The Routledge Doctoral Supervisor's Companion

Supporting Effective Research in Education and the Social Sciences

Edited by
Melanie Walker and Pat Thomson

The Routledge Doctoral Supervisor's Companion

Accompanying *The Routledge Doctoral Student's Companion*, this book examines what it means to be a doctoral student in education and the social sciences, providing a guide for those supervising students. Exploring the key role and pedagogical challenges that face supervisors in students' personal development, the contributors outline the research capabilities that are essential for confidence, quality and success in doctorate-level research. Providing guidance about helpful resources and methodological support, the chapters:

- frame important questions within the history of debates
- act as a road map through international literatures
- make suggestions for good practice
- raise important questions and provide answers to key pedagogical issues
- provide advice on enabling students' scholarly careers and identities.

Although there is no one solution to ideal supervision, this wide-ranging text offers resources that will help supervisors develop their own personal approach to supervision. Ideal for all supervisors whether assisting part-time or full-time students, it is also highly suitable for helping academics to support international students who confront Western doctoral traditions and academic cultures, helping both supervisor and student to understand why things are as they are.

Melanie Walker is Professor of Higher Education at the University of Nottingham, and is also Extraordinary Professor at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa.

Pat Thomson is Professor of Education at the University of Nottingham, and an Adjunct Professor at the University of South Australia and a Visiting Professor at Deakin University, Victoria, Australia.

The Routledge Doctoral Supervisor's Companion

Supporting Effective Research in Education and the Social Sciences

Edited by
Melanie Walker and Pat Thomson

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Contents

List of figures

List of tables

Notes on contributors

Aitchison, Claire PhD is a Senior Lecturer (Postgraduate Literacies) at the University of Western Sydney, Australia. Her research interests are doctoral writing and pedagogies for doctoral education. Recent publications include *Publishing Pedagogies for the Doctorate and Beyond* with B. Kamler and A. Lee (Routledge, 2010) and 'Research Writing Groups' in *Writing Qualitative Research on Practice* (J. Higgs, D. Horsfall and S. Grace, Eds, Sense, 2009).

Bloch, Marianne PhD is Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, with joint appointment in the Department of Gender and Women's Studies. She coordinates the Global Studies, Teaching and the Curriculum masters in C&I at UW-Madison. Recent research and teaching have focused on early education/child care policy, and poststructural, postcolonial and feminist studies of education. Recent books include *Governing children, families, and education: Restructuring the welfare state* (Palgrave, 2003), *Women and Education in Sub-Saharan Africa* (Lynn Reinner, 1998).

David, Miriam PhD is Professor of Sociology of Education and was interim Director of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme at the Institute of Education, University of London. Her research interests include feminist methodologies, diversity, equity and inclusion in postcompulsory and higher education. Her most recent publications include *Improving Learning by Widening Participation in Higher Education* (Routledge, 2009) and editing a special issue of *Higher Education Policy* (March 2009), with L. Morley on 'Celebrations and Challenges: Gender and Higher Education'.

Dixon, Kerryn PhD is a Lecturer in the Applied English Language Department in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. She has a PhD from the University of the Witwatersrand and is particularly interested in the application of Foucault in educational contexts. Her teaching and research are in the area of critical and early childhood literacy, language policy, world Englishness and research methodology.

Evans, Terry PhD is a Professor of Education at Deakin University, Geelong, Australia. He has supervised many doctoral candidates and also researched, published and taught doctoral education. He has edited, with C. Denholm, three books on doctorates, the latest is *Beyond Doctorates Downunder: maximising the impact of your Australian or New Zealand doctorate* (ACER, 2009).

Golde, Chris PhD is the Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Education at Stanford University, California, USA. Her scholarly interests include the doctoral student experience, disciplinary differences in graduate education, and improving graduate programs. Her recent publications include the books *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education* (2006) and *The Formation of Scholars* (2008).

Goode, Jackie PhD is a Senior Research Associate in the Social Sciences Department at Loughborough University. Her education publications include 'Telling tales out of school: connecting the prose and the passion in the learning and teaching of English' (*Qualitative Inquiry*, 2007), 'Empowering or disempowering the international PhD student?: constructions of the dependent and independent learner' (*British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 2007) and '"Managing" Disability: early experiences of university students with disabilities' (*Disability and Society*, 2007).

Gough, Noel PhD is Foundation Professor of Outdoor and Environmental Education and Associate Dean (Academic) in the Faculty of Education, La Trobe University, Victoria, Australia. His research interests include refining poststructuralist methodologies in education, with particular reference to curriculum inquiry, environmental education, and science education.

Grant, Barbara PhD is a Senior Lecturer at The University of Auckland. Her research interests are postgraduate supervision, academic identities and academic development. Her most recent publications include articles on supervision in *London Review of Education* and *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* and a practical book *Academic Writing Retreats: A facilitator's guide* (HERDSA Guide, 2008)

Harland, Tony PhD is Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Otago, New Zealand. His research is founded on a critique of the practices and values of a university education. The questions that concern him are: what ideas are valued in a university education, how are such values informed, and how might they change in the future?

Hughes, Michael PhD is a Senior Research Fellow with the Curtin Sustainable Tourism Centre at Curtin University, Western Australia. Michael's research interests currently revolve around communication and natural and cultural heritage values, and associated beliefs, attitudes and perceptions.

Janks, Hilary PhD is a Professor in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. Her teaching and research are in the areas of language education in multilingual classrooms, language policy, critical literacy and postgraduate pedagogy. Her work is committed to a search for equity and social justice in contexts of poverty.

Lee, Alison is Professor of Education and Director of the Centre for Research in Learning and Change at the University of Technology, Sydney. She has researched and published in doctoral education, with a focus on supervision, writing and professional doctorates. Her most recent publications in this area include *Changing Practices of Doctoral Education* (with D. Boud, Routledge, 2009) and *Publishing Pedagogies for the Doctorate and Beyond* (with C. Aitchison and B. Kamler, Routledge, 2010).

Leonard, Diana PhD is Emeritus Professor at the Institute of Education University of London and a Visiting Professor at the University of Sussex. Her research interests include gender and education, the history of feminism, and the sociology of postgraduate studies. Her recent publications include *A Women's Guide to Doctoral Studies* (Open University Press, 2001) and with M. Rab 'The inter-relationship of employment, marriage and higher education for Pakistani students in the UK', in Unterhalter, E. and Carpentier, V. (Eds), *Whose interests are we serving? Global inequalities and higher education* (Palgrave, in press).

Manathunga, Catharine PhD is a Senior Lecturer in Higher Education at The University of Queensland, Australia. Her research interests include doctoral education, doctoral supervision pedagogies and the history of teaching and learning in universities. Her most recent publications include 'Research as an intercultural contact zone'. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education.* 30(2): 165–77, and *Making a place: an oral history of academic development in Australia*, which was co-edited with A. Lee and P. Kandlbinder (HERDSA, 2008).

McLeod, Julie PhD is Associate Professor in the Melbourne Graduate School of Education, University of Melbourne. Her research interests encompass youth studies, feminism, inequality and education, and qualitative methodologies. Recent publications include *Researching Social Change: Qualitative Approaches* (with R. Thomson, Sage, 2009) and *Troubling Gender and Education* (edited with J. Dillabough and M. Mills, RoutledgeFalmer).

Middleton, Sue PhD is a Professor in the School of Education, University of Waikato. Combining documentary analysis with life-history narrative methods, her research projects have focused on educational and wider social theories as 'lived' in everyday educational settings. The social history of academic research, especially in the discipline of 'Education' is a particular interest. Sue has researched the experiences and perspectives of doctoral graduates in Education and recently, as part of a team, the supervision of Maori doctoral students.

Moore, Sue PhD is an Associate Professor in Environmental Policy at Murdoch University, Western Australia. Her research focuses on the social aspects of natural resource management.

Morrison–Saunders, Angus PhD is Senior Lecturer in Environmental Assessment at Murdoch University, Western Australia. His research interests focus on the application of environmental impact assessment to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Newsome, David PhD is an Associate Professor in nature based tourism at Murdoch University, Western Australia. His research interests also include geo-tourism and wildlife tourism.

Rizvi, Fazal PhD is Professor of Education in the Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois. He is also Adjunct Professor at Deakin University, Australia and a Professorial Fellow at the Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne, Australia. His research interests focus on the areas of global studies in education, comparative and international education, internationalisation of higher education, cultural globalisation and education policy, postcolonial theories of identity, representation and education, global inequalities and educational policy and international student mobility.

Robinson–Pant, Anna PhD is Director of the Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia. Before coming to UEA, she was based for around 10 years in Nepal as a teacher trainer, educational planner and researcher with various development agencies. Her experiences with participatory action–orientated methodologies and cross-cultural learning in a development context have contributed directly to her UK-focused research – including projects with international students at UEA on their experiences of doctoral supervision. She was awarded the BMW Group Award for Intercultural Learning (Theory Category) 2007 for her research in this area.

Seddon, Terri PhD is Professor of Education at Monash University. She researches in the field of education (life–long learning), focusing particularly on policies and politics of educational work. Her most recent book is *Learning and Work and the Politics of Working Life: Global transformations and collective identities in teaching, nursing and social work* (with L. Henriksson and B. Niemeyer, Routledge, 2009).

Starfield, Sue PhD is Director, the Learning Centre, and Associate Professor, School of Education at the University of New South Wales. She is co-author of *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A Handbook for Supervisors* (Routledge, 2007). She is currently working on a project examining practice-based doctoral theses in the visual and performing arts. She is co-editor of the journal *English for Specific Purposes*.

Thomson, Pat PhD is Professor of Education in the School of Education, The University of Nottingham and an Editor of the *Educational Action Research Journal*. A former headteacher, her current research focuses on the arts and creativity in school and community change, headteachers' work, and doctoral education. Her recent publications include *Helping doctoral students write: pedagogies for supervision* (with B. Kamler, Routledge, 2006), *Doing visual research with children and young people* (Routledge, 2008) and *School leadership-heads on the block?* (Routledge, 2009).

Trigwell, Keith PhD is Professor of Higher Education at The University of Sydney, Australia. He was formerly Reader in Higher Education at the University of Oxford where he conducted research into the student experience of learning. His research interests also include scholarship of teaching and learning and research–teaching relations.

Unterhalter, Elaine PhD is Professor of Education and International Development, Institute of Education, University of London with research interests in gender, education, and development. Recent books include *Gender, Schooling and Global Social Justice* (RoutledgeFalmer, 2007), and *Towards gender equality. South Africa Schools during*

the HIV and Aids epidemic (University KwaZulu Natal Press, 2009 with R. Morrell, D. Epstein, D. Bhana and R. Moletsane).

Walker, Melanie PhD is Professor of Higher Education in the School of Education, The University of Nottingham and Extraordinary Professor at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. Her research explores the normative purposes of higher education and its potential contribution to more equal societies under contemporary policy and economic conditions, and to poverty reduction. She is former Director of Postgraduate Students and current Director of Research. She co-edits the *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*. Her recent publications include *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice in Education* (with E. Unterhalter, Palgrave, 2007), and *Higher education pedagogies* (Open University Press, 2006).

Watts, Jacqueline PhD is Senior Lecturer in the Health & Social Care Faculty at the Open University, UK. Her research interests include postgraduate research education, gender and the professions, social context of death and dying. Her work has been published in leading journals such as *Work, Employment and Society*; *Qualitative Research*; *Illness, Crisis and Loss*; *European Journal of Palliative Care*; *Feminism and Psychology*; *Teaching in Higher Education*; and *Open Learning*.

Using this book

Volume 2 is not a duplicate of Volume 1. Our intention in compiling these texts was to produce two complementary volumes. We imagine that many supervisors/advisers and doctoral researchers will not only want to read the text specifically designed for them, but will also find resources that are useful in the other text. We hope that both supervisors/advisers and doctoral researchers will in fact draw selectively on both volumes and find resources that they want to work on together. We are confident that scholars who are responsible for doctoral education courses and supervisor training programmes will select materials from each volume. In each of these cases we see chapters being used as conversation starters, frames and/or guides, rather than recipes or answers.

Volume 2, Part 1

The first half of this volume reframes supervision as pedagogical practice(s). We understand that the concept of pedagogy/ies reads differently in different locations and disciplinary traditions. However, we see it as a preferable notion to that of supervision, which, in managerial times has an unfortunate resonance with technical processes of surveillance and audit. It is also preferable in our view to the terminology of teaching and learning, which omits substantive questions of knowledge and context altogether in favour of a strongly process orientation.

We understand pedagogy to refer to both theories and practices of knowledge production. We believe that the term pedagogy/ies includes questions of what kinds of knowledge are to be produced, their disciplinary boundaries, traditions and conventions. But it also covers teaching/learning (both formal and informal), as well as how learning is to be demonstrated and assessed. In the context of higher education, doctoral pedagogies are enacted in the conversations between supervisors/advisors and students, and in the numerous interactions about texts, particularly research schedules and tools, drafts and the final thesis texts itself. Supervisors differ in their approaches to pedagogical practice and have various preferences for the kind and amount of writing for instance that is undertaken, the way in which feedback is given, and the kinds of interventions that they make. However, what happens between supervisors and doctoral researchers is strongly

framed by disciplinary and institutional conventions, as well as higher education policies and broader geographically and historically situated scholarly traditions.

Although there are enormous differences in the ways in which supervision and pedagogy/ies can be discussed and debated, we are confident in saying that there is still far too little public conversation and scholarship. Supervision in particular is highly privatised, and something that largely happens behind closed doors between consenting adults. Whereas contemporary managerial practices seek to prise open our office doors to count, monitor and regulate what goes on in supervision/advising, our intention here is to present a series of chapters that create a space for collegial conversations, as well as conversations with the doctoral researchers whom we educate. We do not endorse supervision pedagogies as individualised and secretive pastimes, but want instead to promote more open and generative dialogue about what it means to supervise/advise.

The challenges in supervision pedagogies

This volume is specifically designed to raise questions about pedagogy and about the kinds of challenges faced by supervisors. Like any other pedagogical process, supervising doctoral students generates both pleasures and challenges, all the more in contemporary higher education, given the context of globalisation, internationalisation and different modes of doctoral study and diversity in doctoral students, further complicated by the changing nature of higher education, the changing environment for doctoral study and students' own differing purposes for their research (Chapter 1). There are more students, more diverse students, with more diverse aims and plans; increasingly not all doctoral graduates will choose professional lives in the university as might have been the pedagogical assumption in the past.

So what are some of these challenges? The basic challenges must still be to enable a student to successfully complete his or her dissertation in a reasonable amount of time; to foster a productive and enriching pedagogical relationship in which the student grows in confidence and discernment into his or her scholarly and critical identity; and, the supervisor reflexively improves his or her own pedagogical approach, pedagogical repertoire and professional judgement through working with different kinds of students. These are intense and delicate relationships so that, like other pedagogies, doctoral pedagogy demands practitioners who are open to peer learning (and listening to students talk about their learning) and pedagogical dialogue and discussion, a particular challenge in the light of the rather disabling privatised tradition we noted above. Yet there is a huge amount to be learned from each other, and when given the opportunity to find out about the good practices of colleagues, supervisors, we find, respond with interest and enthusiasm. Such peer exchange helps us to make judgements about the quality of our own work and to counter the emphasis on a managerial tickbox compliance culture, increasingly infecting doctoral level study.

The diversity of students, we think, poses particular challenges and tremendous pleasures. For example, many supervisors work with part-time students who are usually mature mid-career professionals well established in a particular field. These students not only have to balance doctoral study, work and personal commitments, but also have to contend with forming a new identity as doctoral scholar in which they are, at least in the early stages, cast in the role of novice learner and student in contrast to their professional standing. The length of part-time doctoral study means that the unexpected can and

usually does crop up for many students, so that the process of supporting but also enabling part-time students to manage their doctoral research and progress demands considerable pedagogical skill and enabling relationships.

Most universities also now find themselves with increasing numbers of doctoral students from other countries, many of whom will conduct their doctoral research in a second language. Both student and supervisor need to come to terms with cross-cultural issues in working together respectfully, as well as different approaches to academic writing and knowledge, while also genuinely valuing the richness that international students bring to the research environment in a particular department. Supervisors need to develop and expand their own cross-cultural capabilities, and try to understand how the academic world and this new place looks to their students, what Martha Nussbaum calls having a 'narrative imagination'.

Perhaps the greatest challenge – and the greatest reward – is that there is no one right way to supervise, and each individual student presents new challenges across some or all of the stages of doctoral study, with the pedagogical relationship having to be adapted and tailored to the particular biography, experiences, and abilities of each new student. Although supervision experience helps in developing good pedagogy, it by no means guarantees success. There is always more to learn and to talk about with each other in enabling the production of worthwhile research, responsibly open to the challenges facing us in the world today, research that asks significant questions and produces valuable knowledge.

Part 1

Introduction

Why *The Doctoral Companions*?

M. Walker and P. Thomson

The Doctoral Companions are designed for doctoral researchers and their supervisors/advisers to read separately and together. The two volumes are neither advice books nor commentaries on the experiences of doctoral research and supervision. Their purpose is to provide complementary and situating commentary about doctoral research and to map key debates that work in and around the burgeoning research methods and doctoral literatures.

Indeed, there are an ever-expanding number of books available to support doctoral research – doing it-guides, toolkits and advice books, methods books, research and evidence-informed policy and practice and how-to-get published. There are countless methodology and methods texts. There is a growing literature on the changing nature of the doctorate, on the doctorate in different parts of the world, on the doctorate and the knowledge economy, on supervision, student experiences and the viva. However, this extensive literature is difficult for doctoral researchers and their supervisors to navigate and will thus not necessarily take students forward in their own doctoral projects. Supervisors are often unaware that their students are consulting advice books and, due to the existence of postgraduate methods training courses, may assume that students understand the nature of the enterprise in which they are involved. Their own intensifying work load also militates against supervisors taking time away from the details of specific supervision projects to engage in more general conversations about the doctorate and the processes of doctoral researchers becoming scholars. Students therefore may well end up confused, with the result that they may follow unproductive methodological and philosophical explorations. Alternatively, they may simply feel inadequate when apparently straightforward advice fails to do the trick. Holbrook and Johnston (1999) explain that such books are unhelpfully decontextualised and fail to acknowledge the messiness of real lives, not amenable to easy control or resolution. They write that, 'Tears and tantrums, frustrations, phobias and personal agendas are missing, so are the supervisors who do have the correct answer or students with unmanageable problems' (1999: 7). Our goal is to support doctoral researchers and their supervisors to interrogate the many catalogues of texts now available for doctoral purchase.

The widely read and highly successful books (Cham 2008a; 2008b; 2008c) and the comic strip titled 'Piled Higher and Deeper' (PhD), developed by graduate student Jorge

Cham, offer a humorous take on the life of a graduate student inhabiting a 'world of grant deadlines, employment worries, political correctness and other sources of relentless angst' (Marcus 2009: 1). The most common response to Cham's comic books and the lectures he gives at universities in the USA on the graduate experience is, he says, about students' sense of alienation and isolation so that doctoral students, 'feel like they're the only ones having these difficulties with their advisers or their funding agencies, that they're lost or they don't really know what they're doing with their lives … they see that there are other people out there like them' (Marcus 2009: 2). Cham's books develop comic characters who resonate with readers and take on a life of their own, characters such as 'Mike Slackenerny' and 'Cecilia'. Of academics Cham says, that while being a graduate student is hard going, 'being a professor is even worse' (Marcus 2009: 2). His website is replete with comments from doctoral students at different stages of their endeavour from around the globe (see www.phdcomics.com), suggesting that he has managed to capture, in ways that advice books often do not, the everyday experience of doctoral research.

The reason Cham's cartoons resonate so strongly with doctoral researchers is, we think, because he addresses one of their key challenges. 'Getting' the doctorate is always much more than simply completing the research – in reality it is about becoming and being a scholar. Being scholarly and becoming a scholar are tasks integral to becoming part of, and belonging to, an academic community. Doing a quality doctorate in contemporary times requires more than the technical skills required of a research process; it involves coming to see oneself as a researcher and taking on a confident and articulate researcher identity. This book, therefore, has an integrating theme of exploring how identity and knowledge formation happen together. Producing 'an original contribution to knowledge' is also to construct oneself as a scholar. These two volumes address a set of interlocking and overlapping big questions that run through the practice of knowledge/identity work.

We take the view that becoming a researcher involves engaging with a range of ideas and issues mediated through a particular research project. We believe that our texts will enable students and their supervisors to navigate their way through the vast library of doctoral and research books by bringing together questions that are generally scattered through a range of texts. For example, discussions about the importance of public intellectual work rarely sit alongside questions of getting started on a research project, or discussions about how to choose a research method together with a conversation about the power relationships embedded in scholarship. Yet, in today's internationalised higher education systems and globalised societies, *not* to bring these things together is to create myopic and unnecessarily parochial and partial understandings of the institutionalised enterprise of knowledge production.

Moreover, these are not yet more books on competing paradigms, how to do a piece of doctoral work from beginning to end, a view of the doctorate that comprises 'tips and tricks', approaches to 'writing up' a thesis, or a set of researcher biographies. Rather, *The Doctoral Companions* place at their centre the interwoven questions of what it means to be a doctoral student in the social sciences, and what is involved in becoming and being a researcher. They further ask what 'capabilities' through research are key to confidence, quality and success. We also provide pragmatic and practical thinking about progressing research/scholarly career and identity.

The rationale behind the two volumes is not simply that the concerns of doctoral researchers and their supervisors are both shared and different, rather we hope to

promote dialogue. However important it is that students establish and join peer communities amongst whom they exchange and circulate the nascent knowledge they are producing and the joys and tribulations that accompany this process, it is in the inter-relationship of student and supervisors that young scholars are produced as confident and successful researchers, or where confidence is as easily diminished. The books, therefore, address the sorts of questions that need to be taken up by developing researchers and which can fruitfully be discussed with supervisors. We suspect from our conversations with doctoral researchers at our own institution, at national and international conferences, and from a variety of reports and research articles, that doctoral candidates want more than conversations about their substantive research. They also want focused 'insider' discussion about 'the rules of the game', what it means to be a scholar, and the purposes and practices of higher education. Much of what appears in the doctoral companions is directed to this end. Authors do not seek to provide answers, but rather to raise issues, which can then be pursued further.

The organisation of *The Doctoral Companions*

Briefly, now, something about the design of each Volume. We have organised both books into large sections, each addressing a key theme associated with becoming and being a doctoral scholar. Volume 1 addresses doctoral students and Volume 2 their supervisors. There is some deliberate repetition of material across the two volumes but we also envisage supervisors finding much of interest in Volume 1, and students locating material of interest in Volume 2.

We begin both volumes by outlining the current global and national policy climate for doctoral education and explain the rapid rise up higher education policy agendas of doctoral students. In Volume 1, Part 2, we take up the theme of becoming a doctoral student and some of the issues students are likely to confront early in their journeys. In Part 3, we address a range of issues around coming to terms with research practice. Chapter authors take up issues and questions; they do not try to address the practical detail of doing a research project but offer ways into thinking about what it means to do and be a doctoral student. We then address the question that sits at the heart of the doctorate but is often rather vaguely explained, that of making a contribution to knowledge (although see Yates 2004). Quite what does it mean to make an original contribution? Do different kinds of knowledge count? Who are the students and does their knowledge count at all? We then draw together these interlocking and overlapping themes in our concluding chapter. After the introductory section in Volume 2, we focus on supervision pedagogies, creating productive doctoral education cultures, making contributions to scholarly knowledge and then draw these together in our conclusion. In Volume 2 we also summarise and link as appropriate back to Volume 1.

The brief we gave to the chapter authors was broad and open. We invited specific contributions, sent everybody the outline for both volumes and then trusted authors to decide how they might take up the specifics of their own contribution. We think they have all risen magnificently to this challenge. In many cases there are references to further helpful work by authors, which can be followed up; while their references provide further access to additional helpful resources.

We want to emphasise that these books are not necessarily linear in their workings. Each chapter in and of itself offers a challenge and an invitation to doctoral readers to

reflect on their own learning to become and to be, and to provide also resources to support and reflect on this becoming. We imagine readers moving backwards and forwards across the big themes, revisiting early themes and engaging later themes even at an early stage of their studies. We hope that readers will continue to draw on the resources of the book in ways that support their own individually staged doctoral development.

Our understandings, ambitions and acknowledgements

We embarked on this extensive editorial project because of our commitments to the value and process of high quality in doctoral education. We understand the doctorate as a relational and pedagogical project of student/supervisor development and identity formation, grounded in the shared project of addressing significant questions and making knowledge under specific contextual and policy conditions. This sounds serious but we also believe that the doctoral experience ought to be about excitement, engagement and achievement. We know it is also often one of remaking identities, of considerable intellectual challenge, and of emotional bumps and bruises.

Doctoral education and the experience of doing a doctorate ought, we think, to be a period when students develop knowledge, 'capabilities' (Sen 1999) and relationship resources for continuing their 'life-long' professional journeys, including new and unpredictable doctoral study challenges. Experiences of doctoral education – positive and life-enhancing, or narrowing horizons and self-belief – will, we believe, shape life-long learner identities. As supervisors, we hope for the former rather than the latter, while recognising that each doctoral venture is biographical, complicated and partly unpredictable. As with any pedagogy or educational process, we cannot pin down the one right way – and nor would we want to – but we can develop knowledge resources that help us work towards better practices produced in the interstices of the student, her thesis, her university context, and our supervision interlaced across all three.

Our interests in putting together this extensive edited collection as researchers and doctoral supervisors and examiners ourselves, with personal experience of doctoral education in three different countries and an international network of supervisor colleagues, is the growing significance of doctoral education as a site of practice in universities internationally. The shift in attention to doctoral education over the last 15 years or so has been remarkable: from a kind of cottage industry involving individual students and supervisors with disciplinary expertise, to a deepening focus for policy, research and publications of diverse kinds. Under contemporary conditions of the knowledge economy and the need for professional credentials beyond the masters level, doctorates in education are of increased importance and professional value to practitioners in a variety of professional settings. More and more people are doing doctorates, not only because new forms of work require higher knowledge production capabilities developed through research, but also because of credential inflation. Students are looking to make an economic and educational investment in their own workplace careers; the doctorate is no longer only about becoming a career academic in a university.

We take education in its broadest sense as our field of concern and we hope that the two volumes will be of broad interest in the social sciences. But we think it is not surprising that so much of the work on doctoral education emanates from scholars who see education and pedagogy as the subject of research. We have been informed by a variety of research into doctoral education – for example, signature pedagogies in doctoral

education (Golde 2007); a rich and growing field of research on doctoral writing pedagogies from early work by Connell (1985) to recent studies (Bendix Petersen 2007; Kamler and Thomson 2006; Kamler and Thomson 2008; Paltridge and Starfield 2007); supervision practices and pedagogies (Brew and Peseta 2008; Boucher and Smith 2006; Delamont *et al.* 1997; Denholm and Evans 2007; Hasrati 2005; Grant 2003; Green 2005; Holligan 2005; Lamm 2004; Lee 2008; Li and Searle 2007; Manathunga 2005a; 2005b; Murphy *et al.* 2007; Neumann 2005; Sambrook *et al.* 2008); emerging attention to more collective models of supervision and collaborative knowledge sharing environments (Malfroy 2005; Parker 2009); pedagogies of doctoral publishing (Lee and Kamler 2008; Kamler 2008); professional doctorates (Brennan 1998; Evans 1997; Scott *et al.* 2004; Maxwell *et al.* 2008; Wellington and Sikes 2006); supervising professional doctorates (Health 2006); doctoral student development (Gardner 2008); managerialism and supervision processes (Cribb and Gewirtz 2006); and doctoral education and future academic faculty development and recruitment (Ehrenberg and Kuh 2008).

It is particularly noteworthy that this research literature has been generated primarily in the last five years, and although there is much of value to supervisors, it is an expansive terrain to negotiate in busy academic lives. We hope, therefore, in these two volumes to signpost key debates and findings from this emergent corpus of research.

We not only owe an intellectual debt to the community of doctoral education researchers, but we also have had considerable practical assistance in putting *The Doctoral Companions* together and to bed. Producing two edited volumes of this size has been greatly helped by the sterling secretarial support we have had from Uta Feinstein, who developed an effective system to keep track of the large number of contributors and has been the central point of contact for authors. She was also instrumental in the last stages of getting the texts ready for the publishers. Helen Hearn and Tham Nguyen, doctoral students in the School of Education, efficiently undertook some of the early copy-editing support. Martina Daykin also provided secretarial support. We are very grateful for the help we have received from all four of them, and for the support of the School of Education for this project. We must also thank Philip Mudd, our commissioning editor at Routledge, who first raised the possibility of the books with us, who provided feedback on our evolving idea to sharpen our thinking on focus, structure and organisation of the two volumes, and who has been encouraging throughout. Finally, our long-suffering partners, Randy Barber and Ian Phimister, have inevitably lived this project with us and there is little doubt that our efforts here depended on their support. Our dogs, too, have played their part in providing welcome unconditional regard!

In conclusion, we must also thank the following authors and publishers for permission to reprint chapters that have previously appeared elsewhere, although most have been revised and updated for this publication:

(1) Terry Evans 'Supervising part time candidates'. Adapted from T. Evans (2007) 'Effective supervision of part-time candidates'. In Denholm, C. and Evans, T. D. (Eds) *Supervising Doctorates Downunder: keys to effective supervision in Australia and New Zealand*. Melbourne, ACER Press. Revised and reprinted with permission from ACER.

(2) Noel Gough 'The truth is not out there: becoming "undetective" in social and educational inquiry; Crime fiction and social inquiry: intertextual continuities'. Adapted from N. Gough (2002) 'Fictions for representing and generating semiotic consciousness: the crime story and educational inquiry'. *International Journal of*

Applied Semiotics, 3(2): 59–76. Revised and reprinted with permission from Atwood publishing, www.atwoodpublishing.com

(3) Barbara Grant 'Negotiating the layered relations of supervision'. Adapted from B Grant (2003) 'Mapping the Pleasures and Risks of Supervision'. *Discourse* 24(2): 175–90. Revised and reprinted with permission from Taylor & Francis.

(4) Elaine Unterhalter 'Global social justice, critical policy, and doctoral pedagogical spaces'. Adapted from E. Unterhalter (2009) 'Global justice or other people's problems? Computer gaming and critical reflection in an international classroom'. *London Review of Education*, 7(1): 41–53. Revised and reprinted with permission from Taylor & Francis.

(5) Jacqueline Watts 'Supervising part-time doctoral students. Issues and Challenges'. Adapted from J. H. Watts (2008) *Challenges of supervising part-time students: towards student–centred practice*, *Teaching Higher Education*, 13(3), 369–73.

References

Bendix Petersen, E. (2007) Negotiating academicity: postgraduate research supervision as category boundary work, *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(4): 475–88

Boucher, C. and Smith, A. (2006) Up close and personal: reflections on our experience of supervising research candidates who are using personal reflective techniques, *Reflective Practice*, 5(3): 345–56.

Brennan, M. (1998), Struggles over the definition and practice of the Educational Doctorate in Australia, *Australian Educational Researcher* 25(1): 71–89.

Brew, A. and Peseta, T. (2008). Supervision development and recognition in a reflexive space. In Boud, D. and Lee, A. (eds). Changing Practices of Doctoral Education. New York and London: Routledge, 126–39.

Cham, J. (2008a) *Piled Higher and Deeper*. Los Angeles, CA: Piled Higher and Deeper LLC.

——(2008b) *Life is Tough and Then You Graduate*. Los Angeles, CA: Piled Higher and Deeper LLC.

——(2008c) *Scooped! the Third Piled Higher and Deeper*. Los Angeles, CA: Piled Higher and Deeper LLC.

Connell, R.W. (1985) How to Supervise a PhD, *Vestes*, 2: 38 (Available at www.ph.unimelb.edu/au/pgss/2520/node33.html. Accessed 5 January 2008.)

Cribb, A. and Gewirtz, S. (2006) Doctoral student supervision in a managerial climate, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 16 (3): 223–36.

Delamont, S., Atkinson, P. and Parry, O. (1997) *Supervising the PhD*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Denholm, C. and Evans, T. (Eds) (2007) *Supervising Doctorates Downunder*. Camberwell, ACER Press.

Ehrenberg, R. G. and Kuh, C. V. (Eds) (2008) *Doctoral Education and the Faculty of the Future*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Evans, T. (1997) Flexible doctoral research: emerging issues in professional doctorate programs, *Studies in Continuing Education*, 19(2): 174–82.

Gardner, S. (2008) *The Development of Doctoral Students: Phases of challenge and support: ASHE Higher Education Report, 34.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass

Golde, C. M. (2007) Signature pedagogies in doctoral education: Are they adaptable for the preparation of education researchers? *Educational Researcher*, 36(6): 344–51.

Grant, B. (2003) Mapping the pleasures and risks of supervision, *Discourse*, 24(2): 175–90.

Green, B. (2005) Unfinished business: subjectivity and supervision, *Higher Education Research and Development*, 24(2): 151–63.

Hasrati, M. (2005) Legitimate peripheral participation and supervising PhD students, *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(5): 557–70.

Health, L. (2006) Supervision of professional doctorates: education doctorates in English universities, *Higher Education Review*, 38(2): 21–41.

Holbrook, A. and Johnston, S. (Eds) (1999) *Supervision of postgraduate research in education*. Coldsteam: AARE.

Holligan, C. (2005) Fact and fiction: a case history of doctoral supervision, *Educational Research*, 47(3); 267–78.

Kamler, B. (2008) Rethinking doctoral publication practices: writing from and beyond the thesis, *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3); 283–94.

Kamler, B. and Thomson, P. (2004) Driven to abstraction: doctoral supervision and Writing pedagogies, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9(2); 195–210.

——(2006) *Helping doctoral students write. Pedagogies for supervision*. London: Routledge.

——(2008) The failure of dissertation advice books: Toward alternative pedagogies for doctoral writing. *Educational Researcher*, 37(8), 507–14.

Lamm, R. (2004) *Nurture or challenge in research higher degree supervision*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Melbourne 28 November to 2 December 2004.

Lee, A. and Kamler, B. (2008) Bringing pedagogy to doctoral publishing, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(5): 511.

Lee, A. (2008) How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision, *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3); 267–81.

Li, S. and Searle, C. (2007) Managing criticism in PhD supervision: a qualitative case study, *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(4): 511–26.

Malfroy, J. (2005) Doctoral supervision, workplace research and changing pedagogic practices, *Higher Education Research and Development*, 24(2): 165–78.

Manathunga, C. (2005a) The development of research supervision: 'turning the light on a private space', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 10(1): 17–30.

——(2005b) Early warning signs in postgraduate research education: a different approach to ensure timely completions, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(2): 219–33.

Marcus, G. (2009) Comic-strip hero, *THE*, 12 February 2009 (Available at www.timeshighereducation. co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=405321. Accessed 9 July 2009.)

Maxwell, T.W., Hickey, C. and Evans, T. (Eds) (2008) *Working doctorates: the impact of Professional Doctorates in the workplace and professions*. Revised papers from the fifth Professional Doctorates conference, Deakin University.

Murphy, N., Bain, J. D. and Conrad, L. (2007) Orientations to research higher degree supervision, *Higher Education*, 53(2): 209–34.

Neumann, R. (2005) Doctoral differences: professional doctorates and PhD compared, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2): 173–88.

Paltridge, B. and Starfield, S. (2007) *Thesis and dissertation writing in a second language*. London: Routledge.

Parker, R. (2009) A learning community approach to doctoral education in the social sciences, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (1): 43–59.

Sambrook, S., Stewart, J. and Roberts, C. (2008) Doctoral supervision … a view from above, below and the middle! *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(1): 71–84.

Scott, D., Brown, A., Lunt, I. and Thorne, L. (2004) *Professional doctorates: Integrating academic and professional knowledge*. Maidenhead: SRHE/Open University Press.

Sen, A. (1999) *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wellington and Sikes (2006) 'A doctorate in a tight compartment': Why do students choose a professional doctorate and what impact does it have on their personal and professional lives? *Studies in Higher Education*, 31 (6): 723–34.

Yates, L. (2004) *What does Good Education Research look like?* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Doctoral education in context

The changing nature of the doctorate and doctoral students

P. Thomson and M. Walker

In June 1996, *The Times Higher Education Supplement* (A. Thomson 1996) reported on a discussion paper called 'Quality and Standards of Postgraduate Research Degrees', produced by the United Kingdom Council for Graduate Education (UKCGE). The article suggested that the postgraduate research sector needed urgent review to secure better quality monitoring, and commented that funding councils had focused little attention on doctoral education because they were more concerned with undergraduate and masters courses. According to the UKCGE report, there was now an urgent need for discussion and clarification of the issues concerning postgraduate research, not least because of a 'dramatic' increase in postgraduates doing research, (A. Thomson 1996). Illustrative figures from the Higher Education Funding Council for England showed a 310 per cent increase in postgraduate research (masters and doctoral) between 1979 and 1994, (HEFCE 1996). The report argued for the need to establish effective postgraduate quality assurance policies and procedures, and monitoring and enhancement mechanisms to reassure 'stakeholders', including students.

Earlier that same year the *THES* had published an article by Davies (1996) on 'What is the role of a PhD supervisor?' pointing to the variation in the quality of support students received, and anticipating the debates that were to accelerate over the next decade. Davies reported the, 'by no means exceptional' experiences, of one PhD student whose relationship had broken down with his supervisor, pointing to the problematic power relations inherent in the relationship. As a result this student did not expect to complete his doctorate, saying:

> I was taken on as a research assistant without meeting (him), and when I arrived it turned out he didn't have a PhD and hadn't supervised before. … There has been a breakdown in our relationship. But my funding depends on my supervisor – he's an expert in the area – and the institution doesn't really have anyone to replace him. I'm an outsider and he is an insider – anything I say carries no weight. I do have a second supervisor, but she doesn't have the time to see me. There have been four postgraduates in the past two years in my department, and I'm the only one left. Maybe if I'm lucky I'll get an MPhil here, but I don't have any control over my funding, and I'll need a reference from this institution if I look for a job.
>
> Davies 1996: 1

In the same article, Davies (1996) quotes Tricia Skuse, who was then finishing a psychology PhD; she observed that a wide range of different supervisory problems exist because:

[O]ne of the fundamental problems with PhDs in Britain is that nothing's standardized. I have friends who start their PhD, see a supervisor a few times and then they're left to fend for themselves. In other universities supervisors will go with you and help you set up your fieldwork, or help you do your analysis and give you a training in research skills.

<div align="right">Davies 1996: 1</div>

The 1996 Chairman's Foreword to the Harris Report on postgraduate education (HEFCE 1996: 1) highlighted 'the central importance of high quality postgraduate education to the creation of the ever more highly skilled workforce which is necessary if the United Kingdom is to flourish in an increasingly complex and competitive world', but also 'the benefits which education at this level, now delivered in a multiplicity of ways, brings to individuals and, through them, to society as a whole'. In the next decade, there was a flurry of policy activity in the UK. By 2006, in the wake of the Harris Report (HEFCE 1996), the HEPI Report (2004) on higher education supply and demand, and the development of UKGCE and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) standards for doctoral education, the field and arena of doctoral education had changed considerably, driven at least in part by the fact that postgraduates were by then increasingly seen as the best source for future university income (Leonard *et al.* 2006; Park 2007).

Nor have these developments been confined to the UK. In Australia, in 1996 Australian universities awarded just fewer than 3,000 PhDs across all subjects. By 2006 the total number was more than 5,500, an 85 per cent increase (Western and Lawson 2008: 1; and see Evans in Chapter 5). This expansion was accompanied by intense interest in the process of supervision, with Australian researchers arguably leading the field in investigating the many facets of research supervision in education at a time when there was little empirical research taking place elsewhere. Notably, a pioneering collection edited by Holbrook and Johnston (1999: 6) explored the process and culture of research supervision within the field of education in Australian universities in order to render both less opaque and hence open to improvement. The editors observed that manuals of procedures and lists of suggestions do not successfully address cultures of doctoral education and supervision because getting a PhD involves more than 'generating a product or perfecting a set of skills'. They pointed instead to the significance of acquiring an academic identity, of belonging to a research culture, and of the work–life pressures that practical self-help books do not address.

In the USA, 52,600 doctorates were awarded in 2004–5, a 14 per cent increase on the figure of 1997–8 (Western and Lawson 2008: 1), while around 1.7 million graduate students study at USA universities alone (Marcus 2009). Not surprisingly, given these figures, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of University Teaching established an *Initiative on the Doctorate* and commissioned essays edited by Golde and G. Walker (2006) on envisaging its future, including in education (Berliner 2006; Richardson 2006). With a focus on doctoral students as the future 'stewards of the disciplines', the essays express a deep concern with the goals and purposes of doctoral education, and especially with the development of a doctoral scholar as 'someone who will creatively generate new knowledge, critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, and responsibly transform those understandings through writing, teaching, and application' (Golde, 2006: 5).

In others parts of Europe, doctoral education is similarly expanding and transforming. Considerable changes have taken place over the last decade as doctoral training and education has come under scrutiny as an object of interest to policy makers in the face of global competition for talented 'knowledge worker' doctoral students (Bleiklie and Hostaker 2004; Bitusikova 2009; Kehm 2007; Leonard *et al.* 2006; Szkudlarek in Volume 1). In 1999, The Bologna Declaration announced the creation of a European Higher Education Area, followed in 2000 by the Lisbon Strategy to create a European Research and Innovation Area. The intention is to produce around 700,000 doctoral researchers in Europe (Park 2007), and to make Europe the most competitive global knowledge economy (Kehm 2007). As with developments elsewhere, the European doctorate is no longer viewed only as a research degree but also as a qualification for other professional fields. In general, there is agreement that high-quality research training and an expanded supply of qualified researchers are both important 'in achieving the vision of a globally competitive Europe of knowledge' (Kehm 2007: 314). Doctoral education in Europe is seen to now require more direction and structure and not to be solely driven by intellectual curiosity. Rather, new knowledge is a strategic resource and economic factor. The effect, according to Kehm (2007), is that knowledge becomes another commodity and its shape acquires a more instrumental approach.

Not surprisingly, policy makers in Europe have begun to be keenly interested in the state of research training and universities have been requested to develop institutional strategies for it. In addition, research training is deemed so important a resource that it is no longer to be left in the hands of professors and departments but has become an object of policy making and has moved to the institutional, and national, even supra-national level (Kehm 2007: 314). Academics are to be monitored by outside 'agents who have motives, purposes and goals that are not purely academic' (Kehm 2007: 316). Kehm (2007) highlights a key tension running through higher education and from which doctoral education is not immune. She puts the problem in this way: 'If a utilitarian concept of relevance becomes so strong that it determines academic notions of quality or excellence and the idea of curiosity-driven research, then we could all end up poorer than we were before' (Kehm 2007: 316).

Diversity of doctoral programmes

Accompanying this accelerating interest in doctoral education, the traditional doctorate in social sciences and education is changing and evolving. In the past it generally involved a period of research by the lone student, supported by a supervisor, culminating in a thesis of around 80,000–100,000 words; this text is required above all to make an original contribution to knowledge (Yates 2004). The PhD is recognised as the standard entry qualification for an academic career (although in the past this was not always the case), but also as an important qualification for other professional fields, such as school leadership, educational development roles in higher education, and professional fields such as health and social care. Nowadays, this traditional doctorate model survives, although the student, especially if studying full-time, is likely to participate in a research culture of projects, seminars and conferences, and typically to have more than one supervisor. Unlike in the past, extended time periods for completion are discouraged, and indeed in the UK there is strong pressure for students to complete a full time doctorate in three to four years and six to eight years for a part-time student. In the USA the PhD period of study is typically longer at around five or six years for full-time students,

and requires two initial years of course work as well as a thesis (Reisz 2008). But these are increasingly more focused and time-bound studies, rather than life-long projects that may have stretched over 10, 11 or more years, as universities bring in rules to limit the period for which a student may be registered for a doctorate.

New forms of doctoral education have also expanded over the last two decades with the professional doctorate growing in popularity, notwithstanding contested views over the value of something described as a 'professional' doctorate (Gill 2009). The thrust of professional doctorates is both to encourage research which contributes to professional practice, but also to open up doctoral education to a wider group of career professionals and a different demographic (Gill 2009). Burgess, founder of UKCGE, explains that the professional doctorate 'opens up opportunities for higher education to talk with professional people who are interested in intellectual problems that arise from their work experience, and that seems to me to be appropriate' (quoted in Gill 2009: 32). Others are less certain about the claim of professional doctorates to have parity of esteem with the PhD, given the lack of standardisation and lack of clarity over what a taught doctorate is (Gill 2009), even though it might also be argued that it is not entirely obvious what a PhD is, nor that it might not always be fit for diverse purposes. It is, however, certainly the case, that over the last 20 years, the part-time professional doctorate has become widespread in education in the UK and Australia especially (Brennan 1998; Collinson 2005; Costley and Armsby 2007; Evans Chapter 5; Health 2006; Neumann 2007; Sarros *et al.* 2005; Stephenson 2006; Wellington and Sikes 2006; Taysum 2007a; Taysum 2007b), while already being more established in the USA and Canada. Such professional doctorates are generally comprised of two years of taught coursework and two to four years towards a dissertation, the latter study typically being shorter, more applied and practice-focused than the usual PhD thesis. For most universities the balance of taught and research elements is over 50 per cent for the research, and most often two-thirds for the research part. Certainly, in the UK this is required for the degree to qualify for research funding.

In addition, there are other routes to a PhD. There is a PhD by publication based on the submission of peer-reviewed papers, usually accompanied by an overview linking the papers (and see Goode Chapter 3). The new route PhD available in a number of UK universities may contain significant taught elements, usually over one year at masters level, which is examined and must be passed before the student proceeds to doctoral research and thesis, which is usually of the standard length. In other cases, the research project is present from the beginning and runs alongside any taught course in year one (Johnston and Murray 2004; Park 2005; Park 2007 and see www.newroutephd.ac.uk/). There are also practice-based PhDs, with a project report and an exegesis, portfolio and artefact dissertations, and even experiments with group research projects.

Doctoral study can now be face to face, or at a distance using electronic communication technologies or a blend of both of these (e.g. Butcher and Sieminiski 2006; Crossouard 2008; Sussex 2008). Furthermore, the marketisation of higher education means that doctoral researchers can now enrol in universities far away from their home location, and thus may find themselves part of a culturally rich student body, although universities themselves may do little to encourage cross-cultural dialogue and exchange.

More diverse doctoral researchers

Not only is the field of doctoral study far more diverse than it has been in the past, but it also attracts more diverse students with a wide range of reasons for choosing doctoral

study, and increasingly it is the focus of academic research. The typical first class honours graduate proceeding directly to doctoral study has arguably never been the norm for education, nursing and social work. In these areas there is no obviously typical doctoral student and ages may range from 24 to 74, in a range of professions, and include white and black candidates, candidates of different ethnicities and religions, men and women, able-bodied and disabled and middle and working class applicants and international students studying away from their home countries (see, for example, Castellanos *et al.* 2006; Chapman and Pyvis 2006; Gillies and Lucey 2007; Green and Scott 2003; Goode 2007; Leonard 2001; McClure 2005; Mastekaasa 2005; Tubin and Lapidot 2008). In the UK, fear of taking on debt appears to deter many working class students from continuing on to doctoral studies (Rodgers 2006).

Increasingly, not all doctoral graduates will choose professional lives in a university. A recent report published by VITAE (2009) for the UK on first destinations of doctoral graduates by subject for 2003–7 indicates the high value employers place on specialised and doctoral-level generic skills. But, significantly for our concern here, only 35 per cent of the total number of doctoral graduates went into a research role across all sectors, only 25 per cent were employed as research staff in higher education, and 14 per cent as lecturers in higher education. Looking more specifically at social science, 42 per cent of the doctoral graduates had studied part-time to 34 per cent went into higher education lecturing and 18 per cent into research roles in higher education (VITAE 2009: 42ff.). All this is to underline that the social science and education doctoral candidate is almost as likely to be studying part-time as full-time, whereas only a minority will enter teaching and research positions in higher education. Many will have come to doctoral studies as professionals in other fields wanting to systematise their professional knowledge, or research policy formation and implementation in their professional fields, or enquire into changing and improving practices in their own contexts. In education, for example, doctoral students include head teachers, teachers in schools, policy researchers, academic administrators, nurse educators, not-for-profit and third-sector professionals, and so on. For the most part, they will continue in this work during their studies and return to it afterwards. They are, in effect, knowledge workers in diverse professional fields.

The diversity of doctoral candidates has implications for doctoral student experiences, given that students differently located will have differing opportunities, as Sen (1999) would say, to 'convert' their particular resources into capabilities to be and become doctoral graduates (see Walker Chapter 2). Diversity produces new obligations for institutions and thus for doctoral supervisors. Thus, for example, a disabled doctoral student may need more or different support from an able-bodied student; a working class student may need more or different support from that of a middle class student, and so on. Supervisors now need to be attentive to and aware of such differences amongst students, and students themselves also need to attend to and be sensitive to diversity in their own peer engagements so that they develop what Nussbaum (1997) describes as a 'narrative imagination', that is the capability to imagine the lives of others and to respond positively.

Doctoral education in globalised times

Golde (2006) points to the changing and changed circumstances of doctoral programmes in the USA, not least shaped by globalisation and the globalisation of knowledge, which is effectively borderless in an age of sophisticated information technologies. Under these globalised conditions, doctoral education offers tremendous opportunities to imaginatively

contribute to knowledge, to critically systematise valuable ideas and transform and generate organised knowledge and understanding both through doctoral scholarship and dissemination (Golde and G. Walker 2006). This is, Golde and G. Walker (2006) argue, much more than a technical activity of skills acquisition; as an educational endeavour it is suffused with moral and ethical dimensions that turn on what kind of doctoral education and doctoral scholars are needed by a democratic knowledge society. As G. Walker (2006) writes:

> Today's PhDs have extraordinary new opportunities to lead efforts to extend human knowledge. They already enjoy new possibilities for educating the next generation of scholars and citizens and for doing so in a wide spectrum of institutional settings. They are also called upon to provide expert opinion in a dizzying array of high-profile public areas. They have a special opportunity and responsibility to inform the public about their disciplines and, ultimately, to shape the public's attitudes about the importance of their fields and the attendant habits of mind of an informed, engaged and ethical scholar.
>
> <div align="right">G. Walker 2006: 427</div>

However, such optimism is insufficient to take account of how developments in the nature and type of doctorates, the increasing numbers of doctoral candidates and shifts in the importance of doctoral students for policy makers are located in and produced by the macro-discourses that surround globalisation and the idea of knowledge economies.

It is not coincidental that the increase in the numbers of doctoral students has accelerated in the last 15 to 20 years, nor that they have risen significantly up the agenda of most universities as graduate schools and other institutional structures have been put in place to offer training support and to encourage dynamic 'communities of practice' (Lave and Wenger 1998). As global economies are reorganised around knowledge and information as key resources, a view in part produced by scholarship about globalisation, this in turn shapes and reshapes education (Carnoy and Rhoten 2002). Knowledge and skills are now understood as crucial for comparative economic advantage. Although definitions are contested (see Peters 2004), that offered by the OECD (1996: 7) is still helpful when it describes a knowledge-based economy as 'economies which are directly based on the production, distribution and use of knowledge and information'.

The effect is that higher education 'has become the new starship in the policy fleet for governments around the world' (Peters and Besley 2006a: 83). Internationally and nationally, the task of higher education is directed to the creation of intellectual capacity and the construction of knowledge and skills for participation in an increasingly knowledge-based world economy. Castells (2004) argues that if knowledge is the 'electricity' of the new international economies, then higher education institutions are the power sources on which a new development process must rely. New theories of economic growth have conferred on education, on knowledge production and the knowledge society (having replaced the older industrial model) a central role as an essential engine of development (Peters 2004; Peters and Besley 2006; OECD 1996; Coyle and Quah 2002; Stiglitz 1999). But for Nobel Laureate Joseph Stiglitz (1999), knowledge is a global public good; it is not finite in the way that commodities like coal and iron are and indeed, in and through its use, increases and disperses. Knowledge when used does not become used-up but can be increased through sharing and further development, so that 'knowledge once

discovered and made public operates expansively to defy the law of scarcity' (Peters and Besley 2006: 799).

Not surprisingly, in turn, doctoral education and what purposes it promotes and serves have also been affected by this globalised turn. It must be understood in the context of the tensions between ethical and critical citizenship and human well being, and a focus on economic development and economic life, as Kehm (2007) alludes to in her concern for the possible directions of doctoral education. Kwiek (2003: 81) neatly sums up the shifts that surround, permeate and influence higher education, and for our purposes here doctoral education, when he writes that higher education 'is asked to adapt to new societal needs, to be more responsive to the world around it, to be more market-, performance-, and student oriented, to be more cost-effective, accountable to its stakeholders, as well as competitive with other providers'.

But the effects of globalisation go further than a utilitarian press for employability and labour market responsive knowledge and skills and the commodification of knowledge. National higher education institutions around the world face declining investment of public funds, and thus there is pressure to diversify institutional sources of income, accompanied by managerial forms of governance, performative and risk avoidance cultures and quality assurance regimes (Kwiek 2003; Peters 2004; Stromquist 2002). International graduate students are sought after for various reasons, but undoubtedly those include the fees premium they command in balancing university budgets.

In recent decades it seems that university education policy (if not academic professionals) has been much more concerned with science and technology and with economic applications of knowledge. The idea of higher education as a public good, enriching both the individual and all of society, has arguably been overtaken by a rhetoric of business models and market relations, together with an audit and accounting regulatory culture. Higher education is, as a result, increasingly regarded as a private commodity rather than a public good. Pessimists assert the decline or erasure of critical learning in the 'ruins' (Readings 1996) of the university, 'except as the rear-guard protests of an exhausted faculty and a fragment of the largely demobilized student body' (Aronowitz and Giroux 2000: 338).

However, such developments are not uncontested and the pages of *Times Higher Education* in the UK feature regular responses to, and critiques of, the 'human capital' direction (where the value of educated persons and their knowledge is solely the economic contribution). Giroux and Myriades (2001), for example, offer a robust critique of corporate university cultures and the spread of commercial values in higher education where 'social visions are dismissed as hopelessly out of date' (Giroux 2001: 3). In her book on contemporary life in British universities, Evans (2004) suggests in her title *Killing Thinking* the death of universities under current regimes of funding, regulation and accountability. Evans (2004) concludes that universities are in fact unlikely to collapse, but she also suggests that they may 'empty of creative engagement and creativity, as new generations, having experienced the deadly possibilities of the bureaucratized university, refuse to consider further involvement with that world and take their energies and talents elsewhere' (Evans 2004: 152). Those 'taking their talents elsewhere' will, of course, include prospective doctoral students.

That education should equip graduates with the knowledge and skills to participate in the economy is, unsurprisingly, the aspect that most concerns governments. But the problem arises when the meaningfulness of economic opportunities is not debated, and when goals such as intellectual development, equal democratic citizenship and broader social goods are overlooked. Moreover, what Kenway *et al.* (2006) characterise as an