . . . .	7
2.2	Documentary governance and accountability . . . . .	8
2.3	Administrative genres and institutional response . . . . .	9
2.4	From theory to analysis . . . . .	10
2.5	Future-oriented implication: evidence abundance and hybrid oversight . . . . .	11
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Research design . . . . .	12
3.2	Methodological boundaries . . . . .	13

3.3	Empirical material and selection criteria . . . . .	14
3.4	Public search protocol and corpus boundary . . . . .	14
3.5	The V0–V4 public follow-up visibility scale . . . . .	15
3.6	Unit of analysis and coding procedure . . . . .	16
3.7	Supplementary robustness scan . . . . .	17
3.8	Reflexivity, quality, and ethics . . . . .	17
3.9	Limitations . . . . .	18
<b>4</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1	Overview of the main evidence . . . . .	19
4.2	V2: visible expectation in UKÄ reports . . . . .	21
4.2.1	Högskolan Väst 2021:18: course-evaluation guidelines . . . . .	22
4.2.2	Högskolan Väst 2021:18: course plans and examination forms . . . . .	23
4.2.3	Stockholms universitet 2020:06: outside-employment routines . . . . .	23
4.2.4	Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29: course-plan clarity . . . . .	24
4.3	V4: strong public follow-up linkage . . . . .	25
4.3.1	Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i> : follow-up decision as bridge document . . . . .	25
4.3.2	Karlstads universitet 2021:28 and the 2022 outside-employment policy . . . . .	26
4.4	Cross-case synthesis . . . . .	27
<b>5</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1	Answering the research question through the V2/V4 distinction . . . . .	29
5.2	Public visibility is relational, not only document-based . . . . .	30
5.3	Administrative genre shapes traceability . . . . .	31
5.4	Bridge documents as provenance-preserving artefacts . . . . .	32
5.5	Institutional response without overclaiming . . . . .	32
5.6	Visibility, burden, and coordination . . . . .	33
5.7	Design-oriented implications for public-sector information systems . . . . .	34
5.8	Bounded future-research implication: evidence abundance . . . . .	34
5.9	Limitations and quality assessment . . . . .	35
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>36</b>
6.1	Answer to the research question . . . . .	36
6.2	Contribution to Informatics . . . . .	37
6.3	Practical implications . . . . .	38
6.4	Limitations and future research . . . . .	38
6.5	Final statement . . . . .	39
<b>A</b>	<b>Document Corpus, Evidence Bank, and Coding Guide</b>	<b>39</b>
A.1	Supplementary concept guide . . . . .	40
A.2	Public search and corpus-boundary protocol . . . . .	41
A.3	UKÄ publication-environment verification . . . . .	43
A.4	Official source verification notes . . . . .	44
A.5	Selected public documents . . . . .	44
A.6	Checked evidence bank . . . . .	45
A.7	Main coding matrix . . . . .	46
A.8	Supplementary robustness-scan log . . . . .	48
A.9	Borderline coding example . . . . .	49
A.10	Coding guide . . . . .	50
A.11	Visibility scale . . . . .	51

---

A.12 AI Contribution Statement . . . . . 51

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background: public oversight as documentary governance

Public administration is made governable through documents. Decisions, reports, routines, templates, course syllabi, appeal instructions, policies, assessment statements, and follow-up decisions do not merely record administrative work after it has happened. They are also information artefacts through which responsibility is assigned, action is coordinated, and accountability can become publicly visible (Pilerot, 2016; Bovens, 2007; Power, 1997; Valverde and Moore, 2019). In Swedish higher education, this documentary dimension is especially important because universities and university colleges are autonomous public organisations while also being subject to legal and administrative requirements concerning student rights, course plans, appeals, course evaluations, student influence, public access, and public documentation (Sveriges riksdag, 1992, 1993, 2017, 1949; Kallio et al., 2021).

The Swedish Higher Education Authority (Universitetskanslersämbetet, UKÄ) conducts legal supervision of universities and university colleges (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, 2021b,d,c). UKÄ's legal-supervision material is therefore a useful empirical setting for an Informatics study of public-sector information systems. The documents show how oversight findings are formulated, how higher education institutions respond, and how corrective expectations are expressed in public records. The Informatics issue is not only whether an institution responds to oversight, but how that response becomes visible, traceable, and analytically reconstructable through public document chains.

The wider higher-education context makes this issue relevant. Swedish universities have been described as subject to increasing documentation, reporting, control, internal bureaucratisation, and shifts from collegial governance toward stronger executive line management (Ahlbäck Öberg and Boberg, 2023; Andersson et al., 2024; Ahlbäck Öberg and Boberg, 2024; Alvehus and Kastberg, 2019). UKÄ has also examined how evaluations and reviews affect administrative burden in the sector, including through information collection, coordination, and reporting demands (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2024). Coordination reports from UKÄ point in the same direction: the challenge is not simply to produce more follow-up, but to coordinate follow-up, reduce overlap, and make already-produced information more useful (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2018, 2022). These sources do not replace the empirical document chains analysed in this thesis. Rather, they explain why public oversight documentation is a relevant setting for studying traceability, public reconstructability, and documentary information infrastructure.

Documents also belong to recurring administrative genres. Oversight reports, institutional responses, follow-up decisions, local policies, course plans, templates, and routines are communicative forms that structure how organisations formulate problems, display responsibility, and make corrective action visible (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994). UKÄ's broader quality-assurance work also treats follow-up as a formal documentary procedure involving action reports, assessment material, statements, decisions, and publication (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2025b). Although this thesis studies selected legal-supervision chains rather than quality-assurance reviews, such guidance illustrates that follow-up is both an administrative outcome and a documentary genre.

## 1.2 Problem statement: public follow-up visibility

A recurring problem in public oversight is that a public finding and an institutional response do not automatically create a publicly reconstructable follow-up chain. A UKÄ report may identify a problem in a course plan, policy, routine, template, or administrative practice. The institution may describe existing routines, state that improvement work is ongoing, or indicate that documents will be revised. UKÄ can then expect changes to documents or procedures from the institution. However, even an external reader may have difficulty piecing together whether there was a later public modification of a rule, template, course plan, procedure, policy, or subsequent decision in connection with the finding. This is indicative of a larger transparency issue: public availability, even when transparent, does not necessarily lead to accountability, usable “public knowledge”, or interpretability (Fox, 2007; Meijer, 2009).

There is a problem in public oversight of this nature, here called *public follow-up visibility*. The concept relates to how visible it is, from public documents, for a later reader to see whether and how an oversight finding was responded to, acted upon, or related to a subsequent governance document. A principal comparative difference in the thesis is between visible expectation and strong public follow-up linkage, while a less binary V0–V4 coding scale is used to measure varying levels of visibility. In other words, the thesis draws a line between cases where UKÄ makes expected action clear in oversight reports and cases where it is clear that a later public document is connected with material in the UKÄ document.

It is an Informatics problem, as it relates to information artefacts and how they are related within an organisation and/or a public-sector information system. Informatics research deals with the interaction of information, people, organisational practices, and information or knowledge objects, both digital and documentary, within a particular context (Oates, 2006; Walsham, 2006). Public-sector information systems also act as a way in which administrative discretion, access, and accountability are mediated in the making, indexing, retrieving, linking, and interpreting of records (Bovens and Zouridis, 2002; Stratton and Carter, 2023). From this point of view, public availability and public reconstructability are not the same. An oversight document could be legally available, easily retrieved upon request, and even publicly available, while still not being readily “linkable” to the oversight finding that it is addressing.

This matters because public accountability depends on more than access to isolated documents. Students, administrators, researchers, oversight bodies, and other external readers may be able to retrieve a report, policy, or course plan without being able to reconstruct how the documents relate to one another. Public follow-up visibility is therefore not treated here as a claim about a specific legal duty to publish every step of remediation, but as an informational condition for making already-public oversight and governance documents interpretable over time.

Provenance-preserving properties such as report numbers, decision numbers, dates, revision histories, titles, stable identifiers, explicit references, records-management routines, and publication practices are aspects of public reconstructability (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; Meijer, 2003; Trace, 2002; International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018; Shepherd et al., 2010; Stratton and Carter, 2023). A later public document, decision, policy, routine, template, or revised governance artefact that refers back to an earlier oversight finding, decision, report, or issue is referred to in this thesis as a *bridge document*. Bridge documents do not evidence legal closure, actual internal

remediation, causation, or ongoing implementation. Their importance is informational: they create a relationship between documents in the public record, making an external reader aware of the provenance of a document and its evidential context, rather than simply adding another document to the public record (Meijer, 2003; Trace, 2002; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024).

This separation maintains the focus of the research on public documentary visibility, as opposed to institutional intentions, legal adequacy, and internal attempts to remediate. A case with strong public follow-up linkage does not necessarily imply that the underlying problem has been solved. Similarly, a case without an identified bridge document does not necessarily identify a lack of institutional action. The claim is more limited: there are document chains that make public follow-up more reconstructable than others.

### 1.3 Key concepts used in the thesis

Table 1.1 provides an overview of the concepts that are used in support of the thesis's argument. The central concepts address the empirical object: how preliminary findings of public oversight make their way, or do not make their way, through subsequent public documents. The table therefore differentiates public visibility and expectation from public follow-up reconstructability.

The main concepts are based on information infrastructure, documentary governance, accountability, transparency, and records/provenance research (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; Pilerot, 2016; Bovens, 2007; Fox, 2007; Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996). Human-centred hybrid decision support is not treated as a core empirical concept in the thesis. It is only applied as a bounded future-oriented implication for why reconstructable public follow-up may become more important within evidence-rich or AI-assisted oversight contexts (Cao, 2023; Cao et al., 2024).

### 1.4 Aim and research question

The purpose of this thesis is to explore how selected findings observed in UKÄ material and the public governance documents that followed them produce different levels of public follow-up visibility in Swedish higher education.

The main research question is:

How do some of the oversight findings in the chosen UKÄ oversight documents and the public governance documents that follow them show varying degrees of public follow-up visibility?

There are three sub-questions that support the main question. The first identifies the relevant documentary relations, the second examines the visible clues of responsibility and corrective

**Table 1.1:** The main concepts used in the thesis.

Concept	Definition	Function in the thesis
Public follow-up visibility	From public documents, the degree to which an external reader can identify that an oversight finding is addressed, acted upon, and/or related to a future governance document.	The object that is analysed in the thesis.
Public reconstructability	The practical potential for reconstructing, based on available records, the relation between earlier findings and later public governance documentation through available identifiers, references, and relations.	Distinguishes formal public availability from being publicly linked and traceable.
Bridge document	A later public document that refers back to an earlier public oversight document, decision, finding, or issue.	One criterion for strong public follow-up linkage.
Visible expectation (V2)	A level where UKÄ makes expected or planned action visible, but where no later published bridge document is identified in the selected corpus and search boundary.	Captures public expectation without a specified later connection.
Strong public follow-up linkage (V4)	A level where a later public document makes an explicit link to earlier UKÄ documents or material.	Captures the strongest form of public follow-up visibility in the study.
Document lineage	The line of sight between a previous finding, the response, the expected next action, and the later governance artefact.	Gives the Informatics terminology for analysing document chains.
Public availability vs. public reconstructability	A formally readable or retrievable document does not necessarily have to be visibly associated with the finding to which it is a response.	Avoids the ill-advised equation of access with traceability in the thesis.
Future-oriented evidence abundance	A possible future state where AI-supported and hybrid decision-support tools make more documentary or procedural signals visible in oversight contexts.	Used only as a limited, future-oriented implication, not in the empirical analysis and not as a description of the author's own AI use.

action, and the third uses those observations to specify the difference between visible expectation and stronger public follow-up linkage. Together, the sub-questions therefore move from document-chain description to analytical comparison.

1. What are the links between oversight findings and responses in documentary governance?
2. What clues do the chosen public document chains give as to responsibility and corrective action?
3. What distinguishes visible expectation from stronger public follow-up linkage in the selected cases?

## 1.5 Scope and delimitations

The study is limited to public documents. It does not use interviews, internal records, personal case material, or administrative or legal matters in which the author is involved. The object of research is public documentary visibility rather than internal remediation. For that reason, the thesis does not attribute institutional intent, individual blame, legal sufficiency, actual implementation, or any general pattern of follow-up work across Swedish higher education institutions.

The empirical material comprises selected reports from UKÄ legal-supervision document series, as well as two more follow-up-oriented document chains. There are two representations of Högskolan Väst. First, course-evaluation guidelines and course-plan examination forms are analysed as V2 findings using UKÄ Report 2021:18 (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b). Second, a V4 bridge-document chain is analysed based on two UKÄ decisions related to the commissioned education programme *Fastighetsmäklare* (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021a,e). Hence, the follow-up decision in the *Fastighetsmäklare* case is not considered to be downstream evidence for UKÄ Report 2021:18.

The selected corpus also includes Stockholms universitet, Linnéuniversitetet, and Karlstads universitet. V2 patterns at Stockholms universitet and Linnéuniversitetet are analysed as cases where expected documentary action is visible, but where no later public bridge document is identified within the analysed corpus and search boundary (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, 2021d). Karlstads universitet is analysed as a V4 pattern because its revised outside-employment policy explicitly states that it is based on UKÄ Report 2021:28, alongside an internal audit report (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021c; Karlstads universitet, 2022). Thus, the Karlstads universitet case is considered evidence of explicit public provenance linkage, but not proof that UKÄ alone caused the policy change.

The corpus is not representative, but rather purposive. The cases are chosen because they allow the analytical contrast between V2 and V4 to be seen (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Therefore, the lack of an identifiable bridge document in the V2 cases should not be taken as evidence of an absence of internal action, or as proof that no such document could exist outside the boundaries of the public search protocol employed for this thesis.

The thesis is also delimited from the author's simultaneous master's thesis, which has an information-governance perspective on public-sector information but differs from the subject under investigation here. This bachelor thesis is an independent study, with a smaller qualita-

tive corpus, a different research question, and a different analytical outcome. It does not reuse empirical findings, datasets, or artefact-based results from the master's thesis.

## 1.6 Contribution and thesis structure

A bounded Informatics argument about public reconstructability is the thesis's contribution. This study demonstrates that there are varying degrees of follow-up visibility produced by different documentary configurations. More specifically, it differentiates between visible expectation, in which the expected action can be found in a UKÄ report, and strong public follow-up linkage, in which a follow-up document or revised governance artefact explicitly reconnects to earlier UKÄ material. The main point of comparison is not whether the institutions acted, but whether the public record preserves a traceable relation between an earlier oversight finding and a later governance artefact. The thesis therefore shows that public reconstructability is created by document genres, identifiers, revision notes, explicit references, and bridge documents (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994; Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; Meijer, 2003; Hurley et al., 2024).

The methodological contribution is that the coding is made explicit and inspectable. The V0–V4 scale is not proposed as a validated measurement instrument, but rather as an interpretive coding scale. To analyse how selected public document chains vary with regard to perceived links in public documents, this case study develops and applies an interpretive coding tool. In Appendix A, the audit trail includes the public search protocol, source-verification notes, evidence bank, coding matrix, robustness scan, borderline coding example, and visibility scale.

The practical contribution is a problem diagnosis for information-system design in the public sector. If the relationships between findings and later governance artefacts were stronger in public records, including in public registers, document-management systems, metadata conventions, revision logs, and publication practices, public records would be easier to reconstruct without necessarily requiring more records. This would require a separate design science study to prototype and evaluate such systems (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007; Cronholm et al., 2024).

The conceptual theories are presented in Section 2. Three themes are of principal importance: information infrastructure, documentary governance and accountability, and administrative genres. These are analysed with the help of institutional theory, which is used more narrowly here in relation to formal response and possible decoupling. Evidence abundance and human-centred hybrid decision support are treated only as future-oriented implications, not as part of the empirical approach and not as a description of the author's own experience of using AI. The qualitative document-analysis methodology and corpus boundary are presented in Section 3. The empirical analysis of V2 and V4 cases, and the synthesis of the cross-case comparison, are presented in Section 4. The results are discussed in relation to documentary governance, information infrastructure, administrative genres, administrative burden, design-oriented implications, and possible future evidence-rich public oversight in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 answers the research question and restates the thesis's bounded Informatics contribution.

## 2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is deliberately hierarchical. Its purpose is to provide Informatics concepts for analysing public documents as information artefacts and governance infrastructure. The analysis is primarily carried by three lenses: information infrastructure, documentary governance and accountability, and administrative genres (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; Pilerot, 2016; Bovens, 2007; Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994). Institutional theory is used more narrowly to interpret why formal organisational responses may become visible without necessarily making later follow-up publicly reconstructable. Evidence abundance and human-centred hybrid decision support are not part of the empirical frame; they are used only as a bounded future-oriented implication. Together, the main concepts explain why public follow-up visibility depends not only on whether documents exist, but on whether they are linked, interpretable, and able to preserve provenance across time. This framing is deliberately narrower than the parallel design-science language of verified closure: the present thesis studies public follow-up visibility in a small qualitative corpus, not automated closure measurement (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007; Cronholm et al., 2024).

### 2.1 Documents as information infrastructure

Information infrastructure theory is useful because it shifts the analysis from individual documents to the relations that make documents usable across time and across organisational settings. Infrastructure is not only a technical substrate. It is embedded in standards, classifications, routines, records, identifiers, and practices that often become visible only when they break down, scale across settings, or fail to support a task (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; Hanseth and Lyytinen, 2010; Monteiro et al., 2013). Records-management standards and scholarship make a related point: the evidential value of a record depends on context, provenance, reliability, authenticity, and retrievability, not merely on the existence of a file (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Meijer, 2003; Trace, 2002; Upward, 1996; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018). In this thesis, public document chains are treated as a small-scale information infrastructure for oversight visibility. This also aligns with Lund Informatics research on information infrastructure evolution, where governmental claims and legal arrangements can function as architectural control points in distributed digital infrastructures (Henningsson et al., 2013).

In the setting studied here, the infrastructure consists of UKÄ reports, institutional responses, local policies, routines, course plans, appeal instructions, and follow-up decisions. These documents make public oversight possible because they preserve traces of findings, explanations, expectations, and later governance responses. They are therefore not treated only as sources of information about governance. They are also governance artefacts that participate in making oversight visible, comparable, and reconstructable.

The infrastructural perspective is useful because public follow-up visibility is relational. A document can be public without being easy to connect to another document. A UKÄ report may identify a problem in a course plan or policy. A later local policy, routine, or course plan may be

revised. Yet unless the later document explicitly refers to the UKÄ report, the oversight issue, a decision number, a report number, or a clear revision reason, the public chain remains difficult to reconstruct. From an Informatics perspective, this is a problem of document relationships, metadata, classification, records-management conventions, and publication practices (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Stratton and Carter, 2023). These relationships are what allow a later reader to reconstruct document lineage and assess provenance across a public governance chain (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999).

This lens connects directly to the empirical coding. V2 describes cases where a UKÄ report makes the finding and expected action public, but where no later public bridge document is identified within the analysed corpus and search boundary. V4 describes cases where a later public document preserves a stronger infrastructural relation by explicitly reconnecting to earlier UKÄ material. The distinction is not based on whether internal action occurred. It is based on whether the public document chain preserves an explicit relation that an external reader can reconstruct.

Taken together, information-infrastructure, records-management, and records-continuum literature suggest that public reconstructability depends on preserved relationships between records, not on the isolated availability of records (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018). This is the infrastructural condition that later distinguishes V4 cases from V2 cases in the empirical analysis.

## 2.2 Documentary governance and accountability

Accountability is treated here as a relational and informational process rather than as a single event. Public actors must be able to give accounts, and external audiences must be able to inspect, interpret, and evaluate those accounts (Bovens, 2007). This makes documents central to public accountability. They are the records through which actions, explanations, decisions, responsibilities, and expectations become externally visible (Power, 1997; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018).

In public administration, accountability is frequently mediated by documents. In higher education, this documentary accountability is shaped by a tension between institutional autonomy and external steering. Public higher education institutions must preserve enough evidence for external scrutiny while also avoiding the reduction of governance to documentation for its own sake (Bovens, 2007; Kallio et al., 2021). Oversight bodies formulate findings; institutions respond; later decisions, policies, routines, templates, or course plans may show how the issue was handled. In the selected chains, accountability is strengthened not merely when a document exists, but when a later document becomes publicly interpretable as a response to an earlier finding. This is why the thesis does not ask whether universities actually complied internally. This also avoids collapsing transparency into accountability, since access to information does not by itself guarantee interpretation, answerability, or corrective capacity (Fox, 2007; Meijer, 2009). It asks how far a public document chain allows an external reader to trace an oversight finding into later governance documentation.

This thesis uses the term *documentary governance* to describe the role of documents as governance artefacts: texts do not merely describe administrative action, but can coordinate, discipline, and stabilise work across organisational settings (Pilerot, 2016; Valverde and Moore, 2019). A document can restate a problem, assign responsibility, describe a planned measure, revise a rule, or create a public bridge to later follow-up. In this thesis, a *bridge document* means a later public document that explicitly reconnects to an earlier oversight report, decision, finding, or issue. The key analytical question is not whether a document exists in isolation, but how documents work together as a chain. This is why the empirical analysis distinguishes between visible expectation and stronger public follow-up linkage.

Records-management research makes the same general point in another vocabulary: transparency depends not only on access to records, but also on reliable record creation, preservation, meta-data, and organisational routines that maintain the evidential value of documents over time (Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018). In this thesis, bridge documents are important because they preserve public provenance across a governance chain. They make it easier for an external reader to understand not only that a later document exists, but why it exists and which earlier oversight issue it responds to (Meijer, 2003; Tough, 2011; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024; Stratton and Carter, 2023).

Accountability theory and records-management research therefore meet at the same analytical point: public accounts require durable, retrievable, and contextualised evidence (Bovens, 2007; Tough, 2011; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018). In the present thesis, a bridge document is treated as the documentary form through which such accountability relations become publicly reconstructable. This does not mean that a bridge document proves legal sufficiency, actual remediation, causation, or lasting implementation. It means that a public link has been preserved, allowing a later reader to reconstruct the relationship between an earlier oversight finding and a later governance artefact.

### 2.3 Administrative genres and institutional response

Genre theory explains why the type of document matters. Organisational genres are recurrent forms of communicative action that structure how actors produce and interpret texts (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994). In the UKÄ material, relevant genres include legal-supervision reports, institutional responses, assessment statements, follow-up decisions, local policies, routines, templates, and course plans. These genres make oversight comparable and administratively manageable, but they also shape what kind of follow-up becomes visible.

Different genres create different kinds of public traceability. A UKÄ report can make a finding and an expectation of action visible. An institutional response can describe existing routines or planned measures. A local policy can show how an institution formulates a rule or routine. A follow-up decision can explicitly reconnect a later assessment to an earlier decision. A revised policy can preserve provenance by stating that the revision was made against the background of a particular report or issue. The same governance issue may therefore become more or less traceable depending on which genre carries it forward. A follow-up decision creates a different kind of visibility than a general policy page or an internal routine, because the genre itself carries an expectation of response to a prior event.

Institutional theory adds a complementary lens. Organisations often respond to external expectations through formal structures, policies, and documented procedures that signal legitimacy (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). Such formal responses may be meaningful, but they can also become partly decoupled from what an external reader can verify. A university may have routines, improvement work, or internal follow-up, while the public record only shows a report and a general statement that action is expected. The thesis therefore interprets weak public follow-up visibility carefully: it is not evidence that nothing happened internally, but a limitation in the public documentary chain, since records are organisationally produced traces rather than neutral mirrors of everything that occurred (Trace, 2002).

In Swedish higher education, this formal-response environment is also shaped by wider shifts toward stronger executive line management and expanding professional administration (Ahlbäck Öberg and Boberg, 2023; Andersson et al., 2024).

This caution is important for the V2/V4 distinction. In a V2 case, a public report may show that action is expected, while the absence of an identified later bridge document means that the documentary linkage remains weak within the selected corpus and search boundary. In a V4 case, a later public document explicitly reconnects to the earlier UKÄ material and thereby preserves the issue as a traceable documentary relation. The distinction is therefore not about the degree of actual remediation. It is about the degree to which a governance response becomes publicly traceable through documentary genres and information infrastructure.

In this sense, administrative genres are not only document templates. They are communicative vehicles through which organisations express, stabilise, and make visible their responses to external expectations. Formal documents can signal responsiveness and legitimacy, while the strength of the public document chain depends on whether later genres preserve explicit links to earlier oversight material.

Genre theory and institutional theory therefore complement the infrastructure perspective. Genres shape how oversight findings, responses, policies, routines, and follow-up decisions become recognisable public artefacts (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994), while institutional theory cautions that visible formal response may remain decoupled from later traceable public action (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). This combination explains why the thesis distinguishes visible expectation from strong public follow-up linkage.

## 2.4 From theory to analysis

The empirical analysis applies the theoretical framework in a focused way. Information infrastructure theory directs attention to links, identifiers, document lineage, provenance, and retrievability. This also connects to system-level and infrastructure-level bureaucracy: when public administration is mediated through information systems, data exchange, and documentary routines, accountability partly resides in the design and linkage of those systems rather than only in face-to-face administrative discretion (Bovens and Zouridis, 2002; Widlak and Peeters, 2025). Documentary governance and accountability direct attention to how findings, explanations, responsibilities, and expected actions become publicly inspectable. Genre theory directs attention to how different document types carry different kinds of public visibility. Institutional theory

cautions against treating the absence of a public bridge as evidence of no internal response.

Together, these lenses produce the main analytical expectation of the thesis: public availability alone is insufficient for strong public follow-up visibility. Stronger visibility requires traceable relations between documents. The V2/V4 contrast operationalises this expectation. V2 captures the public visibility of an expected action without an identified later bridge document in the analysed corpus. V4 captures a stronger documentary relation in which a later public record explicitly reconnects to earlier UKÄ material.

The empirical analysis therefore asks three linked questions of each document chain. First, what finding or expectation is made public? Second, what later public document, if any, carries the issue forward? Third, does the later document preserve an explicit provenance link to the earlier UKÄ material? These questions translate the theoretical framework into the coding logic used in the analysis.

## 2.5 Future-oriented implication: evidence abundance and hybrid oversight

The main theoretical frame of the thesis is information infrastructure, documentary governance, accountability, and administrative genres. Evidence abundance and hybrid decision support are used more narrowly. They explain why public reconstructability may matter in future oversight environments, but they do not carry the empirical analysis and do not form a second research design. This subsection is conceptual. It is not a description of the author's own use of AI or digital tools during the thesis process.

The thesis does not test whether an *Oversight Shock* is occurring. The concept is used only as a future-oriented sensitising idea: AI-assisted oversight may create a mismatch between the speed at which potential documentary or procedural issues become detectable and the speed at which institutions can classify, prioritise, interpret, and document reconstructable follow-up (Cao, 2023; Cao et al., 2024; Shrestha et al., 2019; Ananny and Crawford, 2018). The concern is therefore not that increased detection automatically improves accountability. Rather, increased detection capacity may make provenance-preserving records more important, because public accountability still depends on interpretation, responsibility, and follow-up.

AI-assisted analysis may make low-level documentary or procedural signals easier to detect than to contextualise and follow up; this matters because transparency or detectability alone does not resolve interpretation, accountability, or governance problems in complex information systems (Ananny and Crawford, 2018; Widlak and Peeters, 2025). This thesis uses that concern only as a bounded implication. Missing references, inconsistent terminology, unclear revision histories, absent reasoning, or weak links between decisions and later artefacts may become visible at a much higher volume and granularity than traditional manual review processes were designed to handle. In such a setting, the oversight problem becomes not only detection, but also classification, prioritisation, routing, interpretation, and connection to accountable follow-up.

This is why human-centred hybrid decision support is relevant only as a conceptual bridge. Cao argues that advanced decision support should be designed with a human-centred intent and should use the complementary capabilities of humans and machines in decision-making (Cao, 2023).

Cao et al. similarly define hybrid decision support systems as systems that combine human and machine capabilities for decision tasks (Cao et al., 2024). Applied cautiously here, this suggests that future AI-assisted oversight should not be imagined as a purely automated pipeline. Machines may help detect, cluster, or route signals, but public interpretation, prioritisation, responsibility, and follow-up remain institutional and human-centred tasks.

The limited relevance for this thesis is therefore documentary. Bridge documents, explicit references, stable identifiers, revision histories, and provenance-preserving records can help transform many potential signals into reconstructable public chains (Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024). The empirical analysis does not demonstrate an *Oversight Shock*. It examines one documentary precondition that would matter in such a setting: whether selected public records preserve enough linkage for follow-up to be publicly reconstructed.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Research design

The study adopts an exploratory qualitative approach to document analysis and considers the selected public documents as socio-technical information artefacts, or as “living documents”, rather than as static legal documents (Prior, 2003; Bowen, 2009). This approach is appropriate because the research question concerns how public documents make findings, expectations, responses, and the visibility of later action public, rather than whether the action undertaken by the institutions was lawful or whether internal remediation took place. Qualitative document analysis enables the researcher to explore how documents formulate problems, describe responsibilities, and link, or fail to link, subsequent documents to previous findings (Bowen, 2009). Qualitative content analysis, with an explicit and interpretive approach to the formation of categories, also guides the coding logic (Schreier, 2012; Krippendorff, 2018). The study can be classified as interpretive because it analyses the ways in which meaning, responsibility, and follow-up are represented in public documents (Walsham, 2006). It is also artefact-oriented, because the relationships between information artefacts represented by reports, decisions, policies, routines, and course plans can be examined (Oates, 2006).

The thesis is written as a small comparative study. It does not attempt to measure the UKÄ legal-supervision system as a whole. Instead, it chooses document chains that make it possible to observe varying levels of public follow-up visibility. This follows a strategic qualitative case logic: carefully chosen cases can be used to clarify analytical contrasts without being used for statistical generalisation (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Understanding administrative genres is another important aspect of the analysis, since oversight reports, institutional explanations, follow-up decisions, revised policies, and local governance documents are recurring communicative forms that make governance problems and responses publicly visible (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994).

The research design is therefore comparative, interpretive, and document-centred. It juxtaposes selected chains of public documents, interprets how they relate to oversight and response, and then analyses whether later public documents contain explicit links to earlier UKÄ material. The central methodological object is not the university as a whole, not a single report, and not a legal issue in isolation, but a public documentary response chain around a selected oversight finding.

### 3.2 Methodological boundaries

The empirical context is the legal-supervision setting, but the method is not legal doctrinal analysis. The thesis does not determine whether a university acted lawfully, whether UKÄ's assessment was legally correct, or whether a university completely remedied a problem. It analyses how findings, expectations, responses, and later follow-up are reported in public documentation. The thesis is also not a design science study. It does not build, test, or evaluate an artefact; rather, it includes design-oriented implications based on a qualitative analysis of public document chains (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007; Cronholm et al., 2024).

Table 3.1 presents an overview of the boundaries that keep the method aligned with the research question.

**Table 3.1:** Methodological boundaries and their analytical purpose.

Boundary	What the thesis does not claim	Why this matters
Legal compliance	It does not decide whether an institution complied with administrative law or whether UKÄ's legal assessment was correct.	Keeps the study within Informatics and qualitative document analysis.
Internal remediation	It does not infer internal action, intent, implementation, or inaction from silence in public documents.	Avoids treating missing public linkage as evidence of institutional failure.
Design science	It does not construct, test, or evaluate a document-management artefact.	Keeps design implications at the level of future requirements and problem diagnosis.
Representativeness	It does not estimate the frequency of V2 or V4 patterns across UKÄ supervision.	Fits the purposive case logic and prevents prevalence claims from a small corpus.
Public availability	It does not suggest that all legally public or requestable records are necessarily easy to find or trace online.	Maintains the distinction between formal access and public reconstructability.
Causation	It does not claim that a later policy or decision was caused solely by a UKÄ finding unless the public document itself supports that claim.	Avoids exaggerating provenance linkage by presenting it as institutional causality.

### 3.3 Empirical material and selection criteria

The empirical material comprises a set of public UKÄ legal-supervision reports, as well as two document chains that are oriented towards follow-up. The corpus consists of UKÄ reports on Stockholms universitet, Högskolan Väst, Linnéuniversitetet, and Karlstads universitet; UKÄ's original and follow-up decisions regarding Högskolan Väst's commissioned education programme *Fastighetsmäklare*; and Karlstads universitet's revised *Policy om bisysslor* (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, 2021b,a,e,d,c; Karlstads universitet, 2022). The selected public documents and the evidence bank are listed in detail in Appendix A.

The documents were selected based on four criteria: (1) the document is public; (2) it is part of UKÄ legal supervision or a follow-up-related or policy-related chain; (3) the document concerns documentary governance, for example course plans, course evaluations, policies, routines, templates, or outside-employment rules; and (4) the document supports comparison between lower and higher levels of public follow-up visibility. The cases were therefore chosen as illustrative rather than representative. They show the difference between visible expectation and strong public follow-up linkage.

One important case-design boundary is that Högskolan Väst appears in two different ways. UKÄ Report 2021:18 is treated as a legal-supervision report that provides findings on course evaluations and course-plan examination forms. UKÄ follow-up decision 32-00327-21 is part of a different *Fastighetsmäklare* chain and is not treated as downstream evidence for UKÄ Report 2021:18. This boundary prevents two different UKÄ processes associated with the same institution from being collapsed into one document chain.

The Karlstads universitet case also requires a boundary note. The revised *Policy om bisysslor* is treated as a bridge document because it specifically states that it was revised against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28, together with an internal audit report. Thus, the case is an example of explicit public provenance linkage. It is not viewed as proof that the policy change resulted solely from UKÄ's actions.

### 3.4 Public search protocol and corpus boundary

The corpus boundary was defined through the retrieval of public documents, rather than through systematic requests for official documents under Chapter 2 of the Freedom of the Press Act (*begäran om allmän handling*) (Sveriges riksdag, 1949). The search started with UKÄ reports and decisions and was then supplemented by searches for later public documents that specifically referred to the report, decision, finding, or issue. The purpose was not to establish that no relevant document exists anywhere. It was to find out whether there was a qualifying bridge document within the selected and documented public corpus.

The search logic was conservative. A later document was classified as a bridge document only if it explicitly referred to the earlier UKÄ report, decision, finding, issue, report number, decision number, or clearly identifiable oversight matter. A later document with similar content was not enough. This means that although a current course plan, guideline, or policy might be relevant in

practice, it would not count as V4 unless it preserved a visible connection to the earlier oversight material. The public search protocol, corpus-boundary protocol, and official evidence anchors are reported in Appendix A.

The research process was carried out in three broad documentation phases. The development of the proposal and the designation of supervisors took place from 26–27 January 2026. The main phase of source-material collection for the selected UKÄ and university document chains took place from 3–7 February 2026. Notebook-supported exploratory analysis started on 5 March 2026. This work was not treated as empirical evidence, but was used to support source retrieval, text extraction, document-chain inspection, and case refinement. A final source-retrieval and verification run was made prior to submission, on 17 May 2026, to strengthen the audit trail. This run retrieved the source documents from official UKÄ and university sources, created retrieval and extraction logs, and produced raw text, cleaned text, and page-level text files for checking the documents selected for the final corpus. The final check did not identify any additional public bridge document that altered the V2/V4 coding. Empirical statements in the thesis therefore remain based on the cited public UKÄ and university documents, not on notebook outputs.

An important implication of this search protocol is interpretive. When the thesis states that no later public bridge document was identified in a V2 case, it means that no qualifying bridge document was found within the selected public corpus and search boundary. It does not imply that no internal action took place, that no document exists in an institutional archive, or that a document could not be obtained by other means.

### 3.5 The V0–V4 public follow-up visibility scale

Public follow-up visibility is operationalised qualitatively through a V0–V4 scale. The scale categorises the extent to which a selected oversight finding can be followed through public documents. It does not evaluate legal compliance, internal remediation, institutional performance, or the substantive quality of corrective action.

**Table 3.2:** Public follow-up visibility scale.

Code	Label	Meaning
V0	Finding only	UKÄ finding visible, but no clear public response in the analysed material.
V1	Response visible	Response, explanation, or submitted material visible, but no clear action.
V2	Action stated / visible expectation	Planned, ongoing, expected, or claimed action visible, but no later public bridge document identified within the selected corpus and search boundary.
V3	Follow-up visible	Later follow-up document or governance artefact visible, but linkage is weak, indirect, or not explicitly tied to the earlier UKÄ material.

Code	Label	Meaning
V4	Strong follow-up linkage	Later public document explicitly connected to the earlier finding, report, decision, or issue.

The V0–V4 scale is not used as a validated instrument for measuring visibility, but as a visibility typology (Schreier, 2012; Krippendorff, 2018; Saldaña, 2025). The scale helps the reader understand the analytical continuum between finding-only visibility and strong public follow-up linkage. However, the empirical contribution of this thesis consists primarily of comparing selected cases between V2 and V4. V2 is significant because it demonstrates that UKÄ can make expected action visible even without a later traceable public chain being identified. V4 is important because it exemplifies how a later bridge document or governance document can explicitly reconnect to earlier UKÄ material. The intermediate levels remain part of the coding structure, but the selected corpus is used mainly to compare visible expectation with strong public follow-up linkage.

### 3.6 Unit of analysis and coding procedure

The unit of analysis is a public documentary response chain around a selected oversight finding. A chain begins with a UKÄ finding, criticism, observation, or expectation statement and may include an institutional response, stated action, later follow-up decision, or revised governance document. The unit is therefore not the institution as a whole and not the full UKÄ report as a single case.

The final analysis focuses on six selected findings or document chains: Höskolan Väst course evaluations; Höskolan Väst course plans and examination forms; the separate Höskolan Väst *Fastighetsmäklare* follow-up chain; Stockholms universitet outside-employment routines; Linnéuniversitetet course-plan clarity and examination forms; and Karlstads universitet outside-employment policy revision. Two findings may originate from the same report when they illustrate distinct documentary governance issues, but they are not treated as separate institutional cases.

Coding proceeded in four steps, following the general qualitative principle that coding should make interpretive category assignment explicit and inspectable (Saldaña, 2025). First, the selected documents were read to identify passages where UKÄ formulated a finding, observation, criticism, or expectation concerning a governance document or routine. Second, each passage was coded for the implicated document artefact, such as a course plan, guideline, policy, routine, template, or follow-up decision. Third, the passage was coded for how responsibility and corrective action were expressed. Fourth, the public document chain was assigned a V0–V4 visibility level.

The decisive coding rule concerned bridge documents. Report numbers, decision numbers, dates, titles, revision notes, and explicit references were treated as provenance-preserving features. General topical similarity, an existing routine, a later document on the same broad subject, or an uncited institutional web page was not enough for V4. If a UKÄ report described an existing routine, expected a review, or stated that a local document should be adjusted, the case remained

V2 unless the corpus contained a later public document that explicitly reconnected to the earlier UKÄ material (Bowker and Star, 1999; International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Meijer, 2003; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018; Hurley et al., 2024).

Because the coding was conducted by a single researcher, the scale was applied conservatively (Krippendorff, 2018; Saldaña, 2025). Ambiguous cases were not upgraded to V4 unless the later public document preserved an explicit link to the earlier UKÄ material. This conservative rule reduces the risk of overstating follow-up visibility, but it also means that some practically relevant institutional action may remain outside the strongest visibility category.

### **3.7 Supplementary robustness scan**

A supplementary robustness scan was conducted as a limited plausibility check of the case selection. The scan covered the four UKÄ legal-supervision reports already included in the corpus: Stockholms universitet 2020:06, Högskolan Väst 2021:18, Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29, and Karlstads universitet 2021:28. It identified additional documentary governance issues, such as course plans, course evaluations, appeal information, complaints routines, outside-employment documentation, and local steering documents. The scan did not add new documents to the corpus and was not used to count legal deficiencies, validate the V0–V4 scale, or estimate prevalence. Its purpose was to check whether the selected findings remained analytically plausible examples of documentary governance issues (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Bowen, 2009).

The scan also helped separate the empirical contribution from a frequency claim. The thesis does not argue that V2 or V4 patterns are typical across UKÄ supervision. It argues that the selected cases demonstrate analytically important differences in public follow-up visibility.

### **3.8 Reflexivity, quality, and ethics**

The study uses four quality principles adapted from qualitative trustworthiness and quality criteria (Shenton, 2004; Tracy, 2010). Credibility is supported by using public source documents and keeping empirical claims as close as possible to the cited passages. Transparency is supported by the corpus table, evidence bank, coding matrix, borderline example, and visibility scale in Appendix A. Traceability is supported by linking each main result to a specific document chain and page reference. Confirmability is supported by separating verified source claims from analytical inferences. Although the coding is done by a single researcher, the coding criteria are clearly specified so that they can be disputed and modified.

The material consists of documents from public institutions. Private student records, internal emails, personal case notes, personal material, and individual staff conduct are not analysed. The names of institutions are retained because the documents are public and removing them would make the sources more difficult to trace. The empirical corpus does not include administrative or legal matters in which the author is personally involved. The thesis is also separated from

the author's concurrent master's thesis. Results from that project, such as empirical findings, datasets, or artefact-based results, are not used as results in this bachelor thesis.

Digital and AI-based tools were used as supporting materials in the research and writing process, not as empirical sources or analytical authorities. Gemini integrated in Google Colab was used to troubleshoot Python code in the notebook-supported workflow. The document extraction, checking, and analysis-support outputs were generated by scripted code in Colab, not by a large language model. Different large language model tools and Google Translate were also used to suggest alternative English formulations and translation options. These suggestions were not inserted verbatim; the final wording, translation choices, argumentation, and interpretation were revised and decided by the author.

Plagiarism-checking and AI-detection tools were employed as additional quality-control measures to assess whether the final writing appeared consistent with independent student work. These tools were not treated as evidence of authorship, originality, or academic validity, and they were not used as empirical evidence. No AI tool determined the research question, selected the public documents, built the corpus, assigned the V0–V4 coding, verified whether a bridge document exists, assessed legal or institutional adequacy, or made the final interpretation. The author is responsible for the code workflow, source selection, document handling, coding decisions, translation, analysis, references, and claims in the thesis.

### **3.9 Limitations**

There are some limitations to the study. Only six document chains or findings have been analysed. The study does not seek to determine what happened inside the organisations, and it relies only on public documents. It does not rely on a validated measurement instrument, but on an interpretive coding scale developed for this thesis. Low visibility could indicate weak public linkage, a document outside the selected corpus, a document obtainable through other routes, or a publication practice that makes the link difficult to find. This is an intentional design feature of the method and does not imply institutional failure.

Another limitation is that the coding was conducted by one researcher. While the coding rules are clearly outlined and conservative, an intercoder reliability test was not conducted. The V0–V4 scale should therefore be interpreted as an inspectable analytical typology for this corpus, not as a general measurement model. This thesis does not evaluate whether bridge documents improve accountability outcomes in practice. It considers whether bridge documents improve public reconstructability as a documentary condition for accountability.

Future studies could address these limitations by including systematic document requests, additional coders, interviews, or a larger corpus covering a longer period and different types of supervision. A design science study could also use the findings as requirements for metadata, document-management, or public-register functions that maintain connections between oversight findings and subsequent governance artefacts.

## 4 Results

The results are presented through the analytical separation between V2 and V4. V2 cases show *visible expectation*: UKÄ identifies a documentary governance problem and expects, assumes, or suggests a change in a document, routine, policy, or practice. V4 cases demonstrate *strong public follow-up linkage*: a subsequent public bridge document or governance artefact explicitly links back to previous UKÄ material. V2 and V4 do not differ in the level of actual remediation. They differ in the extent to which a governance response is made publicly traceable through the chain of documents.

The chapter is divided into three steps. First, it provides a summary of the key evidence. Second, it analyses the V2 and V4 cases individually, following the same reasoning for each chain: oversight finding, implicated document artefact, decisive evidence anchor, coding implication, and limitation. Third, it synthesises the comparison between cases. This structure makes the V0–V4 coding visible not just as a label, but as an analytical procedure, and connects the empirical cases back to the theoretical issues of documentary provenance, evidential context, and public reconstructability (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Tough, 2011; Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024). (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Tough, 2011; Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024).

### 4.1 Overview of the main evidence

Table 4.1 summarises the six selected findings analysed in the thesis and shows how each finding is situated within a public document chain and coded on the V0–V4 public follow-up visibility scale. Two findings originate from UKÄ Report 2021:18, but they concern distinct documentary governance issues and are therefore coded separately. The table should be read as a visibility matrix, not as an assessment of legal compliance, institutional performance, or actual internal implementation.

**Table 4.1:** Main finding-evidence matrix.

Finding context	Document chain	Finding / issue	Level	Evidence note
Högskolan Väst 2021:18	UKÄ Report 2021:18; no later bridge document identified within the selected corpus	Course evaluations: information about results and measures	V2	UKÄ finds that the guidelines do not clearly show which students should be informed about results and measures, how information should be provided, or how information should be kept available, and expects the guidelines to be reviewed (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 40–41).
Högskolan Väst 2021:18	UKÄ Report 2021:18; no later bridge document identified within the selected corpus	Course plans: unclear examination forms	V2	UKÄ identifies unclear examination-form wording in selected course plans and expects the course plans to be adjusted (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 32–33).
Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	UKÄ decision 2021-04-20 and follow-up decision 2021-12-07	Commissioned education supervision and explicit follow-up	V4	The original decision states that UKÄ will follow up the matter and requests reporting of measures; the later decision explicitly follows up the April decision and records submitted clarifications and measures. In several issues, UKÄ also states that the legal follow-up is closed (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021a, p. 39); (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021e, pp. 1–3).

Finding context	Document chain	Finding / issue	Level	Evidence note
Stockholms universitet 2020:06	UKÄ Report 2020:06; no later bridge document identified within the selected corpus	Outside-employment routine described but not documented in steering documents	V2	UKÄ notes that a twice-yearly reminder routine is described but does not appear in submitted steering documents, and says the routine should suitably be documented in the rules (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, pp. 77–78).
Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29	UKÄ Report 2021:29; no later bridge document identified within the selected corpus	Course-plan clarity and examination forms	V2	UKÄ states that three course plans have deficiencies concerning clearly stated examination forms and expects adjustment (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021d, pp. 36–37).
Karlstads universitet 2021:28 and 2022 policy	UKÄ Report 2021:28 and revised local policy	Outside-employment policy revision	V4	UKÄ expects the policy to be adjusted; the later revised policy explicitly states that the revision is made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 and an internal audit report (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021c, p. 69); (Karlstads universitet, 2022, p. 1).

The table shows that the central empirical difference is not whether UKÄ makes a finding visible. All six findings are visible in public documents. The difference is whether a later public document preserves an explicit relationship to the earlier UKÄ material. The V2 cases contain public findings and visible expectations of action, but no later public bridge document was identified within the analysed corpus and search boundary. The V4 cases contain later public documents that explicitly carry earlier UKÄ material forward.

## 4.2 V2: visible expectation in UKÄ reports

V2 cases demonstrate that reports produced by UKÄ can help make expected governance responses visible and tangible without, however, producing a later report chain that is traceable. They are consequently important edge cases. They do not show a lack of institutional action,

but they do show a kind of public reconstructability that stops at the level of expectation in the analysed public record.

#### 4.2.1 Högskolan Väst 2021:18: course-evaluation guidelines

The first Högskolan Väst finding concerns course evaluations and feedback on results and measures. The guidelines discussed by UKÄ are not explicit about which students should be informed, what they should be informed about, how the information should be provided, or how it should be made available to students (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 40–41). The implicated artefact is therefore not just the practice of course evaluations, but the guideline for how information from course evaluations is communicated.

**Decisive evidence anchor.** The conclusive evidence used by UKÄ is that Högskolan Väst’s guidelines were not clear about which students should be informed about course-evaluation results and measures, how this information should be provided, or whether decisions on measures should be made available. UKÄ therefore expected the higher education institution to review and clarify the guidelines (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 40–41).

**Coding implication.** This supports a V2 coding because the public record exposes both the documentary problem and the expected corrective action, while the analysed corpus does not contain a subsequent public document that explicitly reconnects a revised course-evaluation guideline to the UKÄ finding. It is not coded as V3 because there is no later follow-up artefact in the corpus with a weak, direct, or indirect connection to the UKÄ finding. One possible alternative interpretation would be to treat the expectation of review as follow-up. This thesis does not do so, because the coding distinguishes between an expectation in the oversight report that is visible to the public and a later public bridge document that can make the follow-up reconstructable.

**Limitation.** The V2 code does not indicate that Högskolan Väst did not review the guideline internally, nor that there could not be a relevant document outside the selected search boundary. It indicates that, in the analysed public chain, there is no explicit later link to an updated public governance artefact.

**Analytical implication.** From an infrastructural perspective, the chain reveals itself to be weak after the visible expectation: the finding is public, but the later provenance relation is not preserved in the analysed corpus (Bowker and Star, 1999; International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Meijer, 2003; Hurley et al., 2024). The case therefore makes a point about public visibility, but not about strong public reconstructability.

#### 4.2.2 Högskolan Väst 2021:18: course plans and examination forms

The second Högskolan Väst finding concerns course plans. UKÄ considers that there are unclear formulations about examination forms in some course plans and that these course plans need to be changed (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 32–33). The artefacts involved are course plans, which are public governance documents for students, teachers, and administrators. Their wording is important because it relates to how examination is organised and which expectations are relevant.

**Decisive evidence anchor.** The evidence anchor is UKÄ’s identification of vague formulations in three course plans. One example is the wording that re-examination may take place “in another form”, which UKÄ finds incompatible with the requirement that examination forms must be clearly regulated in course plans (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 32–33).

**Coding implication.** The case remains V2 because the UKÄ finding and the need for documentary adjustment are made visible, but no later public document in the analysed corpus explicitly reconnects revised course-plan wording to the UKÄ finding. It is not coded as V3 because no later course-plan artefact with weak or indirect linkage was found in the selected public corpus. Although a current or later course plan may exist and may even contain better wording, topical similarity is not enough for V4 unless the course plan preserves an explicit connection to the previous report, finding, or issue.

**Limitation.** The coding does not determine whether the course plans have since been changed or whether existing course plans are clearer. It analyses whether there is a reconstructable path in the public document chain from the UKÄ finding to a later governance artefact.

**Analytical implication.** The case shows how one can distinguish between a public governance artefact and a reconstructable governance chain. A course plan can be publicly available, but if it is not accompanied by a reference or revision note linking it to the UKÄ finding, it is not a bridge document (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018; Meijer, 2003; Stratton and Carter, 2023).

#### 4.2.3 Stockholms universitet 2020:06: outside-employment routines

A different V2 pattern is found in the document domain of Stockholms universitet 2020:06. UKÄ discusses outside-employment routines and refers to a mismatch between a described routine and submitted steering documents. The university mentions a twice-yearly reminder routine, but UKÄ finds that the routine has not been recorded in the submitted steering documents and that it should suitably be documented in the rules (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, pp. 77–78).

**Decisive evidence anchor.** The evidence anchor is UKÄ's observation that Stockholms universitet describes its practice of sending a twice-yearly reminder to report outside employment, while this practice is not documented in the steering documents provided. UKÄ therefore states that the university should suitably document the routine in its rules (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, pp. 77–78).

**Coding implication.** This supports a V2 coding because the expected documentary action is visible, while no later public steering document was found in the selected corpus that explicitly reconnects the routine to the UKÄ finding. The university's description is considered a public response in the report, but by itself it is not sufficient for strong follow-up linkage.

**Limitation.** This case should not be interpreted as a general statement that Stockholms universitet lacked outside-employment governance. UKÄ also identifies rules and systems in the area. The V2 coding refers to the narrower issue that the described routine was not visible in the submitted steering documents and that no later bridge document was found in the selected corpus.

**Analytical implication.** This issue is not only a genre issue, but also an infrastructure issue. A described routine is not as publicly traceable as a revised steering document that preserves its continued association with the oversight finding (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994). Thus, the case makes visible the distinction between administrative practice and documentary representation.

#### 4.2.4 Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29: course-plan clarity

Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29 provides another V2 case. According to UKÄ, three reviewed course plans have shortcomings when it comes to clearly stated examination forms (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021d, pp. 36–37). As with Högskolan Väst, this is not only a matter of legal language. It is also about the transparency of a public governance artefact that establishes expectations for students, teachers, and administrators.

**Decisive evidence anchor.** UKÄ finds that the three reviewed course plans lack sufficient clarity in how students' performance is assessed. UKÄ expected Linnéuniversitetet to make changes to the course plans and, based on comments from the student union, to take any necessary steps to ensure that the wording of examination forms in other course plans is clear (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021d, pp. 36–37).

**Coding implication.** This supports V2 rather than V3 or V4. The expected change is public, but there is no later document in the analysed corpus that functions as a follow-up artefact, a weakly connected revision, or a bridge document that connects the revision to the UKÄ finding.

The coding therefore preserves the distinction between an expectation of documentary correction and a public record that allows the correction to be reconstructed.

**Limitation.** The V2 code does not mean that Linnéuniversitetet did not try to adjust the course plans, nor that there is no other document outside the search boundary. It means that no later public artefact in the analysed corpus explicitly links a revision or follow-up to the UKÄ finding.

**Analytical implication.** This reinforces the infrastructural argument from the theory chapter: the public existence of a report cannot be equated with a durable relationship between the report and a subsequent governance artefact (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999). A bridge would need to make this relation visible, for example through a report reference, decision number, revision note, or stated reason for the change (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024).

The V2 cases demonstrate that UKÄ reports can make a problem and an expected corrective response public. They also show the limits of public traceability within the investigated corpus. An action is expected, but the reader cannot follow the issue into a later public document where the documentary governance artefact is modified. V2 therefore represents visible evidence of expectation, not evidence of failed follow-up.

### 4.3 V4: strong public follow-up linkage

V4 cases differ because later public documents explicitly reconnect to earlier UKÄ material. They therefore demonstrate what stronger public follow-up visibility can look like in the selected corpus. They do not prove complete remediation, legal sufficiency, sole causation, or long-term implementation. They do, however, make the public document chain more reconstructable.

#### 4.3.1 Höskolan Väst *Fastighetsmäklare*: follow-up decision as bridge document

In the Höskolan Väst *Fastighetsmäklare* chain, the initial UKÄ decision of 20 April 2021 states that UKÄ will follow up the case and requests that the higher education institution report measures by a specific date (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021a, p. 39). The later decision follows up the previous decision and records not only the earlier decision but also the clarifications and account of measures provided by Höskolan Väst (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021e, pp. 1–3). For several issues, the later decision also states that UKÄ's legal follow-up is closed.

**Decisive evidence anchor.** The evidence anchor is that UKÄ's later decision identifies the April 2021 oversight decision, states that the follow-up case was registered under number 32-00327-21, and records the account of measures taken and clarifications provided by Höskolan Väst (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021e, pp. 1–3). This gives the public reader an explicit

connection between the original decision, the measures requested, the measures reported by the institution, and UKÄ's later assessment.

**Coding implication.** The case is coded as V4 because the later decision contains the linking function that is missing in the V2 cases. The V4 classification is based on explicit public follow-up linkage. In this instance, the linkage also involves parts of the decision where legal follow-up closure is stated. However, the code should not be interpreted as an independent evaluation of educational quality, legal adequacy, or long-term internal implementation beyond what UKÄ states.

**Limitation.** The follow-up decision is a strong bridge document, but it does not resolve all potential questions concerning the programme, quality, or later practice. The V4 code is therefore a visibility code, not a substantive closure code.

**Analytical implication.** The follow-up decision can be characterised as a bridge document because it carries the previous decision forward as an explicit object of later assessment. This type of provenance-preserving relation over time is central to accountability in records-management and accountability literature (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Tough, 2011; Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018). In genre terms, the follow-up decision extends the previous oversight decision into a second public genre, where the history of the previous decision continues (Orlikowski and Yates, 1994).

#### 4.3.2 Karlstads universitet 2021:28 and the 2022 outside-employment policy

Karlstads universitet is the clearest example in the corpus of a revised local governance artefact that explicitly elaborates on a previous UKÄ report. In UKÄ Report 2021:28, UKÄ calls for the university to revise its outside-employment policy so that teachers' responsibility to inform the university about relevant outside employment is clearly stated (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021c, p. 69). Karlstads universitet's later revised *Policy om bisysslor* explicitly states that the revision is made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 and the internal auditor's report (Karlstads universitet, 2022, p. 1).

**Decisive evidence anchor.** The evidence anchor is the clear statement within the revised policy itself. The policy states that the revision of the 2019 policy is made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 and the internal auditor's report (Karlstads universitet, 2022, p. 1). This is not just topical similarity between two documents; it is a public statement of documentary provenance.

**Coding implication.** The case is coded as V4 because the revised policy explicitly contains the bridge required by the coding scheme. The coding does not imply an independent assessment

of the substantive adequacy of the policy or the practical implementation of outside-employment reporting. It means that there is an explicit connection between the later public policy and the earlier UKÄ report.

**Limitation.** The policy also names the internal auditor’s report as part of the revision background. The V4 coding should therefore not be interpreted as a claim that the policy revision was solely due to UKÄ. It denotes a demonstrated public provenance connection, not sole causation.

**Analytical implication.** The Karlstad policy keeps institutional provenance visible by explicitly mentioning the UKÄ report as part of the revision background. It therefore does not only state a rule, but also documents why the rule was revised and which oversight source it responds to. This makes the policy publicly interpretable as part of a provenance relation (Bowker and Star, 1999; Bovens, 2007; Meijer, 2003; Hurley et al., 2024).

The V4 cases thereby provide additional visibility. They do not merely show that action was expected. They demonstrate how a subsequent public document is related to previous oversight material. Those links make the governance response easier for an outside observer to trace.

#### 4.4 Cross-case synthesis

The empirical payoff of the chapter is the cross-case synthesis. The empirical pattern can be summarised as follows: V2 makes expected action visible, while V4 makes the follow-up relation reconstructable. This is a minor difference in coding terminology, but a significant analytical difference. When reading a V2 chain, it is clear that UKÄ has found a problem and expects adjustment. A V4 chain makes it possible for the reader to view a later public document that clearly carries the previous finding forward.

**Table 4.2:** Cross-case synthesis of V2 and V4 coding logic.

Visibility pattern	What is public	What is missing or added	Analytical implication
V2: Högskolan Väst course evaluations	UKÄ identifies a need to review guidelines.	No later public bridge in the analysed corpus reconnects revised guidance to the finding.	There is a public expectation, but follow-up reconstructability remains weak.
V2: Högskolan Väst course plans	UKÄ identifies a problem and expects the course plans to be changed.	No later public bridge in the analysed corpus reconnects course-plan revision to the finding.	Public course-plan information would not by itself establish a traceable follow-up chain.

Visibility pattern	What is public	What is missing or added	Analytical implication
V2: Stockholms universitet outside-employment routine	UKÄ identifies that a described reminder routine is not visible in submitted steering documents.	No later public bridge in the analysed corpus shows that the routine was documented in rules in response to the finding.	The case points to the difference between administrative practice and documentary representation.
V2: Linnéuniversitetet course plans	UKÄ states that selected course plans lack clarity concerning examination forms.	No later public bridge in the analysed corpus relinks a revised artefact to the finding.	The case reiterates that visible expectation is weaker than public reconstructability.
V4: Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	The original UKÄ decision, request for measures, and later UKÄ follow-up decision are public.	The later follow-up decision makes clear that it follows up the earlier decision.	A public bridge document makes the oversight chain reconstructable over time.
V4: Karlstads universitet outside-employment policy	UKÄ's expectation of policy adjustment and the later revised policy are public.	The revised policy clearly states that the revision was carried out against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 and an internal audit report.	A local governance artefact preserves provenance by naming the oversight source.

The strengthened evidence anchors show that the V2/V4 distinction rests on features in the public record rather than on inferred institutional behaviour. The V2 cases are cases where UKÄ finds a problem and develops an expectation of future change in a public artefact, but where the analysed chain does not contain an explicit public statement linking to a later artefact change. In the V4 cases, this linking is done in the subsequent public document: the UKÄ follow-up decision refers back to the Högskolan Väst decision, and Karlstads universitet's new policy names UKÄ Report 2021:28 as part of the revision background.

It is not a matter of the existence or non-existence of documents, but of whether the public information infrastructure preserves documentary provenance over time. A current public document cannot simply be assumed to be evidence of follow-up linkage. Without a revision history, explicit reference, decision number, report number, or change note, it may not be possible to distinguish between a change related to the UKÄ finding, an existing routine, or an unrelated later update (Meijer, 2003; Trace, 2002; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024; Stratton and Carter, 2023).

The synthesis also sheds light on the difference between public availability and public traceability. In the V2 cases, the relevant topic or document type may be publicly known. What cannot be seen in the analysed chain is an explicit public relation between the earlier UKÄ finding and a later governance artefact. This relationship is made explicit in the V4 cases by means of a bridge document. For public reconstructability, therefore, it matters less how many public documents exist than whether those documents make connections, state reasons for revision, and maintain

clear relations with earlier oversight material.

The results also indicate how the theoretical framework is used in the analysis. Information infrastructure theory helps to explain why links, identifiers, and the history of documents are significant. Documentary governance explains why reports, routines, guidelines, course plans, and follow-up decisions are not passive documents, but part of governance. Genre theory explains why a follow-up decision or revised policy can have a different kind of visibility than a general statement or an existing routine. Institutional theory cautions that the absence of a subsequent public bridge should not be confused with the absence of internal action.

Across the case studies, the central Informatics argument is therefore that public follow-up visibility is an infrastructural condition created through identifiers, references, revision notes, genres, publication practices, and the systems through which public records are identified, versioned, linked, and published (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Meijer, 2003; Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Henningsson et al., 2013; Stratton and Carter, 2023). In the selected chains, report numbers, decision numbers, publication environments, revision notes, and case-management numbers all serve as operational control points. If they retain explicit connections between records, then the chain is V4. If they do not, the chain remains visible only at the level of V2.

In practical information-system terms, there is a mechanism in addition to textual wording. The question is whether metadata-like links between artefacts are maintained strongly enough for subsequent readers to reconstruct the relationship between an oversight finding and a later governance document (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; DAMA International, 2017; ARMA International, 2017; Stratton and Carter, 2023). That is why the distinction between V2 and V4 is important: it helps identify the documentary conditions under which public oversight becomes more or less reconstructable.

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 Answering the research question through the V2/V4 distinction

The research question focused on how, and to what degree, selected UKÄ oversight findings and subsequent public governance documents create public follow-up visibility. The findings indicate that the structure of the public document chain is central. In the V2 cases, public visibility is primarily created by the UKÄ report itself: a problem is identified, a particular institution is made responsible, and an expectation of adjustment is made public. In the V4 cases, visibility is strengthened because a later public document more clearly links back to earlier UKÄ material. Empirically, the difference is therefore not between action and inaction, but between visible expectation and public linkage that can be reconstructed from the visible record.

This distinction helps to focus the thesis's main point. Public follow-up visibility is relational,

meaning that records can support accountability not only because they can be accessed, but also because they are preserved in context, are authentic, have provenance, and are interpretable (Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024). It is not enough that documents exist, or that the same topic is mentioned in multiple documents. Follow-up requires a relation between the earlier oversight finding and the later governance artefact that can be followed by an external reader. In the selected material, bridge documents, explicit references to earlier reports, follow-up decisions, revision notes, or other textual features create that relation by naming or referring to the earlier oversight source.

The results therefore support a cautious answer: in the UKÄ chains studied here, public follow-up visibility is stronger when later public documents preserve explicit links to the earlier public documents that form the basis for oversight. Where such links do not occur in the analysed corpus, the public record may still show an anticipated action, but the relation is weaker and less easily reconstructed. This is a claim about public documentation and connection, not a claim about institutional intent, actual internal remediation, legal sufficiency, or how widespread follow-up efforts are across Swedish higher education. It is also consistent with records-management and freedom-of-information research, which treats access, retrieval context, and relations between records as separate but connected aspects of accountability (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Tough, 2011; Meijer, 2003; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018; Stratton and Carter, 2023).

## 5.2 Public visibility is relational, not only document-based

The underlying theoretical point is that documentary governance depends on relationships between records, and that public accountability depends on relationships between documents. This is consistent with information-infrastructure theory, which understands information as usable not only through individual artefacts, but also through standards, classifications, routines, and relations (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999). The results indicate that the V2 cases contain public, specific, and critical reports, but that later follow-up is still difficult to reconstruct. A finding exists in the public record, and an expectation exists in the public record, but this does not necessarily imply a subsequent public record where the issue is visibly resolved.

This relationship can be seen in the strengthened evidence anchors. In the V2 cases, the decisive textual features are UKÄ's expectations that guidelines, course plans, steering documents, or policies should be reviewed, clarified, documented, or adjusted. The V4 cases differ because the decisive textual features are stronger. The Högskolan Väst follow-up decision explicitly takes up the earlier decision and carries it into a later follow-up genre. The Karlstads universitet policy explicitly refers to UKÄ Report 2021:28 as part of the revision background. The analytical difference is therefore located in the public documentary chain itself, rather than inferred from institutional behaviour.

Public availability and public reconstructability are therefore key issues. A document may be public in a legal sense, meaning that it is requestable or accessible, while still being difficult to use for follow-up purposes if it is not published, indexed, versioned, or explicitly linked to the earlier oversight finding. This reflects the wider issue that transparency does not automatically lead to accountability, interpretation, or usable public knowledge (Fox, 2007; Meijer, 2009).

Conversely, a relatively brief reference to a previous report can go a long way in strengthening reconstructability because it preserves documentary lineage. This indicates that public-sector information systems should be assessed both in terms of access to individual documents and in terms of their ability to maintain relationships between documents (Stratton and Carter, 2023; Bannister and Connolly, 2014).

### 5.3 Administrative genre shapes traceability

The results also show that administrative genre matters. A UKÄ legal-supervision report, a university policy, a course plan, an institutional explanation, and a follow-up decision do different communicative work. A report can make a finding and expected action visible. A policy can stabilise a local rule. A follow-up decision can reconnect a later assessment to an earlier oversight decision. These genre differences affect how public follow-up visibility is produced (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994).

Broader UKÄ material supports this genre interpretation without becoming part of the empirical corpus. In UKÄ's quality-assurance work, follow-up is formalised through recurring documentary stages such as action reports, assessment material, statements, decisions, and publication of decisions (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2025b, 2020b). UKÄ's later reporting also describes follow-up as a recurring component of quality-development work, including follow-up of institutional quality-assurance reviews and education evaluations (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2025a). This supports the limited claim that follow-up is also an administrative genre with recognisable documentary expectations, even though the present thesis analyses selected legal-supervision chains rather than UKÄ's quality-assurance system as a whole.

This is especially clear in the contrast between the V2 outside-employment case at Stockholms universitet and the V4 outside-employment policy case at Karlstads universitet. In the Stockholm case, the described reminder routine does not appear in the submitted steering documents, and UKÄ states that the routine should suitably be documented in the rules (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, pp. 77–78). In the Karlstad case, the revised policy explicitly names UKÄ Report 2021:28 as part of the background for revision, alongside an internal audit report (Karlstads universitet, 2022, p. 1). The broader history of outside-employment oversight in Swedish higher education also treats information, control, documentation, and follow-up as linked governance issues (Högskoleverket, 2009). The issue in the selected cases is therefore not only whether outside-employment rules exist, but whether the public record preserves the relation between an oversight finding and a later rule or routine.

The course-plan cases show a similar but weaker pattern. UKÄ identifies unclear examination-form wording in course plans at Högskolan Väst and Linnéuniversitetet (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 32–33); (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021d, pp. 36–37). Course plans are public governance artefacts, but the analysed chains do not include later bridge documents reconnecting revised course-plan wording to the UKÄ findings. The issue is therefore not whether course plans exist. It is whether the revision history or public-document relation allows the oversight finding to be followed across time.

Future research could extend this genre analysis by coding institutional response documents

according to whether they primarily acknowledge findings, defer action, revise local rules, or close follow-up. Such a study would need a larger corpus, because the present thesis uses genre theory only to explain how different document types shape public traceability (Yates and Orlikowski, 1992; Orlikowski and Yates, 1994).

#### **5.4 Bridge documents as provenance-preserving artefacts**

The bridge document explains why V4 is analytically stronger than V2. A bridge document records a visible relationship between a previous finding and a subsequent response. Records-management and records-continuum perspectives treat such a relation as a way of preserving the evidential value of records by maintaining context, authenticity, provenance, and reconstructable relationships over time (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024; Casadesús de Mingo and Cerrillo-i Martínez, 2018). In accountability terms, it helps an external audience inspect how a public actor accounts for a past problem (Bovens, 2007).

The Högskolan Väst *Fastighetsmäklare* follow-up decision and the Karlstads universitet policy revision are two different types of bridge documents. The first is an oversight decision made by UKÄ after the original decision. The second is a local governance artefact that explicitly names the previous UKÄ report as part of the background to its revision. Both create stronger public follow-up linkage, but they do so in different genres. This underscores that traceability is not only a practical feature of a document object, but also a theoretical feature produced through administrative forms, publication routines, and conventions of reference.

At the same time, V4 should not be over-interpreted. A bridge document is a strong step towards public reconstructability, but it is not in itself evidence of substantive adequacy, legal compliance, causation, or sustained implementation. For example, the Karlstads universitet policy refers to the revision background and names both UKÄ Report 2021:28 and an internal audit report. This indicates provenance linkage, but not that UKÄ was the sole cause of the revision. The V4 code shows the strength of the public chain, not the quality of the governance solution. This difference is relevant because the thesis focuses on public follow-up visibility, not institutional performance.

#### **5.5 Institutional response without overclaiming**

Institutional theory helps explain why public documents may show responsiveness while still leaving the later public chain incomplete. In response to external expectations, organisations often enact compliance through formal structures, documented procedures, and accounts that signal legitimacy (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). In the V2 cases, UKÄ's expected action is visible, and the institution may have acted internally or through documents that are not part of the analysed corpus. The absence of a public bridge should therefore be interpreted as a limitation in the public documentary chain, not as a mirror of institutional reality

(Trace, 2002).

This cautious interpretation is central to the thesis. The study does not argue that V2 institutions did not act, nor that V4 institutions were necessarily fully compliant. Rather, it contrasts different levels of public reconstructability. This makes the V2/V4 distinction useful without turning it into an evaluation of the institutions. It also keeps the contribution within Informatics: the focus is on the public information infrastructure that carries findings and follow-up, rather than on hidden organisational processes outside the public record.

## 5.6 Visibility, burden, and coordination

A more traceable documentary chain is not cost-free. Documentation, reporting, evaluation, and control requirements for higher-education institutions are already increasing in Sweden (Ahlbäck Öberg and Boberg, 2023; Andersson et al., 2024; Ahlbäck Öberg and Boberg, 2024; Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2024; Alvehus and Kastberg, 2019). UKÄ's mapping of administrative burden in relation to evaluation indicates that unclear evaluation purposes, overlap between evaluations, and short planning horizons can increase burdens for universities and university colleges (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2024). The implication of the present thesis is therefore not that institutions should produce more documentation for the sake of documentation. The problem is not primarily the volume of documents. It is the relationship between documents: records already produced for oversight should contain stronger document relationships, such as report numbers, reasons for revision, decision identifiers, and links to earlier findings, in order to make follow-up easier to reconstruct.

This interpretation is also consistent with UKÄ's coordination work. UKÄ describes the advantages of coordinating follow-up, evaluation, and analysis as creating overview, identifying opportunities for cooperation, reducing overlap, reducing reporting burdens, and increasing the reuse of existing review results and knowledge (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2018, 2022). This thesis therefore proposes a practical approach to increased public reconstructability: it should be pursued by improving linkage and reuse of existing records, rather than by creating more parallel reporting chains.

This also connects to the problem of audit society. Power's critique of audit practices is a warning that documentation can become ritualised and decoupled from substantive improvement (Power, 1997). If a bridge document is used only as a closing ritual, it may become another formality. However, in this thesis its value is more limited and more specific. A bridge document is not treated as proof of implementation. It is treated as a way of helping the public record maintain the connection from finding, to expected response, to later governance artefact. The recommendation is therefore not more ceremony in reporting, but leaner documentary practices that preserve provenance.

## 5.7 Design-oriented implications for public-sector information systems

The results are relevant for public-sector information systems and document-management practices. The implication is not that oversight organisations, universities, or university colleges need to create more documents. Rather, the results indicate the value of improved relational documentation. Public follow-up evidence could be strengthened by persistent identifiers for reports and decisions, references from revised policies or routines to UKÄ decisions, short revision logs, and metadata that identifies which decision or finding a later governance artefact addresses (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Stratton and Carter, 2023; DAMA International, 2017; ARMA International, 2017).

The practical implication is therefore system-oriented. It concerns the case-management, document-management, and publication systems that public organisations use for their records. Public follow-up visibility could, in principle, be strengthened if such systems supported explicit links between oversight findings and subsequent governance artefacts, persistent identifiers, case histories, and publication metadata. Although no particular system implementation is evaluated in this thesis, the results indicate that public reconstructability requires systems that preserve document lineage, rather than only storing documents as individual files.

This would support public reconstructability without turning every internal action into a separate public report. Documenting provenance within a policy, routine, course-plan revision, or follow-up decision could preserve information about why the document or decision exists and which earlier issue it addresses. Public document chains would then be more usable for students, administrators, oversight bodies, researchers, and external readers.

This also relates to public-value concerns in digital government. Information systems in public administration should not only support efficiency, but also human and democratic values such as transparency, accountability, fairness, and trust (Bannister and Connolly, 2014). Provenance-preserving document systems are therefore not merely technical improvements, but potential public-value infrastructures. The present study does not assess system design, but it points to a documentary requirement that could be studied in future design-oriented research.

These implications are design-oriented, but they are not design-science results. The thesis identifies a problem of documentary visibility and possible requirements for future systems. It does not develop or evaluate an artefact. A design science study would be required to create and test such a system (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007; Cronholm et al., 2024).

## 5.8 Bounded future-research implication: evidence abundance

This subsection is a bounded future-research implication of the document-chain analysis, not an empirical finding of the thesis. It is included only to explain why reconstructable document chains may become more important in evidence-rich or AI-assisted oversight settings.

The empirical analysis does not measure an *Oversight Shock*, and the selected corpus is too small to support claims about the prevalence of visibility gaps. A related future risk is an

imbalance between the ability to detect issues and the ability to provide documentary follow-up. If AI-assisted tools can signal many more low-level documentary or procedural issues, the governance challenge may shift from finding issues to classifying, prioritising, routing, and documenting accountable follow-up. In this context, public reconstructability becomes more important, because without bridge documents, stable identifiers, revision notes, or explicit references, more visible signals may produce fragmentation rather than accountability (Cao, 2023; Cao et al., 2024; Shrestha et al., 2019; Ananny and Crawford, 2018; Widlak and Peeters, 2025).

The implication is therefore modest: documentary follow-up visibility matters before oversight is scaled up into larger evidence environments with AI support. Future tools may make it easier to identify many low-level documentary or procedural irregularities, but many signals do not necessarily lead to stronger public accountability. Issues of interpretation, responsibility, and governance in complex information systems cannot be solved only by stronger detection (Ananny and Crawford, 2018; Widlak and Peeters, 2025). The challenge is likely to move from the search for potential problems to the categorisation of problems, prioritisation, allocation to relevant actors, and recording of accountable follow-up in a publicly reconstructable way (Cao, 2023; Cao et al., 2024; Ananny and Crawford, 2018).

The V2/V4 distinction helps specify this problem. Detected signals can remain disconnected unless they are supported by stable identifiers, revision notes, explicit follow-up references, or bridge documents. The oversight problem may become a problem of differentiating systematic patterns from high-volume anomaly signals, rather than a simple lack of evidence. Bridge documents do not solve that future problem by themselves, but they provide one documentary condition for connecting a visible issue to a later response.

The hybrid decision-support literature is therefore used as a future-oriented implication rather than as a core theoretical approach. Cao's research on human-centred hybrid decision support emphasises the complementary capabilities of humans and machines in decision-making (Cao, 2023; Cao et al., 2024). Interpreted cautiously in a public oversight setting, this implies that future systems would still depend on human and institutional judgement for interpretation, prioritisation, responsibility, and follow-up. More visible findings do not necessarily translate into more reconstructable follow-up. That is the narrower contribution of the present thesis.

## 5.9 Limitations and quality assessment

The analysis concerns documentary governance responses: the responses that become visible in public documents, not what an institution may do internally.

The study has several limitations. These limitations are important because the thesis investigates a visibility condition rather than the actual prevalence of follow-up practices. First, the corpus is small and purposive. It allows for analytical comparison, but not statistical generalisation. Second, only public documents are used. Internal remediation may exist but remain outside the analysed public record. Third, the V0–V4 scale is a transparent coding tool developed for this study, not a validated measurement instrument. Fourth, the coding was carried out by one researcher.

These limitations are addressed through conservative claims. A lower visibility code does not necessarily mean that the institution did not act. It may mean that the selected public chain lacks a bridge document, or that a retrievable public document exists outside the selected corpus. This detection-deficit risk is not treated as institutional failure, but as a public follow-up visibility issue within the analysed corpus and public search boundary. Silence is not used to infer internal action, and visible follow-up is not treated as legal closure. The thesis also distinguishes between verified source claims and analytical inferences. The evidence bank is included in Appendix A, and the coding criteria are included in the visibility scale. As a consequence, the thesis emphasises transparency, traceability, and bounded interpretation rather than generalisation.

Another methodological risk is visibility bias. Fully traceable document chains can seem more important because they are easier to find and follow in the public record. Conversely, weaker V2 chains can involve internal actions that were not preserved as public bridge documents. The V2/V4 distinction should therefore not be read as a dichotomy between action and inaction. It distinguishes between different levels of public reconstructability in the analysed corpus.

The supplementary robustness scan should be interpreted in the same way. It did not count legal deficiencies, validate the V0–V4 scale, or estimate the frequency of different visibility levels. It was used to determine whether the selected findings remained analytically plausible examples of documentary governance issues, and whether the difference between V2 and V4 remained meaningful when the four UKÄ reports were read more broadly. The scan provides a plausibility check rather than a stand-alone validation dataset. It strengthens the analytical defensibility of the study, but it does not turn the study from qualitative document analysis into a quantitative inventory (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Bowen, 2009).

The discussion therefore strengthens the thesis's bounded claim. The selected material illustrates that public follow-up visibility is enhanced when later documents preserve explicit links to earlier public oversight material. It does not support broader claims about legal sufficiency, actual remediation, causation, or system-wide prevalence.

## 6 Conclusion

### 6.1 Answer to the research question

The questions of this thesis were: how do selected UKÄ findings produce different levels of visibility of public follow-up, and how do subsequent public governance documents support this? The answer is that visibility depends on the structure of the public document chain. Expected consequences of action can become visible in UKÄ reports when documentary governance problems are identified and institutions are expected to adjust routines, course plans, policies, guidelines, or documented practices. This can be seen in V2, visible expectation. More visible public follow-up, V4, occurs when a later public bridge document or revised governance artefact directly refers back to earlier UKÄ material.

The difference has to do with public traceability, not institutional performance. The absence of a public bridge document in the selected corpus does not mean that no public chain exists elsewhere; it means only that the analysed public chain does not preserve such linkage within the selected public search boundary. It is not a statement that no internal action occurred, that legal non-compliance occurred, or that remediation did not take place. A public relation becomes stronger when there is a bridge document, but the thesis does not thereby verify legal closure, substantive adequacy, causation, or enduring implementation (Bovens, 2007; Tough, 2011; Meijer, 2003; Trace, 2002).

This contrast is highlighted in the selected cases. The V2 cases make findings and expectations visible, but the analysed chains do not contain later public documents that explicitly carry the issues forward. The V4 cases differ because a later public follow-up decision or revised policy preserves an explicit link to earlier UKÄ material. The central conclusion is therefore that, in addition to the presence of documents, the public information infrastructure must maintain documentary relationships, provenance, and evidential context over time (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; Meijer, 2003; Upward, 1996; Hurley et al., 2024).

## 6.2 Contribution to Informatics

The thesis provides a bounded Informatics argument: public reconstructability is an infrastructural condition produced by document genres, explicit bridge documents, identifiers, revision notes, and metadata-like linkages. The legal-supervision context defines the oversight event, but the Informatics contribution is to analyse whether that event can still be traced in the information available to the public. The study shows that documentary governance is not only about the production of documents, but also about relationships between documents, records, systems, and contexts (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; International Organization for Standardization, 2016; Meijer, 2003; Hurley et al., 2024; Stratton and Carter, 2023). Findings, responses, policies, course plans, routines, and follow-up decisions become analytically useful when they can be connected over time.

The thesis also presents a simple qualitative coding method for analysing public follow-up visibility. The V0–V4 typology helps differentiate visible expectation from stronger follow-up linkage without making legal claims about closure. This makes the study relevant for documentary governance, public-sector information systems, information infrastructure, and accountability in higher education under conditions of institutional autonomy and external steering (Kallio et al., 2021; Bannister and Connolly, 2014). By operationalising public reconstructability through bridge documents and provenance-preserving features such as report numbers, decision numbers, revision notes, explicit references, and stable identifiers, the thesis presents concrete requirements for records-management systems and publication practices that could strengthen public follow-up visibility without necessarily increasing the amount of documentation.

The contribution is deliberately narrow. The thesis does not present the V0–V4 scale as a legally validated measurement instrument, does not estimate how often visibility patterns occur, and does not assess the legal adequacy of institutional responses. Its contribution is to show how selected public-sector document chains can be handled as information infrastructure, and how public reconstructability can be treated as a documentary condition for accountability.

### 6.3 Practical implications

The implication is not that UKÄ or higher education institutions need to produce more documents. The results instead suggest the importance of improving the documentation of relations. Public follow-up visibility could be improved through persistent report and decision identifiers, explicit references from revised policies or routines back to UKÄ findings, short revision logs, and meta-data that shows which finding a later governance artefact responds to (International Organization for Standardization, 2016; DAMA International, 2017; ARMA International, 2017; Stratton and Carter, 2023). Such measures would support traceability without becoming a recommendation for more reporting for its own sake (Alvehus and Kastberg, 2019; Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2024).

One core implication is that public-sector systems should retain the history of documents. A public record should ideally contain not only the fact that a document exists, but also why it exists, which oversight finding or decision it relates to, and how changes or revisions to the record can be followed over time. This is especially important for policies, routines, templates, course plans, and guidelines that may change over time. If readers can only see the most recent version, and no revision history or explicit reference is preserved, the public record may be legally available while still being difficult to reconstruct analytically (Stratton and Carter, 2023).

This implies that future systems for institutional governance artefacts should preserve provenance links between findings, institutional responses, and later governance artefacts. Oversight registers, document-management systems, and publication practices could support this by carrying report numbers or decision numbers forward into follow-up documents, publishing short change notes for policy revisions, connecting revised routines to the oversight finding they respond to, and maintaining version histories for compliance-relevant documents. These are design-oriented implications only. Such systems would need to be prototyped and evaluated in a separate design science study (Hevner et al., 2004; Peffers et al., 2007; Cronholm et al., 2024).

### 6.4 Limitations and future research

The study is limited to selected public documents, a bounded public search procedure, and a small number of document chains. The distinction between V2 and V4 is useful for analytical purposes, but the thesis cannot estimate the frequency of either pattern across UKÄ supervision or Swedish higher education more broadly. The absence of an identified bridge document should therefore not be interpreted as evidence of a lack of institutional action, or as proof that no relevant record exists elsewhere.

The coding was also conducted by one researcher only, and the interpretive nature of the V0–V4 scale is another limitation. The coding rules have been made explicit and are conservative, but no intercoder reliability test was performed. The scale should therefore be understood as an inspectable analytical typology for this specific corpus, not as a general measurement model. The thesis also does not assess whether stronger public reconstructability leads to better accountability outcomes in practice. It examines whether selected public records contain sufficient linkage to make follow-up reconstructable.

Future studies could expand the corpus, compare different types of UKÄ supervision, interview administrators, or systematically request official documents in order to compare published visibility with legal retrievability. A larger study could examine whether V2, V3, and V4 patterns differ across policy areas, institutions, or oversight genres. A design science approach could also be used to prototype metadata schemas, follow-up registers, or document-linking tools that support stronger public document chains.

Further research could focus on how AI-supported oversight transforms oversight from a search problem into a triage problem: how to process many small signals related to documentation and procedures, how to act on them, and how to connect them to appropriate institutional follow-up (Cao, 2023; Cao et al., 2024; Shrestha et al., 2019; Ananny and Crawford, 2018; Widlak and Peeters, 2025). This future-research point concerns a possible development in public-sector oversight, not the author’s own writing process.

## 6.5 Final statement

Public governance is documentary as well as organisational. Stronger public follow-up visibility appears in the selected UKÄ chains when later public documents preserve clear links to earlier public oversight material. In the absence of such links, public documents may remain accessible, while the follow-up relation can only be weakly reconstructed. In the type of oversight chain explored in this thesis, the documentary condition for public accountability is strengthened when formally public documents are durable, linkable, and reconstructable. The thesis therefore demonstrates that public follow-up visibility requires a public information infrastructure that preserves not only the documents themselves, but also the documentary relations that allow findings, expectations, and later governance artefacts to be followed over time (Star and Ruhleder, 1996; Bowker and Star, 1999; Meijer, 2003; Hurley et al., 2024).

# A Document Corpus, Evidence Bank, and Coding Guide

This appendix makes the qualitative coding audit trail inspectable. It documents the public search boundary, the final source-verification log, source-verification notes, selected documents, the evidence bank, the coding matrix, the supplementary robustness scan, a borderline coding example, a coding guide, and the visibility scale. The appendix supports the main text. It does not turn the study into a quantitative inventory of UKÄ supervision, and it does not prove the absence of documents outside the selected public corpus. When possible, printed page numbers in the PDF files are used for page references. The column “PDF page” indicates the one-indexed location in the PDF source used during the evidence check.

## A.1 Supplementary concept guide

The core concepts needed to follow the argument are detailed in the main text. For the purposes of coding and discussion, secondary terms and boundary concepts are listed in Table A.1.

**Table A.1:** Additional concepts and boundary terms.

Concept	Definition	Role in the thesis
Administrative genres	Repeated communicative forms, such as reports, responses, decisions, policies, templates, course plans, and routines.	Describes why document type matters for the public visibility of responsibility, response, and follow-up.
Information artefact	A document or record considered as a structured carrier of information, meaning, responsibility, and organisational action.	Makes it possible to analyse reports, decisions, policies, routines, course plans, and follow-up documents as objects in an Informatics study.
Document lineage	The traceable link between an initial finding, response, anticipated action, and subsequent governance artefact.	Reflects the thesis's focus on relationships between documents, not only on the availability of individual documents.
Decisive evidence anchor	The document relation or textual feature that justifies a coding decision.	Embeds V2/V4 coding as an evidence-informed analytical process, not only as a label.
Public search boundary	The selected public-document search set and evidence base within which bridge documents were identified or not identified.	Explains that “no bridge in corpus” does not mean that no document exists elsewhere, but is a statement about the analysed public material.
Institutional response	An official organisational reaction to external demands, for example a policy, routine, procedure, or statement of intended action.	Contributes to interpreting why a visible formal response may not necessarily create a strong public follow-up chain.
Audit ritual	A situation where documentation or review demonstrates accountability without necessarily improving substantive follow-up.	Cautions that bridge documents should increase public reconstructability rather than become ceremonial documentation.
Public value	Values such as transparency, accountability, fairness, and trust in relation to public-sector information systems.	Links documentary traceability to broader digital-government concerns beyond efficiency.

## A.2 Public search and corpus-boundary protocol

The following table documents the bounded public search logic used to define the corpus and to avoid treating absence of a bridge document as evidence of absence of internal action. The search was oriented toward publicly visible bridge documents, not toward proving that no relevant document could exist elsewhere. The table reports the source basis, search locations, indicative terms, and coding decisions used for the analysis.

The original source-gathering phase was conducted between 3 and 7 February 2026, after proposal and supervisor-assignment work between 26 January and 2 February 2026. Notebook-supported exploratory analysis of the material began on 5 March 2026. A final source-retrieval and verification run was conducted on 17 May 2026. This final run produced a source-retrieval log, source-retrieval table, text-extraction log, raw source PDFs, cleaned text files, and page-level text files. These materials were used to strengthen the audit trail and verify the final corpus boundary. They are not treated as empirical evidence in themselves; the empirical evidence remains the cited public UKÄ and university documents.

**Table A.2:** Public search and corpus-boundary protocol.

Chain / issue	Search date/range	Search location	Search terms / source basis	Result and coding decision
Högskolan Väst 2021:18, course evaluations	3–7 Feb.; final verification 17 May 2026	UKÄ report; Högskolan Väst public website; general web search	UKÄ Report 2021:18; “Högskolan Väst UKÄ 2021:18 kursvärdering”; “kursvärdering resultat åtgärder UKÄ Högskolan Väst”; “riktlinjer kursvärdering Högskolan Väst UKÄ”	No later public document was identified in the selected corpus that explicitly reconnected a revised guideline or follow-up document to the UKÄ finding. Coded V2.
Högskolan Väst 2021:18, examination forms	3–7 Feb.; final verification 17 May 2026	UKÄ report; Högskolan Väst public website; general web search	UKÄ Report 2021:18; “Högskolan Väst UKÄ 2021:18 examinationsformer”; “kursplan examinationsformer UKÄ Högskolan Väst”; “UKÄ kursplaner Högskolan Väst 2021:18”	No later public document was identified in the selected corpus that explicitly reconnected a revised course-plan artefact to the UKÄ finding. Coded V2.
Stockholms universitet 2020:06, outside employment	3–7 Feb.; final verification 17 May 2026	UKÄ report; Stockholms universitet public website; general web search	UKÄ Report 2020:06; “Stockholms universitet UKÄ 2020:06 bisysslor”; “bisysslor regler Stockholms universitet UKÄ”; “två gånger per år bisysslor Stockholms universitet”	No later public steering document was identified in the selected corpus that explicitly reconnected the routine to the UKÄ finding. Coded V2.
Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29, examination forms	3–7 Feb.; final verification 17 May 2026	UKÄ report; Linnéuniversitetet public website; general web search	UKÄ Report 2021:29; “Linnéuniversitetet UKÄ 2021:29 examinationsformer”; “kursplan examinationsformer Linnéuniversitetet UKÄ”; “UKÄ Linnéuniversitetet kursplaner”	No later public document was identified in the selected corpus that explicitly reconnected a revised course-plan artefact to the UKÄ finding. Coded V2.

Chain / issue	Search date/range	Search location	Search terms / source basis	Result and coding decision
Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	3–7 Feb.; final verification 17 May 2026	UKÄ decision and follow-up decision; general web search	Original UKÄ decision 2021-04-20; follow-up decision 32-00327-21; “32-00327-21”; “Högskolan Väst Fastighetsmäklare UKÄ uppföljning”	A later UKÄ follow-up decision explicitly referred back to the April 2021 decision and was included as a bridge document. In some issues, the later decision also states that UKÄ’s legal follow-up is closed. Coded V4, but not treated as an independent assessment of long-term internal implementation.
Karlstads universitet, outside employment	3–7 Feb.; final verification 17 May 2026	UKÄ report; Karlstads universitet public policy document; general web search	UKÄ Report 2021:28; <i>Policy om bisysslor</i> ; “Karlstads universitet UKÄ 2021:28 bisysslor”; “Policy om bisysslor UKÄ 2021:28”	The revised policy explicitly stated that the revision was made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28. Coded V4.
All four selected institutions, publication- environment cross-check	3–7 Feb.; final verification 17 May 2026	UKÄ publication pages filtered by lärosäte for Högskolan Väst, Stockholms universitet, Karlstads universitet, and Linnéuniversitetet	UKÄ publication environment; institution-filtered publication searches; selected report titles, report numbers, decision numbers, and institution names	The cross-check was used for source verification and corpus-boundary control, not for expanding the empirical corpus. It confirmed the visibility of the selected UKÄ materials in the public publication environment and did not identify any additional qualifying bridge document that changed the V2/V4 coding.

The protocol makes the corpus boundary inspectable. It does not substitute for formal document requests, interviews, or internal records. A V2 code means that no qualifying later bridge document was identified within this bounded public corpus, not that the institution failed to act or that no retrievable public document exists elsewhere. This preserves the distinction between formal public availability and public reconstructability (Stratton and Carter, 2023; International Organization for Standardization, 2016).

**Final source-retrieval and verification log.** A final source-retrieval and verification run was conducted on 17 May 2026. The purpose was to verify the final corpus boundary, not to expand the empirical corpus. The run retrieved the official source documents used in the thesis and generated retrieval and extraction logs, raw source PDFs, cleaned text files, and page-level text files. These materials were used as audit-trail support and are not treated as empirical evidence in themselves; the empirical claims remain grounded in the cited public UKÄ and university documents.

**Table A.3:** Final source-retrieval and verification log, 17 May 2026.

Chain / issue	Date	Search / retrieval location	Retrieved file / identifier	Source verified	Coding consequence
Stockholms universitet outside-employment routine	17 May 2026	UKÄ public source; official PDF retrieved	2020-07-02- stockholm- universitet.pdf; UKÄ Report 2020:06	UKÄ Report 2020:06, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Stockholms universitet</i>	Verified the V2 evidence anchor. No additional public bridge document was identified within the final verification boundary.
Högskolan Väst course-evaluation guidelines	17 May 2026	UKÄ public source; official PDF retrieved	21-06-14-hogskolan- vast.pdf; UKÄ Report 2021:18	UKÄ Report 2021:18, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Högskolan Väst</i>	Verified the V2 evidence anchor. No additional public bridge document was identified within the final verification boundary.

Chain / issue	Date	Search / retrieval location	Retrieved file / identifier	Source verified	Coding consequence
Högskolan Väst course plans and examination forms	17 May 2026	UKÄ public source; official PDF retrieved	21-06-14-hogskolan-vast.pdf; UKÄ Report 2021:18	UKÄ Report 2021:18, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Högskolan Väst</i>	Verified the V2 evidence anchor. No additional public bridge document was identified within the final verification boundary.
Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	17 May 2026	UKÄ public source; official PDFs retrieved	UKÄ decisions 31-00286-19 / 31-00486-19 and 32-00327-21	Original UKÄ decision 31-00286-19 / 31-00486-19 and follow-up decision 32-00327-21	Verified the V4 bridge-document chain. The follow-up decision explicitly reconnects to the earlier decision.
Linnéuniversitetet course-plan clarity	17 May 2026	UKÄ public source; official PDF retrieved	2021-11-29-linneuniversitetet.pdf; UKÄ Report 2021:29	UKÄ Report 2021:29, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Linnéuniversitetet</i>	Verified the V2 evidence anchor. No additional public bridge document was identified within the final verification boundary.
Karlstads universitet outside-employment policy	17 May 2026	UKÄ and Karlstads universitet public sources; official PDFs retrieved	2021-11-29-karlstads-universitet.pdf; policy-om-bisysslor-220411.pdf	UKÄ Report 2021:28 and revised <i>Policy om bisysslor</i>	Verified the V4 bridge-document chain. The revised policy explicitly states that the revision was made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28.

### A.3 UKÄ publication-environment verification

A final verification search was conducted on 17 May 2026 in UKÄ’s public publication environment for Högskolan Väst, Stockholms universitet, Karlstads universitet, and Linnéuniversitetet. This search was used as a source-verification and corpus-boundary step rather than as a basis for expanding the empirical corpus. It checked whether the selected legal-supervision reports and follow-up documents were visible in UKÄ’s public publication environment and whether any additional later public bridge document was visible for the selected chains.

The publication-environment check did not identify any additional document that changed the coding decisions reported in Table A.7. For the V2 chains, the check did not identify a later public document that explicitly reconnected a revised governance artefact to the relevant UKÄ finding. For the V4 chains, the already selected Högskolan Väst follow-up decision and Karlstads universitet revised policy remained the qualifying bridge documents. The check therefore supports the corpus boundary, but it does not prove that no further public or requestable records exist outside the checked publication environment.

This step also clarified the distinction between UKÄ’s publication environment and other publication routes. UKÄ’s public publication pages contain reports, supervision decisions, guidance documents, statistical analyses, and other publications, while some quality-assurance-system decisions may be published through other UKÄ channels such as Högscolekollen. Because this thesis studies selected legal-supervision and directly connected public document chains, the publication-environment check was used only to verify the selected corpus and not to add new quality-assurance cases.

## A.4 Official source verification notes

The source verification below records the official public documents used for the final evidence-anchor revision of Chapter 4. The table is not a new corpus. It clarifies which public files support the decisive evidence anchors in the results chapter and helps separate source verification from the interpretive V0–V4 coding.

**Table A.4:** Official source verification notes for the main cases.

Chain / issue	Official public document	Page anchor used	Verification note
Stockholms universitet outside-employment routine	UKÄ Report 2020:06, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Stockholms universitet</i>	pp. 77–78	Used to verify that the university described a twice-yearly reminder routine, while UKÄ noted that the routine did not appear in the submitted steering documents and should suitably be documented in the rules.
Högskolan Väst course plans	UKÄ Report 2021:18, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Högskolan Väst</i>	pp. 32–33	Used to verify UKÄ’s finding that selected course plans contained unclear examination-form wording and that the course plans were expected to be adjusted.
Högskolan Väst course-evaluation guidelines	UKÄ Report 2021:18, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Högskolan Väst</i>	pp. 40–41	Used to verify UKÄ’s finding that the guidelines did not clearly show which students should be informed about results/measures, how information should be provided, or how decisions on measures should be made available.
Linnéuniversitetet course plans	UKÄ Report 2021:29, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Linnéuniversitetet</i>	pp. 36–37	Used to verify UKÄ’s conclusion that three reviewed course plans did not state examination forms clearly enough and that the university was expected to adjust the course plans.
Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	UKÄ decision 31-00286-19 / 31-00486-19 and UKÄ follow-up decision 32-00327-21	Original decision p. 39; follow-up decision pp. 1–3	Used to verify that the original decision announced follow-up and that the later decision explicitly reconnected to the April 2021 decision, recorded submitted measures, and in some issues closed UKÄ’s legal follow-up.
Karlstads universitet outside-employment policy	UKÄ Report 2021:28 and Karlstads universitet, <i>Policy om bisysslor</i>	UKÄ report p. 69; policy p. 1	Used to verify the V4 bridge: UKÄ expected policy adjustment and the later revised policy explicitly states that revision was made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 and the internal auditor’s report.

## A.5 Selected public documents

**Table A.5:** Selected public documents.

Institution / chain	Document	Analytical use
Stockholms universitet	UKÄ Report 2020:06, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Stockholms universitet</i>	Used to analyse visible expectation concerning outside-employment routines and steering documents.

Institution / chain	Document	Analytical use
Högskolan Väst	UKÄ Report 2021:18, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Högskolan Väst</i>	Used to analyse V2 cases concerning course evaluations and unclear examination forms in course plans.
Högskolan Väst, <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i> chain	UKÄ decision 31-00286-19 / 31-00486-19, 20 April 2021	Original decision in a separate supervision chain concerning the commissioned education programme <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i> . Not treated as part of UKÄ Report 2021:18.
Högskolan Väst, <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i> chain	UKÄ follow-up decision 32-00327-21, 7 December 2021	Used to analyse strong public follow-up linkage where a later UKÄ decision explicitly refers back to the earlier supervision decision.
Linnéuniversitetet	UKÄ Report 2021:29, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Linnéuniversitetet</i>	Used to analyse a V2 case concerning course-plan clarity. Complaints handling is kept as supporting evidence only.
Karlstads universitet	UKÄ Report 2021:28, <i>Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på Karlstads universitet</i>	Used to analyse UKÄ's finding that the outside-employment policy should be adjusted.
Karlstads universitet	<i>Policy om bisysslor</i> , revised 2022	Used to analyse V4 public follow-up linkage because the policy explicitly refers to UKÄ Report 2021:28 as background for revision.

## A.6 Checked evidence bank

**Table A.6:** Checked evidence bank.

Finding context	Claim	Source	Printed page	PDF page	Short evidence note
Högskolan Väst 2021:18	Course evaluations: information and availability	UKÄ Report 2021:18	40–41	40–41	UKÄ finds that the guidelines do not clearly identify which students should receive information about results/measures, how information should be given, or how results/measures should be kept available.

Finding context	Claim	Source	Printed page	PDF page	Short evidence note
Högskolan Väst 2021:18	Course plans: unclear examination forms	UKÄ Report 2021:18	32–33	32–33	UKÄ identifies unclear examination-form wording and expects the relevant course plans to be adjusted.
Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	Original decision announces follow-up	UKÄ decision 2021-04-20	39	39	The decision states that UKÄ will follow up the matter and asks Högskolan Väst to report measures by 30 June 2021.
Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	Follow-up decision reconnects to original decision	UKÄ decision 32-00327-21	1–3	1–3	The later decision states that UKÄ followed up the 20 April 2021 decision and that Högskolan Väst submitted clarifications and an account of measures taken. In some issues, the decision also states that UKÄ's legal follow-up is closed.
Stockholms universitet 2020:06	Outside-employment reminder routine not documented in steering documents	UKÄ Report 2020:06	77–78	77–78	UKÄ notes that a twice-yearly reminder routine does not appear in submitted steering documents and that the routine should suitably be documented in the rules.
Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29	Course-plan clarity and examination forms	UKÄ Report 2021:29	36–37	36–37	UKÄ states that assessment forms are not clearly stated in three reviewed course plans.
Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29	Complaints-handling routines, supporting evidence only	UKÄ Report 2021:29	72–73	71–72	UKÄ notes that routines exist and are available, but annual summaries have not been systematic and routines should be reviewed. Not used as a main result row.
Karlstads universitet 2021:28	Outside-employment policy should be adjusted	UKÄ Report 2021:28	69	69	UKÄ expects the policy to state clearly that teachers have a duty to inform the university about relevant outside employment.
Karlstads universitet 2022	Revised policy explicitly cites UKÄ Report 2021:28	<i>Policy om bisysslor</i>	1	1	The revised policy states that the revision is made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 and the internal auditor's report.

## A.7 Main coding matrix

**Table A.7:** Main finding-level coding matrix.

Finding context	Document chain	Finding / issue	Level	Evidence note
Högskolan Väst 2021:18	UKÄ Report 2021:18 (no later bridge identified in corpus)	Course evaluations: information about results and measures	V2	UKÄ finds that the guidelines do not clearly show which students should be informed about results/measures or how information should be provided, and expects the guidelines to be reviewed (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 40–41).
Högskolan Väst 2021:18	UKÄ Report 2021:18 (no later bridge identified in corpus)	Course plans: unclear examination forms	V2	UKÄ identifies unclear examination-form wording in selected course plans and expects the course plans to be adjusted (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 32–33).
Högskolan Väst <i>Fastighetsmäklare</i>	UKÄ decision 2021-04-20 + follow-up decision 2021-12-07	Commissioned education supervision and follow-up	V4	Original decision states that UKÄ will follow up the matter and requests reporting of measures; later decision explicitly follows up the April decision and, in some issues, states that UKÄ's legal follow-up is closed (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021a, p. 39); (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021e, pp. 1–3).
Stockholms universitet 2020:06	UKÄ Report 2020:06 (no later bridge identified in corpus)	Outside-employment routine described but not documented in steering documents	V2	UKÄ notes that a twice-yearly reminder routine is described but does not appear in submitted steering documents, and says the routine should suitably be documented in the rules (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, pp. 77–78).

Finding context	Document chain	Finding / issue	Level	Evidence note
Linnéuniversitetet 2021:29	UKÄ Report 2021:29 (no later bridge identified in corpus)	Course-plan clarity and examination forms	V2	UKÄ states that three course plans have deficiencies concerning clearly stated examination forms (Universitetskanslersämberet, 2021d, pp. 36–37).
Karlstads universitet 2021:28 + 2022 policy	UKÄ Report 2021:28 + revised local policy	Outside-employment policy revision	V4	UKÄ expects the policy to be adjusted; the later revised policy explicitly states that the revision is made against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 (Universitetskanslersämberet, 2021c, p. 69); (Karlstads universitet, 2022, p. 1).

## A.8 Supplementary robustness-scan log

The supplementary scan was used as a limited plausibility check of analytical suitability, not as a quantitative inventory, validation dataset, or prevalence estimate. It covered the four UKÄ legal-supervision reports already included in the corpus and looked for additional documentary governance issues that resembled the selected findings.

**Table A.8:** Supplementary robustness-scan log.

Report	Additional issue types noted during scan	Role in the thesis
UKÄ Report 2020:06, Stockholms universitet	Additional documentary issues concerning local rules, complaint-related routines, student influence, course-evaluation documentation, and public steering documents.	Supported the analytical suitability of treating outside-employment documentation as a documentary governance issue. Not used to count deficiencies or estimate prevalence.
UKÄ Report 2021:18, Högskolan Väst	Additional documentary issues concerning course plans, course evaluations, appeal information, and local guidelines.	Supported the selection of two distinct V2 findings from the same report while avoiding an institution-level prevalence claim.

Report	Additional issue types noted during scan	Role in the thesis
UKÄ Report 2021:29, Linnéuniversitetet	Additional documentary issues concerning course-plan clarity, complaints-handling routines, and documentation of student-facing procedures.	Used as supporting context only; the main result remains the selected course-plan clarity finding.
UKÄ Report 2021:28, Karlstads universitet	Additional documentary issues concerning local steering documents and outside-employment policy formulation.	Supported the contrast between UKÄ's expectation and Karlstad's later revised policy that explicitly references the UKÄ report.

The scan helped check that the selected V2 findings remained analytically plausible examples of visible expectations within the same reports. It does not validate the V0–V4 scale, and it does not show how common V2 or V4 is in UKÄ supervision generally.

## A.9 Borderline coding example

The following borderline coding examples illustrate how the same passage can demonstrate institutional action, or anticipated action, without qualifying as strong public follow-up linkage. The determining factor is whether a later public record preserves an explicit link to the earlier UKÄ finding through a report number, decision identifier, revision note, or similar reference. If such a relationship was not found in the selected corpus, the case was retained at V2 despite the possibility that action occurred internally.

**Table A.9:** Examples of borderline coding decisions.

Finding context	Why the passage could be read as stronger visibility	Final code	Rationale
Stockholms universitet 2020:06, outside-employment routine	The university refers to a twice-yearly reminder routine, indicating that there may be a practice beyond the report itself. UKÄ also states that the routine should suitably be documented in the rules (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2020a, pp. 77–78).	V2	The passage was not coded as V3 or V4 because no later public bridge document or revised steering document was identified in the selected corpus that explicitly linked the routine to the UKÄ finding. The code therefore reflects visible expectation and a documentation requirement, not absence of internal practice.

Finding context	Why the passage could be read as stronger visibility	Final code	Rationale
Högskolan Väst 2021:18, course evaluations	UKÄ expects the guidelines to be reviewed, which can be read as a clear corrective expectation. The passage therefore shows more than a finding-only situation (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021b, pp. 40–41).	V2	No later public follow-up document or revised guideline explicitly connected to the finding was identified in the analysed chain. The finding therefore remains V2 rather than V4.
Karlstads universitet 2021:28 and 2022 <i>Policy om bisysslor</i>	The UKÄ report by itself expects the policy to be adjusted, which would be V2. The later policy, however, clearly states that the revision was carried out against the background of UKÄ Report 2021:28 (Universitetskanslersämbetet, 2021c, p. 69); (Karlstads universitet, 2022, p. 1).	V4	This was assigned to V4 because a direct link from the later public policy to the UKÄ report is explicit. The bridge is not inferred from timing alone; it is based on the explicit mention in the revised policy.

The two V4 cases should be read as illustrative structural examples of strong public follow-up linkage, not as evidence of how common such bridge documents are in UKÄ oversight generally. Their role is analytical rather than statistical: they show what strong public reconstructability looks like in the selected corpus.

## A.10 Coding guide

Relevant passages were coded using the following questions:

1. **Finding formulation:** What issue does UKÄ identify or comment on?
2. **Document artefact:** What document, routine, template, course plan, rule, or public document is at stake?
3. **Responsibility formulation:** Does the responsibility statement imply a requirement, recommendation, expectation, assumption, or acknowledgement?
4. **Action visibility:** Does the public document state that there are routines, that routines are planned to be adjusted, that they are continuously improved, or that they have been changed?
5. **Follow-up visibility:** How far can the public follow the chain of documentation?

## A.11 Visibility scale

**Table A.10:** V0–V4 visibility scale.

Code	Label	Meaning
V0	Finding only	UKÄ finding visible, but no clear public response in the analysed material.
V1	Response visible	Response, explanation, or submitted material visible, but no clear action.
V2	Action stated / visible expectation	Planned, ongoing, expected, or claimed action visible, but no later bridge document identified in the selected corpus.
V3	Follow-up visible	Later follow-up document or governance artefact visible, but linkage is weak or indirect.
V4	Strong follow-up linkage	Later public follow-up document explicitly refers to the earlier finding, report, decision, or issue.

Coding was used for qualitative comparison rather than statistical measurement. Legal adequacy and actual internal remediation are not measured in the V0–V4 scale. The scale evaluates the public visibility of follow-up in the analysed document chain and within the bounded public corpus. Accordingly, V4 is not a sign that the issue has been completely addressed. It means that a later public document preserves an explicit relationship to an earlier finding, report, decision, or issue. V2 indicates that expected or planned action is visible, but that no qualifying later bridge document was identified within the selected corpus. Where the public record was ambiguous, the analysis did not infer internal remediation beyond what was visible in the documents themselves.

## A.12 AI Contribution Statement

Digital and AI-assisted tools were used in a limited and auxiliary manner during the thesis process. Gemini integrated in Google Colab was used to help debug Python code in the notebook-supported workflow. The Python/Colab workflow generated files used for document extraction, checking, and analysis support. No large language model generated the empirical material, selected the corpus, or made coding decisions.

Google Translate, synonym lexicons, manual terminology searches, and various LLM-based tools were used to suggest alternative translations, phrasings, synonyms, and English-language or terminological choices. These suggestions were used only as prompts for revision. They were not copied into the thesis as final text without author review, comparison, and rewriting. The final wording, translation choices, terminology, structure, interpretation, and argument were determined by the author.

Plagiarism-checking and AI-detection tools were used as supplementary quality-control measures to assess whether the writing appeared consistent with student-produced work. These checks

were not considered proof of originality, authorship, or academic validity, and they were not used as empirical evidence.

No AI tool was treated as an empirical source. AI tools did not determine the research question, select the public documents, delimit the corpus, code the document classes V0–V4, verify whether a bridge document existed, assess legal or institutional appropriateness, or interpret the results. The author remains responsible for the code workflow, source selection, document handling, analysis, translation, references, and all claims made in the thesis.

## References

- Ahlbäck Öberg, S. and Boberg, J. (2023). The decollegialization of higher education institutions in Sweden. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 9(2):126–143.
- Ahlbäck Öberg, S. and Boberg, J. (2024). Ökad kontroll och ökad byråkratisering: Interna effekter på lärosätena. Technical report, Sveriges universitets- och högskoleförbund, Stockholm. HERO, Uppsala universitet. Published October 2024. ISBN 978-91-989285-4-9.
- Alvehus, J. and Kastberg, G. (2019). Ökande administration: Belägg och potentiella förklaringar: två essäer. Technical Report 155, KFi – Kommunforskning i Västsverige, Göteborg.
- Ananny, M. and Crawford, K. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New Media & Society*, 20(3):973–989.
- Andersson, F. W., Jordahl, H., and Kärnä, A. (2024). Ballooning bureaucracy? stylized facts of growing administration in Swedish higher education. *Constitutional Political Economy*, 35(2):303–326.
- ARMA International (2017). Implementing the generally accepted recordkeeping principles. Technical Report ARMA International TR 30-2017, ARMA International. Includes the Information Governance Maturity Model and guidance for developing, evaluating, and improving information governance programs.
- Bannister, F. and Connolly, R. (2014). ICT, public values and transformative government: A framework and programme for research. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(1):119–128.
- Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4):447–468.
- Bovens, M. and Zouridis, S. (2002). From street-level to system-level bureaucracies: How information and communication technology is transforming administrative discretion and constitutional control. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2):174–184.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2):27–40.

- Bowker, G. C. and Star, S. L. (1999). *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Cao, L. (2023). *Designing Human-Centered Hybrid Decision Support Systems*. PhD thesis, University of Gothenburg. ISBN 978-91-8069-246-5 (PDF). URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2077/75568>. Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Cao, L., Lindman, J., Cronholm, S., and Göbel, H. (2024). Design principles for hybrid decision support systems in IT service management. In *ECIS 2024 Proceedings*, number 11. Complete Research Paper. Paper number 1653. URL: [https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2024/track23\\_designresearch/track23\\_designresearch/11](https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2024/track23_designresearch/track23_designresearch/11). Accessed 2026-05-11.
- Casadesús de Mingo, A. and Cerrillo-i Martínez, A. (2018). Improving records management to promote transparency and prevent corruption. *International Journal of Information Management*, 38(1):256–261.
- Cronholm, S., Sjöström, J., Göbel, H., and Juell-Skielse, G. (2024). Generalisation of design science research. In *ECIS 2024 Proceedings*, number 6. Complete Research Paper. Paper number 1390. URL: [https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2024/track23\\_designresearch/track23\\_designresearch/6](https://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2024/track23_designresearch/track23_designresearch/6). Accessed 2026-05-11.
- DAMA International (2017). *DAMA-DMBOK: Data Management Body of Knowledge*. Technics Publications, Basking Ridge, NJ, 2 edition.
- DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2):147–160.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2):219–245.
- Fox, J. A. (2007). The uncertain relationship between transparency and accountability. *Development in Practice*, 17(4–5):663–671.
- Hanseth, O. and Lyytinen, K. (2010). Design theory for dynamic complexity in information infrastructures: The case of building internet. *Journal of Information Technology*, 25(1):1–19.
- Henningsson, S., Hedman, J., and Andersson, B. (2013). Shaping information infrastructure evolution: Governmental claims of architectural control points. In *ECEG 2013: 13th European Conference on eGovernment*, pages 240–247. Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited.
- Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., and Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1):75–105.
- Högskoleverket (2009). Högskolelärares bisysslor: En uppföljning. Technical Report Rapport 2009:31 R, Högskoleverket, Stockholm.
- Hurley, C., McKemmish, S., Reed, B., and Timbery, N. (2024). The power of provenance in the records continuum. *Archival Science*, 24(4):825–845.
- International Organization for Standardization (2016). ISO 15489-1:2016 information and documentation — records management — part 1: Concepts and principles. Technical report, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva.

- Kallio, T. J., Kallio, K.-M., Huusko, M., Pyykkö, R., and Kivistö, J. (2021). Balancing between accountability and autonomy: The impact and relevance of public steering mechanisms within higher education. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 33(6):46–68.
- Karlstads universitet (2022). Policy om bisysslor. Decision 53/22, Dnr C2022/390, valid from 2022-04-11. URL: [https://inslaget.kau.se/sites/default/files/2023-01/Policy%20om%20bisysslor%20220411\\_tillganglig.pdf](https://inslaget.kau.se/sites/default/files/2023-01/Policy%20om%20bisysslor%20220411_tillganglig.pdf). Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA, 4 edition.
- Meijer, A. (2009). Understanding modern transparency. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75(2):255–269.
- Meijer, A. J. (2003). Trust this document! ICTs, authentic records and accountability. *Archival Science*, 3(3):275–290.
- Meyer, J. W. and Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2):340–363.
- Monteiro, E., Pollock, N., Hanseth, O., and Williams, R. (2013). From artefacts to infrastructures. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 22(4–6):575–607.
- Oates, B. J. (2006). *Researching Information Systems and Computing*. SAGE, London.
- Orlikowski, W. J. and Yates, J. (1994). Genre repertoire: The structuring of communicative practices in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(4):541–574.
- Peffer, K., Tuunanen, T., Rothenberger, M. A., and Chatterjee, S. (2007). A design science research methodology for information systems research. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(3):45–77.
- Pilerot, O. (2016). The ruling relation of evidence-based practice: the case of documentary governance in a social welfare service. *Information Research*, 21(1):paper 703.
- Power, M. (1997). *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Prior, L. (2003). *Using Documents in Social Research*. SAGE Publications Ltd, London.
- Saldaña, J. (2025). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. SAGE Publications, London, 5 edition.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. SAGE, London.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2):63–75.
- Shepherd, E., Stevenson, A., and Flinn, A. (2010). Information governance, records management, and freedom of information: A study of local government authorities in England. *Government Information Quarterly*, 27(4):337–345.
- Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., and von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. *California Management Review*, 61(4):66–83.

- Star, S. L. and Ruhleder, K. (1996). Steps toward an ecology of infrastructure: Design and access for large information spaces. *Information Systems Research*, 7(1):111–134.
- Stratton, C. and Carter, D. (2023). Locating information systems in the freedom of information process. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(2):101807.
- Sveriges riksdag (1949). Tryckfrihetsförordningen (1949:105). Svensk författningssamling.
- Sveriges riksdag (1992). Högskolelagen (1992:1434). Svensk författningssamling.
- Sveriges riksdag (1993). Högskoleförordningen (1993:100). Svensk författningssamling.
- Sveriges riksdag (2017). Förvaltningslagen (2017:900). Svensk författningssamling.
- Tough, A. (2011). Accountability, open government and record keeping: Time to think again? *Records Management Journal*, 21(3):225–236.
- Trace, C. B. (2002). What is recorded is never simply “what happened”: Record keeping in modern organizational culture. *Archival Science*, 2(1–2):137–159.
- Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10):837–851.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2018). Samordning av uppföljning och utvärdering: Rapportering av ett regeringsuppdrag. Technical Report Rapport 2018:3, Universitetskanslersämbetet, Stockholm.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2020a). Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på stockholms universitet. Technical Report UKÄ Rapport 2020:06, Universitetskanslersämbetet. Diarienummer 32-00585-19. Published 2 July 2020. URL: <https://gamla.uka.se/download/18.696ad784172ea9f045b298d/1593702050447/2020-07-02-tillsyn-av-regeltill%C3%A4mpningen-pa-stockholm-universitet.pdf>. Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2020b). Vägledning för uppföljning av utbildningar med ifrågasatt kvalitet: Utbildningsutvärdering på grundnivå och avancerad nivå samt forskarnivå. Technical Report Reg.nr 411-262-20, Universitetskanslersämbetet, Stockholm. Originally published 2018, revised 2020.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2021a). Anmälningar mot högskolan väst om uppdragsutbildningen fastighetsmäklare, 120 högskolepoäng. Decision 31-00286-19 and 31-00486-19, 20 April 2021. URL: <https://gamla.uka.se/download/18.233a99f01784aaa5f55ca5d/1619005712540/Beslut%2031-00486-19%20och%2031-00286-19%20-%20webben.pdf>. Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2021b). Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på högskolan väst. Technical Report UKÄ Rapport 2021:18, Universitetskanslersämbetet. Diarienummer 32-00561-20. Published 14 June 2021. URL: <https://gamla.uka.se/download/18.15866dd179eb83f14e22b1/1623675573838/21-06-14%20Tillsyn%20av%20regeltill%C3%A4mpningen%20p%C3%A5%20H%C3%B6gskolan%20V%C3%A4st.pdf>. Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2021c). Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på karlstads universitet. Technical Report UKÄ Rapport 2021:28, Universitetskanslersämbetet. Diarienummer 32-00215-21. Published 29 November 2021. URL: <https://gamla.uka.se/download/18.9>

- d9edf717cdf6b63a7a739/1638351873258/2021-11-29-Tillsynsrapport%20av%20regeltillmpningen%20av%20Karlstads%20universitet.pdf. Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2021d). Tillsyn av regeltillämpningen på linnéuniversitetet. Technical Report UKÄ Rapport 2021:29, Universitetskanslersämbetet. Diarienummer 32-00216-21. Published 29 November 2021. URL: <https://gamla.uka.se/download/18.9d9edf717cdf6b63a7a71d/1638351316008/2021-11-29-Tillsynsrapport%20Linneuniversitetet.pdf>. Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2021e). Uppföljning av UKÄ:s tillsynsbeslut om högskolan västs uppdragsutbildning fastighetsmäklare, 120 högskolepoäng. Decision 32-00327-21, 7 December 2021. URL: <https://gamla.uka.se/download/18.28b81b1217db83b3254588/1639554011344/Beslut%2032-00327-21.pdf>. Accessed 2026-05-10.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2022). Nätverk för samordning av uppföljning, utvärdering och analys av högskolans verksamhet: Rapportering av ett regeringsuppdrag. Technical Report Rapport 2022:10, Universitetskanslersämbetet, Johanneshov.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2024). Utvärderingars inverkan på den administrativa bördan i högskolesektorn: En kartläggning. Technical Report Rapport 2024:34, Universitetskanslersämbetet, Johanneshov. Published 13 December 2024.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2025a). Kvalitetssäkring och kvalitetsutveckling 2025: Redovisning till regeringen. Technical Report Rapport 2026:3, Universitetskanslersämbetet, Johanneshov.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2025b). Vägledning för uppföljning av granskning av lärosätenas kvalitetssäkringsarbete avseende utbildning och forskning. Technical Report Diarienummer 411-00590-24, Universitetskanslersämbetet, Johanneshov.
- Upward, F. (1996). Structuring the records continuum - part one. post-custodial principles and properties. *Archives & Manuscripts*, 24(2):268–285.
- Valverde, M. and Moore, A. (2019). The performance of transparency in public–private infrastructure project governance: The politics of documentary practices. *Urban Studies*, 56(4):689–704.
- Walsham, G. (2006). Doing interpretive research. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 15(3):320–330.
- Widlak, A. C. and Peeters, R. (2025). A theory of the infrastructure-level bureaucracy: Understanding the consequences of data-exchange for procedural justice, organizational decision-making, and data itself. *Government Information Quarterly*, 42(2):102021.
- Yates, J. and Orlikowski, W. J. (1992). Genres of organizational communication: A structural approach to studying communication and media. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2):299–326.