

The connection between professional doctorates and the workplace: symbiotic relationship or loose association?

Hilary Burgess

School of Education, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

Gordon Weller

School of Health and Social Sciences, Middlesex University, Middlesex, UK

Jerry Wellington

School of Education, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Corresponding author: hb144@le.ac.uk

This paper continues to develop our on-going research project around the impact of undertaking a professional doctorate (PD). It explores the connection between the professional doctorate and the workplace from the student perspective and considers the strategy, skills and processes professional doctorate practitioners use as they strive to transfer their research outcomes and contribute to their organisation practice.

We use as a metaphor the notion of symbiosis to explore knowledge transfer between doctoral study and work place setting and ask whether there is a 'symbiotic relationship' between the doctoral student and their workplace practice. The focus of the paper is upon how knowledge and skills are (or are not) transferred back and utilised in practice. Data was collected using a range of case studies and narrative stories from students willing to engage in personal reflection alongside telephone and face-to-face interviews and analysis of students' doctoral dissertations.

Keywords: Professional doctorates, knowledge transfer, doctoral students

Introduction

This paper is part of an on-going research project being conducted by Hilary Burgess, Gordon Weller and Jerry Wellington, exploring and attempting to conceptualise the impact of the professional doctorate on students' professional practice and personal development.

The professional doctorate (PD) is founded on a range of statements relating to: its 'impact on professional practice'; its aim of producing 'reflective practitioners; and its role in developing 'professional knowledge' and 'work based research'. Bourner et al (2001) suggest that specific named professional doctorates such as the Doctor of Education or the Professional Doctorate in Health provide identification with a profession. Sometimes these claims are used as a means of marketing the PD, whilst sometimes they are used as a way of separating it from the traditional PhD. Some of the rationale and rhetoric 'behind' professional doctorates involves the claim that we are developing 'researching professionals' and that the PD will improve practice and enhance professional development. However, there is a similar lack of research evidence for these claims identified by Halse and Mowbray (2011) discussing the impact of the PhD who argue 'there is a striking absence of systematic research into the multidimensional impact of the doctorate' (p. 513). There are also claims that the PD produces original academic knowledge specific to a professional context (Green and Powell, 2005: 93).

All of the above terms and claims are problematic. Our earlier research (Burgess, Weller and Wellington, 2011) indicated that the potential for impact on the organisation and PD graduate professional practice was dependent upon a range of factors. Some of the factors related to organisational and individual impact: for example, organisational recognition of the new qualities of PD graduates and their potential to contribute more effectively. This points to the organisation's culture and how receptive it may be to learning and development to influence change; the potential for impact of PD learning is context- related. For example, how supportive and inclusive is the line manager in encouraging PD graduate involvement in problem solving and decision making? In addition, the PD graduate may need further

development in order to integrate back into the organisation context and draw upon their research related expertise. So a counter-argument for recognition and understanding of the potential impact of the PD graduate, may include a focus on the organisation in providing support within a culture of professional development. Marketing claims for positive organisation impact through PD graduate staff members may conversely focus upon organisational change and learning in order to enable the influence of PD graduate staff. Part of the difficulty in determining the impact of the PD graduate on the organisation may relate to the complexity in understanding what counts as an impact. Should, for example, the concept of impact always be linked to business success (as questioned by Garrick and Rhodes, 1998: 175)? Are there more subtle forms of impact that go beyond the 'bottom-line' financial concept and which underpin a symbiotic relationship between PD knowledge and organisational workplace learning? We found the notion of symbiosis a valuable one in developing this paper as both employer and the PD graduate have a role to play in a symbiotic relationship. If neither is aware of the potential of the other, nothing will happen.

For this paper, we have focused entirely on the perspectives of the students. We realise that symbiosis is a complex, two-way process and in our future research we plan to explore the views and perspectives of employers on the impact of the PD. The aim of our research project discussed in this paper, is to explore, analyse and document the extent to which students who have completed, or are still engaged in, a PD consider that either the product of their doctorate or the process of doing it, have 'impacted' on their professional practice and their own development.

Our central research questions are:

- What evidence do we currently have about the impact of professional doctorates? Do the claims often used to market and to distinguish the PD from the PhD live up to the evidence that we have on this issue?
- To what extent does the activity of doing and completing a PD really impact on a student's professional life and career?
- Exactly how does it make an impact? Is it a visible impact or a tacit one? Does it make the student a 'better professional' or practitioner? Is it a result of process or product?

- More broadly, in what senses do PD students contribute to the development of the organisations they work in or the profession as a whole?

The participants in the study were all professional doctorate students who had either completed their doctoral theses or were in the process of doing so. The students were, or had been, registered for doctoral study at one of three universities selected because of our knowledge of the doctoral programmes at those institutions. In addition, the programmes, two Doctor of Education and one Professional Doctorate in Health, were all well established and provided a perspective across a range of different professionals. Our respondents closely matched the comment by Evans (1997) about the nature of students who undertook a professional doctorate. All our respondents to date have been mature, mid- to late- professionals with the exception of one who had retired.

The narrative data was collected in several ways, from a study of doctoral theses, through on line questionnaires, telephone interviews and face-to-face interviews in a number of phases as our interest in this subject developed. The periods of data collection are outlined below:

Phase 1: October _ December 2009. Data collected from the largest programme in the study using completed EdD theses. Fifty-six were considered out of one hundred and sixty-five theses available in the library at that time. Documents were chosen at random, but attempts were made to have in the sample studies submitted every year from 2000 to 2009. The topics in the sample covered a wide range of subjects, from literacy and primary education, to professional and higher education, to studies dealing with equality and disability. Of the students who wrote the theses, thirty one were primary or secondary school teachers; six were involved in teacher training or professional development; 10 were in further or higher education; eight were in adult learning; and one was a nursing tutor. Three main themes emerged in the textual evidence of writers' perspectives and from their substantial narratives on the processes of doing their doctorate and the impact of their research: motivation; perceptions of research process; and perceptions of impact. Further analysis revealed a number of sub-categories under each main theme and tables of the frequency with

which each of the sub-categories are mentioned were developed to indicate the significance of aspects of the data.

Phase 2: Data gathered at the second of the institutions across 2010 from eight narrative stories from students undertaking an EdD who were willing to openly engage in the activity of personal reflection. The students were from a mix of career backgrounds that included further and higher education, school teaching, consultancy in education; and one was retired. In this phase we were concerned with the impact of undertaking a doctorate in education on underlying values and assumptions, perceptions and attitudes and how ways of 'behaving' may have changed. Some of the narratives they produced are long and intricate and contain a wealth of data, which was analysed to see how closely it matched the earlier themes that emerged in Phase 1. This second phase confirmed the findings of our earlier data collection with a stronger emphasis on three areas: the impact upon professional careers, the impact upon discourse and the impact upon personal lives.

Phase 3: In 2011, research was carried out at a third institution offering a Professional Doctorate in Health as we wanted to test our emerging themes and analysis across a different type of doctoral programme. In this phase, there were ten student respondents who included seven in NHS managerial positions; one in Private Health management (managing own GP practices); one was a private consultant operating in the Health Sector; and one a university researcher in Health. The online and face-to-face interviews were semi-structured, encouraging students to take a narrative approach in their reflections upon their doctoral experience. The earlier themes emerged again in this third phase with a strong emphasis upon impact in the workplace setting.

While all our narratives are independent of one another and drawn from different sources and institutions they also form one larger, coherent narrative which emerged through applying the same thematic analysis across all data sets. Our analysis therefore can be described as a mixture of analysis of narratives and narrative analysis very similar to that used by Rytivaara and Kershner (2012) in their study of teachers' professional learning. We have moved between the performance of collecting and

analysing evidence across the three phases, as Polkinghorne (2007) suggests, 'choosing further sources of evidence based on needs derived from interpretations of the already gathered evidence' (p. 478). Having identified the three key themes of motivation; perceptions of research processes; and perceptions of impact emerging from the data (some of which have been discussed in our earlier publications), we chose to focus in this paper on the third theme of impact to study the connection between the professional doctorate and the workplace setting from the student perspective. A close analysis of the data revealed sub-themes on the presentation of self in the workplace setting; academic knowledge versus workplace knowledge; the accumulation of practice wisdom; and criticality in academia. It is these sub-themes that we later expand on to form the basis of our discussion.

Phase 4 of our research, funded by the Higher Education Funding Council, will examine this same issue from the employer and organisation perspective. At this stage we will be able to draw upon both sets of data to further address our question as to whether there is a symbiotic relationship or only a loose association between professional doctorate study and the workplace setting.

All of the research has been carried out under the ethical guidelines of the three Universities we work for, with fully documented ethical approval. All participation has been purely voluntary.

The key question we have asked graduates to reflect upon is:

How has the PD influenced/ impacted upon/ altered my own professional practice?

We asked participants to reflect on the positive aspects of the interaction between the process and product of the PD and their professional life – but we also ask them to consider if any negative interactions or even dissonance has occurred. (See Appendix one for full details).

So far, we have a wide range of interesting data which is not only informing our main research questions but is also enabling us to conceptualise some of the problematic terms in this debate and show how 'impact' and influence might work in reality. The data have also given interesting, unexpected insights and anecdotes into issues that

we had not intended to explore, such as perceptions of parity of esteem between PDs and the PhD.

This paper builds upon earlier research and publications on the tensions, impact and identity of practitioners as they embark upon and later emerge from professional doctorate study (Wellington and Sikes, 2006); Burgess & Wellington, 2010; Burgess et al, 2011). Specifically, this paper extends our work by considering the strategy, skills and processes by which professional doctorate practitioners strive to transfer their research outcomes and contribute to their organisation practice.

The Notions of 'Knowledge Transfer' and Symbiosis

Knowledge transfer between educational institutions and industry has emerged as a priority for most universities in the UK. One recognised facilitator for such knowledge transfer is through researchers undertaking organisationally relevant research (Lee et al, 2000). However, our research indicates that there are a number of issues around the effective transfer of knowledge and skills learned at doctoral level when students complete their studies and 'return' to the workplace. Our initial findings indicated that newly qualified professionals at doctoral level have developed a range of transferable skills, attitudes and abilities as a result of their professional doctorate (Burgess and Wellington, 2010; Wellington and Sikes, 2006). These skills and attitudes are highly relevant to how the professional researcher 're-enters', and is received into, the political and cultural context of his or her workplace. The focus of this paper is on how that knowledge and those skills are (or are not) transferred back or utilised in practice. The specific professional practice oriented doctorate undertaken by these students ought to ease knowledge transfer facilitated as it is by the 'situated' nature of their study. However, our research indicates that this is not always the case.

A useful metaphor in this context is the notion of symbiosis. The term 'symbiotic relationship' would seem to imply a close association between two entities (usually organisms in the strict scientific sense) in which the relationship or interaction is of benefit to both parties.

Do our data on the impact of the professional doctorate (PD) support the presence of symbiosis or is it more a case of tenuous connection?

Using our data and a range of concepts and theories that relate to the key ideas of knowledge transfer and symbiosis we are exploring, from the student's perspective:

- Whether their PDs are 'recognised' in the workplace – this begs the question, what does it mean to be recognised? Does it mean used (the very basic requirement), valued (a higher level of recognition) or rewarded?
- On the contrary, is the PD ever either deliberately ignored or more negatively treated with scepticism (at best) or derision, ridicule and cynicism (at worst)?
- Does a student's PD lead to an 'enhanced contribution' in their workplace? (This may not be the case, for example, with a classroom teacher whose study during the PD may have had no connection to classroom life.)
- Does either the product (dissertation or publication) or the process (personal development, added generic skills) resulting from the student's PD lead to development of the profession? If so, how?

THE VOICES AND NARRATIVES OF THE STUDENTS

The potential change in identity of doctoral candidates as they progress through their learning journey may lead to great strides in personal skills development (for example written communication, critical thinking and verbal reasoning) and more general attitudes and aptitudes valued in academia such as 'criticality'. For the doctoral students in our sample, the situated nature of their learning created many interesting workplace dynamics and brought varying responses to their hard earned professional knowledge. For some it was about a reaffirmation of their professional values; for others, it required the management of a new 'critical edge' in their working relationships. There was some evidence of lack of acceptance among colleagues, which may lead to difficulty in influencing and convincing leaders within their organisation, and a potential fracturing of the employment relationship.

As in earlier publications, data are drawn from different sources: online interview questionnaires, doctoral theses, and face-to-face and telephone interviews. In jointly exploring the data we have worked together in developing an analysis which we feel is rigorous and has enabled us to elucidate some of the complex processes in the

symbiosis (or lack of it) in the relationships between University and the workplace. In presenting the data, we have tried to give voice to the students whilst at the same time using the analytic frameworks we have jointly developed during the research for this and our previous papers together.

In this section we present the voices and stories of the students with very little commentary or conceptualisation. The selection below is drawn from the large collection of transcribed data from our sources. In the subsequent section we present ideas and theories, which relate to our 'raw data' below.

Many of the students' reflections concerned the way that their PD, and the skills or dispositions they had developed as a result of it, were received and recognised in the workplace. For example, the first comment suggests that a healthy organisation will allow graduates to 'question and challenge' but accepts that compromise is needed:

If you work in a bureaucracy like the xxxx, you kind of accept that there are some constraints that you have to work under. Now you can challenge those, and you can question them, but at the end of the day if you fight against them continually, that's when you are going...to have the mismatch and the disharmony. But I think that very much depends on the culture in which you work in and I suppose I'm quite lucky in some ways to work in a culture where we can actually question. It doesn't mean to say that it will change, but you can question and you can challenge, and I don't think any of us would be human actually if there weren't things that happened in the work place that didn't quite match our expectations.

A second student reflects in a similar way on the difference between the nature of thinking and deliberation in academia as contrasted with the occasional need for 'swift action' and intuition in professional situations. This relates to the discussion in our next section on the epistemological differences between the two domains (see table one later) and the contrast between mode 1 and mode 2 knowledge:

I am better able to gauge appropriate actions in professional situations. As a result of the programme I am more informed about issues and willing to share that knowledge when appropriate opportunities arise. However, it

can sometimes be a disadvantage to deliberate too much and to attempt to take the contra view into account when advancing a particular strategy for some small change. Sometimes swift action based on intuition wins the day.

In the next comment, the student seems to be reporting a more negative experience of the contrast in terms of her encounter with 'anti-intellectualism' and to a smaller extent the presence of bullying in the workplace:

I suppose what the doctorate did for me was up my expectations around intellectual content around the work we were doing, which was broadly around leadership development... I kind of lost confidence in my director and I think she also lost confidence in me. I think probably... she was quite anti-intellectual, so if you've got those dynamics going on in your organisation and someone says 'oh I'm going to do a professional doctorate' and it's quite a public thing, you're kind of making a statement about why you think you need to do it, it does raise questions about what other people are doing I think. It can make those who are feeling a bit anxious about their own abilities question I think and if they are in a position of authority and power then it can be quite uncomfortable. I mean I said she was a real bully, but she wasn't bullying me, but I knew she was wary around me.

One of the qualities or dispositions that the doctorate is designed to develop is the ability to be critical and indeed in most Universities the requirement to show criticality is one of the stated criteria for the award of a doctorate. However, two of our students commented that 'criticality' is not always welcomed in the workplace. The first student wrote of being cautious with her challenges and discourse:

I am more critical, more questioning and challenging now... not everybody likes that... I also have to be careful with a lot of the people I work with that I don't use too much academic or management speak else it just puts them off.

In a similar vein, a second student spoke of tempering or 'managing' her critical edge:

My experience has given me a critical edge but this needs to be managed within the context of professional circumstances. In some situations, a critical approach may be challenging for less reflective colleagues. The critical edge needs to be balanced with relationship building.

We discuss these ideas later in the context of the notion of 'critical strangers' (Greene, 1988) and the contrasts shown in table one below between 'epistemic virtues' (Rizvi, 2008) in academia as contrasted with the professions or the workplace.

In our data we have numerous accounts and reflections on the way that the students' PD is received and recognised in the workplace, in varying ways. For example, one student working in HE, in a long written account, contrasted the way she and her doctorate are perceived in her new post with the attitudes evident in her previous situation:

I have recently moved to another HE institution and have also completed my doctorate. This new institution has celebrated my achievement and is pleased to make this known among my colleagues. Having a doctorate has definitely been an advantage as far as gaining a new job. In my previous HE institution there was pressure on staff to gain a Masters degree as teaching is becoming a Masters profession. I was delighted to be ahead of the game. However, it did single me out as being different. While there was a certain comradeship about having to gain a Masters while teaching a heavy load, going beyond that point and studying for a doctorate did present a certain isolation as I was not able to share in the common pressure other colleagues were operating under. There was also a possible dismissal of the pressure of studying for a doctorate as this was perceived by some as voluntary and therefore expendable, whereas the Masters was becoming a requirement. At times there were "jokes" made about me gaining my doctorate and at other times there were dismissive comments.

The above reflection shows the important differences and nuances between organisations and institutions even when they are in the same sector (in this case HE). Similarly, a recent graduate, who is working in a school at a senior level, told a long and heartfelt story of how his endeavour to gain promotion had been greeted with

cynicism in some situations. We do not have space to include the full narrative here (it is over 1500 words) but these three sentences sum up the situation:

In relation to my application for a post as Principal, the whole process has been one of 'toning down' the EdD aspects. My letter (not included here) is a good example of this. Interactions during the interview process have sometimes involved cynical discourse, particularly in terms of the use of the word academic as being somehow detached from reality.

Another student felt that the process of doing a PD (i.e. the skills he had developed) and also the product of his doctorate (a case study of his own HEI) had not been exploited at all by his workplace:

I write well. I enjoy and feel I am quite good at social research. However, having completed the EdD, I am not using these skills within my Institute. Perhaps, had I completed the EdD some years previously, I might have been in a position to use it to pursue different career options within the Institute or even outside it. It does seem a pity that the Institute, having invested in this qualification is not actively seeking to benefit from it.

My research thesis was a case study of the unsuccessful application in the late 1990s by my Institute (xxxxx) for university status. Recently, they have made a renewed application for university title and a committee has been set up to progress this application. It seems strange that, although my Head of School put forward my name to be included on this committee, I have never been invited to take part in its work.

The contrast between a PhD and a PD was very much on the minds of some of our respondents as the comments below indicate. The first talks of the added pressure and the increased 'learning anxiety' of the professional doctorate due to its connection with practice:

The professional doctorate feels, I don't know, maybe it's more public than a PhDyou know the archetypal PhD which you can just do in the library you know, with you and your supervisor, doesn't really have employment implications, or potentially doesn't have employment implications. So my colleague at work did his PhD at Bristol on Liege (a French saint) because by

professional journey he was a priest as well as a senior fellow at the XXXXX and nobody would have really said well you are crap at your job if he failed. If you do a professional doctorate which is directly connected to your professional practice and all you come out with is an MA or this is crap you've got to redo all the data, that has huge implications. So I think potentially the learning anxiety is higher, potentially. I mean I've got no evidence of that, just the evidence of one, my own experience. So how you are contained and managed and supervised is critical...maybe the performance requirements on the people running the doctorate are slightly different as well.

We return to this idea in our discussion of the pedagogical implications of our research later.

In other reflections, the issue of parity of esteem was very near the surface. One student wrote of the lack of recognition for the PD in the field of healthcare and the accusation that it is not a 'proper doctorate':

There's actually still quite mixed responses to the title, which I found when I first graduated I was you know 'doctor' but it's interesting when you work in healthcare, that when you say it's a professional doctorate... then people often say it's not a proper doctorate; you still get those responses which are quite disappointing. So I think that is still something about, it's still not probably positioned or has not got the recognition that perhaps it deserves.

Finally, this student spoke of the PD being different but equal:

On the negative side, the Professional Doctorate (PD) is relatively new and as such new ideas tend to be treated with scepticism. One of the Professors in my department said to me "Now that you have this (Ed.D.) out of your system are you going to do a proper PhD?" This suggests that there is a stigma attached to the PD in that it is not quite up to a "proper PhD". I believe that the experience of the PD was every bit as rigorous as a "proper PhD" but perhaps it is just a tad recent for some. If anything the Ed.D. was tougher than a "proper PhD" as I had to pass six bloody

assignments as well as submit a thesis whilst one need only submit a thesis for a “proper PhD”! I feel that my Ed.D. thesis could stand beside any PhD thesis in the field and be indistinguishable academically. Yet this feeling that somehow the PD is an inferior product seems (to me) to be persistent in some circles. I would urge fellow PD holders to resist this argument steadfastly. In my opinion the PD is not inferior to the “proper PhD”, it is just different!

DISCUSSION AND CONCEPTUALISATION

In the section above we have presented the voices of students drawn from our sample of fifty-six theses, eight narrative stories and ten semi-structured interviews . We have done this with a minimum of commentary in the hope that their voices to some extent speak for themselves. In this section we present some key ideas and concepts which relate to these reflections. In table one of this section we attempt to sum up some of the contrasts between the two domains in which the PD students find themselves.

Specific ideas and concepts relating to our data

1. Presentation of self and 'being in the world with others'

We can see from our narratives and interview data that one of the crucial factors in creating a symbiosis between graduates and their learning organisation is the way that they 'present' themselves in their setting, either during the course of the PD or after its completion. This relates to a notion first put forward by Goffman (1953) in an important discussion of the 'presentation of self in everyday life'. Goffman argued that all individuals play a 'part' in the context in which they find themselves and he talks of the 'performer', who interestingly can sometimes be taken in 'by his own act'. This in turn relates to Jean Paul Sartre's notion of 'bad faith' (*mauvaise foi*); Sartre (1958) argued that many people in everyday situations can play their part to the extent that they become the person they are playing, thus engaging in a form of self-deception. The French philosopher and novelist's classic example is that of a waiter who is almost swallowed up by his role by behaving in certain ways in terms of how they carry the tray, the way they walk and the way they interact with customers. We would argue that there are instances in the connection between a PD graduate and their workplace where 'presentation of self' is crucial and there are occasional glimpses of the presence of Sartre's '*mauvaise foi*' in the cases we have gathered so far. Some students, for example, realised that they were more critical and challenging since completing their doctoral studies and recognised that they needed to learn how to temper their criticality in relation to those around them. Others were less aware of the need to manage their increased expectations in the workplace.

By engaging in 'bad faith' or poor presentation of self, an individual in an organisation, perhaps under pressure from the context they find themselves in, may lose his or her

identity and authenticity and in turn their agency and efficacy – in this case, the lack of impact of a PD may be as a direct result of the individual's disposition, attitude and behaviour rather than the organisation they are located in. This shows the importance of Bourdieu's (1990) notion of 'being-in-the-world-with-others', based in turn on Heidegger's (1962) notion of the importance of 'Being'. This is the idea that the crucial factor in institutions (such as a university), organisations and workplaces is the individual's actions, dispositions, interactions and relationships with and towards others in shaping their own personal situation and the broader context they are working in.

The presentation of self relates to one of the exaggerated polarisations shown in table one in which we put forward an exaggerated summary showing workplace or professional life as contrasted with academia. During the course of the doctorate, in most Universities, the emphasis tends to be on autonomy, independent learning and self-development; and this emphasis is made stronger by the assessment process (the individual *viva voce*, at a single event) and often by the teaching or supervision process. This contrasts with the workplace where the emphasis is often on a community of practice, shared effort and reward, team working and being-with-others and some of our students found the different emphases in expectations difficult to manage.

2. Mode 1 versus mode 2 knowledge and 'subjugated ways of knowing'

The distinction between mode 1 and mode 2 knowledge was made over two decades ago (Gibbons et al, 1994) but is still valuable and relevant in considering the impact of the professional doctorate. In a nutshell, mode 1 knowledge is that revered and generated by academia. It is cumulative, codified and in a sense 'clean'. Its main mode of dissemination is via the academic book, the refereed paper and the conference presentation. In contrast, mode 2 knowledge and its production has its roots in the more 'messy', problem solving world of the workplace. It is said to be disseminated primarily through informal contact, executive reports, on-line postings and other forms of e-communication (Usher and Edwards, 2000). We recognise that such stark distinctions between modes of knowledge are in fact exaggerations, however, we chose to present it in this way to emphasise the differences in the two settings in

which our students work and also because the comments of our students above demonstrate the difficulties some of them faced as they attempted to utilise or combine their 'ways of knowing'. A summary of some of the features of both modes is given in table one.

TABLE ONE: CONTRASTING DIMENSIONS IN THE 2 DOMAINS: AN EXAGGERATED POLARISATION

DIMENSION	ACADEMIA	WORKPLACE/ PROFESSIONAL LIFE
Knowledge generation and construction	Literature-based Building on the past Individual Independent, autonomous Competitive	Practice-based Future-driven Co-production Collaborative
Nature of knowledge/ epistemology	Academic, theoretical Formally codified Mode 1 Independent Generalisable Explicit, written Discipline-based	Practical (phronesis) Informally codified and passed on 'Practice wisdom' Mode 2 Tacit (Polanyi, 1967) Dependent Context-bound, local, situated Tacit, oral Grounded, transdisciplinary
Nature of 'self'/ epistemological stance	Solitary Isolated 'epistemic virtues'(Rizvi, 2008)	Connected teamwork Being-in-the-world-with others Community of practice
Assessment and evaluation	Individual	Continuous review and

	Single event (the <i>viva voce</i>) Traditional, established Explicit, external criteria Individually rewarded	evaluation Dynamic, changing Implicit Internal, un-written criteria Shared rewards
Nature of thinking, logic	Deductive or hypothetico- deductive Individual agency	Inductive, creative, problem-solving imaginative Teamwork/ shared agency
Interactions and culture	Dispassionate 'objective' Detached, impersonal	Emotional Involved Personal
Dissemination and publication	Explicit, written, formal Academic writing with the 'academic virtues' Academic journals Conferences and seminars National or international	Oral, tacit, informal contact meetings Territorial Workplace writing Internal reports Professional journals
Criticality and reflection	Critical Reflection-on-action	Intuitive Reflection-in-action

Examples in our work of where mode 1 and mode 2 knowledge appear to clash or are ignored are evident in the comments around lack of recognition for their doctorate. In particular, the case of the student who had completed a thesis on institutions gaining university status and whose views and work was not sought or considered when her own institution decided to go down that route. The question can therefore be posed: is the lack of symbiosis between PD graduates and their organisation related to the nature of knowledge in the two contexts? Equally, is it a result of the 'presentation of

self' discussed earlier? Or can it be attributed to the difference in the nature of criticality and reflection in the two contexts? (again, see table one).

The question remains of course as to whether one mode of knowledge is seen as superior to or more valued than the other – Foucault (1980) described certain systems of knowledge as 'subjugated ways of knowing' and one wonders if this situation applies to mode 2 knowledge as compared with that in mode 1? These 'subjugated ways of knowing' are clearly evident in the comment from the student who considered having undertaken his PD he wrote well and was 'quite good' at social research yet his institution did not value or make use of these important skills.

3. Practice wisdom and the sociological imagination

Another interesting notion in considering the contrasting nature of knowledge in different settings is the idea of 'practice wisdom'. Clearly, it has its roots in Aristotelian notions of practical wisdom or phronesis. It has been given more recent credence by discussions of how practitioners work in clinical settings and in social work. (O'Sullivan, 2005; Sheppard, 1995). It has been argued that the notion also has more recent roots in the ideas of C. Wright Mills (2000) who stressed the need for vision as part of our 'sociological imagination' in which we view the world by seeing links between individual situations and problems and the wider world of social issues. An example of this perhaps is the student who spoke of being better able to understand and diagnose problems on completing doctoral study but that sometimes 'swift action and intuition win the day'. The idea is that practice wisdom originates from the accumulated knowledge, personal practice and professional wisdom of the practitioner dealing with real-life cases (in some senses, of course, it undermines a heavy reliance on the notion that all good practice is evidence based but that is another debate.).

4. Criticality in academia and the workplace – the idea of 'critical strangers' and being 'territorialised'

Some of the reflections we have shown above indicate that the requirement in academic work to be critical (a key criterion in regulations for assessing doctoral work) does not transfer easily from one domain to the other —hence the comment in the quotation above about the dis-comfort that can be felt when being critical, challenging

and questioning in the workplace. A few of our students, though, were more effective in the way they approached this problem, describing how they felt more informed and able to share knowledge and learned how to temper their critical edge.

When we consider the difference between ‘criticality’ in the doctorate and in the workplace, a valuable concept was first put forward by Greene in 1988. Greene suggested that it is possible for individuals to become ‘critical strangers’ to their own institutions, communities and workplaces. This can create barriers and tensions (Burgess, Weller and Wellington, 2011) which again reduce the impact of the PD on professional life and the professions themselves.

This dis-comfort and feeling of being a stranger may result from a tendency in some professions and organisations for individuals to become ‘territorialised’ (Baumard, 1999). This occurs when their knowledge and skills (their cognition) being restricted, bounded or constrained by the context in which they work. This can result in a difficulty to adapt to different situations, cultures or viewpoints. Equally, such ‘territorialisation’ to use Baumard’s term, would seem to be a major barrier to symbiosis and knowledge transfer in considering the impact of the PD.

Broader debates over Doctoral Education

The section above has outlined several ideas or theories which are useful notions in considering the symbiosis between professional doctorates and the workplace. In addition, table one has suggested some of the areas where the contrast between the two domains can be seen. In this section we consider some of the broader debates that relate to our data.

What are doctorates for?

The reflections and accounts of our students do raise the general question of the purpose of doctorates. There is a growing debate around the question of what ‘doctorateness’ is (see Wellington, 2012 and Park 2007, for example) as well as more widely available literature discussing ‘what doctorates are for’ and what ‘PhDs do’ (The UK Grad programme, for example, 2006). Lee and Dunston (2011) write of the drive for ‘employability and workforce supply’ in higher education and this has clearly been

extended to doctoral level programmes as a result of the Roberts' Review (2002) which presented the case for PhD students to develop generic, transferable skills which would make them more employable, whatever their discipline. The Roberts agenda, as it is now colloquially called, has been backed up and thus implemented by large amounts of funding to Universities and their doctoral programmes. Whilst the PhD has thus become more vocational, the rhetoric behind professional doctorates has continued in the same vein, with a stress on career development, personal and professional development and the development of the professions (Neumann, 2005; Wellington, 2012).

Diversity or confusion? And 'fitness' for the economy?

In some ways then, the boundaries between the so-called traditional PhD and the wide range of professional doctorates have been blurred. Their paths seem to have converged. This has resulted in what Shulman et al (2006) have called a confusion of purpose and a blurring of the differentiating characteristics of doctoral programmes. The old distinction based on the idea that the PhD is for the 'professional scholar' and the PD for the 'scholarly professional' seems to have broken down. Our data show clearly that many students pursue the PD in order to be future scholars, whilst our experience as supervisors over many years tells us that many PhD students are developing practitioners. Despite this convergence, our data indicate clearly that the issue of parity between the vocational and the academic is as strong at doctoral level as it is at other levels of education (see work by McCulloch, 1995, for example, and subsequent work by the same author looking at the history of this issue).

More positively the current situation in doctoral provision has been described by Usher (2002) as providing a diversity of doctorates. Usher goes on to discuss their fitness for the 'knowledge economy' in the context of the current drive to develop so-called 'employability'. Interestingly, and this can only be a brief comment here, our own research relates closely to the on-going debate about the development of 'employability skills' which now seems to be prevalent in higher education (see a whole range of sources including Knight and Yorke, 2004, Cranmer, 2006, Saunders and Zuzel, 2010; and going back to the 1990s see Atkins, 1999 and Assiter, 1995, for example). The link between the 'employability agenda' and our own study of impact

connects in at least two ways: first, employers often say that they want certain skills and people, such as 'critical thinkers' but do they really? Or do they simply want their own version of criticality (Saunders and Zuzel, 2010)? Secondly, and more broadly, do the transferable skills, which form the core of the employability push, really transfer from one domain to another? Our data would suggest that transfer is problematic, to say the least.

Returning to the notion of 'doctorateness', it would seem that there is now no single characteristic common to all doctorates (even if there ever was one). Arguably, there is now not even a set of characteristics forming either necessary or sufficient conditions for doctorateness, across the current diversity. Rather, we now have a kind of Wittgenstenian family resemblance between the wide range of doctorates now available (argued by Wellington, 2012).

The question remains of course as to whether this diversity of doctorates has developed into a hierarchy as seems to be the tendency of so many educational qualifications in the UK in the past (see for example Carr and other authors in Wellington, 1993, in discussing the 'work related curriculum'). We cannot delve into the question of parity of esteem at doctoral level here but we continue to collect data, not yet published, showing that perceptions of lack of parity are alive and well in both the workplace and academia.

Professional doctorates and the 'learning organisation'

The notion of the 'learning organisation' has been attributed to the work of Senge (1990) who identified five main characteristics of a learning organisation: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, a shared vision, and team learning. Perhaps the most relevant (to this paper) of Senge's characteristics or 'disciplines' was 'personal mastery' where individuals take up training and development aimed at improving their understanding towards organisation objectives. This discipline has resonance with the professional doctoral learner, who is often supported by their organisation or institution in time and/or finance to undertake the learning.

What are the organisation's responsibilities in creating the right ecological conditions for growth and development? Eraut (2004) notes that informal and practice oriented learning in the workplace will need to be nurtured and supported in order to foster a pluralist learning culture, a point that is significant to our initial research findings. Organisations may benefit from guidance on how to best integrate and exploit an employee who has undergone professional doctoral development. Such guidance may indicate strategies and influences to the human resources mind-set on how to create space for the professional doctorate member to utilise their (sometimes tacit) research and practice knowledge within the organisational culture.

Hurst (1995) proposed a cyclical order of change within organisations, moving through conservation, creative destruction, renewal and exploitation and then back to conservation, achieved through strategic management. Stacey et al (2000) consider that organisations learn and grow through holding the paradox of stability and instability, seemingly on the edge of chaos. The sequential movement through the complex states of instability to stability, and the resulting change, in successful organisations, is attained through transformational leadership. The consequence of an employee undertaking doctoral research and such learning being integrated into the organisation may be understood as part of the instability that organisations need to experience in order to evolve strategically. However, this form of potential instability may require a different, perhaps more explicit and authentic approach from organisation leaders.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF OUR RESEARCH

What can or should those involved in developing and 'delivering' professional doctorates do about the development of symbiosis between the two organisms: student and organisation? Assuming that we cannot change or even influence the organisation in the ways outlined above then should we prepare the student for the differences which we have exaggerated in table one? If so, how should we prepare them? Should this be part of the programme of the PD? Should we attempt to 'manage their expectations' of their return to 'civilian life' and discuss how to leave the 'no man's land'? (To mix a few metaphors)

What can staff working in academia i.e. lecturers, tutors, programme directors of professional doctorates, do about any of the issues raised above? It would seem difficult, though perhaps not impossible, to influence let alone change or transform the organisations to which PD graduates 'return' or 're-enter' following their successful completion. This may be worthy of debate but the focus of this part of the paper is the question: how can or should the academy prepare students in order to create or enhance symbiosis between the product and the process of their doctorate and the organisation to which they 'return'? How can their expectations of their role in the workplace following graduation be better managed? We start from the assumption that the academy does have a role and a responsibility in this area. Without symbiosis, the effect of the PD in personal development, professional development and the development of professions is likely to be diminished.

As a key stakeholder in the outcome of the research, the (learning) organisation role may need to be reconsidered in terms of involvement and responsibility for the research. There may be approaches to be developed that can foster a genuine learning contract. Without such commitment how can a PD learn to apply their critical research learning in the workplace, and what happens when research findings conflict with accepted employer views or practice? Dealing with conflicting values, criticality and impartiality may cause the PD graduate to have to readjust and re-align their personal and professional identity or as Argyris (1960) has termed it 'psychological contract': a tacit understanding of the boundaries and limits of their responsibility as well as (power) relationship with their employer (Robinson, 1996). Understanding of the psychological contract that the PD graduate has with their employer in terms of developed identity through the academic intervention/impact of the doctorate could help to clarify and even enhance the transformative nature of the PD contribution. Should a consideration and discussion of this 're-adjustment and re-alignment' be part of the curriculum in the later phases of the PD?

We believe that our data suggest a need, towards the end of the professional doctorate, for a preparatory stage to enable development in using transferable skills within the cultural context of the organisation. The role of the workplace, the employer and the context is crucial and in a future phase of this project, funded by a

grant from the Higher Education Academy, we plan to research, design and put forward a potential development framework for completing professional doctoral students.

OTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Our study is evolving to understand and recognise the needs of individuals, organisations and higher education institutions in a new and more integrative way. The data presented above are entirely focused on the student's perspective. One of the key points emerging from our data is that impact depends on the nature of the 'working environment' which is 'receiving' the successful PD graduate so that his or her development does not fall on 'stony ground'. Thus a fruitful avenue for further research would be to shift this focus to concentrate on the organisation or institution in which the student is employed. This would involve an in-depth investigation of the relevant stakeholders. From the workplace or employer's perspective we would like to explore, for example, the following questions:

- What do they see as a learning organisation - what are the right ecological conditions for growth, acceptance of new ideas and skills, professional and personal development for PD graduates?
- To what extent does or can the employer and university work symbiotically with the student in the learning process? For example, is there a learning agreement between the three organisms which is of mutual benefit? To what extent can or do employers help to enhance the student's learning experience e.g. by allowing time for reflection or writing? Or by providing access to key informants for fieldwork?
- Is the employer involved in the assessment process of the PD? Should they be?
- Are workplaces/employers involved in shaping the curriculum or the pedagogy of the PD in their discipline? E.g. are employers present on steering/advisory groups or programme committees?
- What are employers' views on the right ecological conditions for a learning organisation to accept a new PD graduate, who is re-entering? And how (methodologically) should we go about exploring these views? (For example: interviews with employers, or perhaps two or three case studies/narratives exploring both perspectives i.e. the seeds and the stony (or more fertile ground); what is fertile ground in a profession?)

References

- Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding Organizational Behavior*. Homewood: Ill, Dorsey.
- Assiter, A. (1995). *Transferable Skills in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Atkins, M (1999). 'Oven ready and self basting: taking stock of employability skills'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 4 267-80.
- Baumard, P (1999). *Tacit knowledge in organisations*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourner, T., Bowden, R. and Laing, S. (2010). Professional Doctorates in England. *Studies in Higher Education*. 26 (1), 65-83.
- Burgess, H and Wellington, J. (2010). Exploring the impact of the professional doctorate on students' professional practice and personal development: Early indications. *Work Based Learning e-Journal*, 1 (1).
- Burgess, H., Weller, G and Wellington, J. (2011). Tensions in the purpose and impact of professional doctorates. *Work Based Learning e-Journal*, 2 (1).
- Carr, W (1993). 'Education and the world of work: clarifying the contemporary debate' in J. Wellington (ed.) *The Work Related Curriculum*. London: Kogan Page.
- Cranmer, S (2006). 'Enhancing graduate employability: best intentions and mixed outcomes'. *Studies in Higher Education*. 31, 169-184.
- Eraut, M. (2004). 'Informal learning in the workplace'. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26(2), 247-273.
- Evans, T. (1997) 'Flexible doctoral research: emerging issues in professional doctorate programmes'. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 19 (2),174-182.

Foucault, Michel (1980). *Power-knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Hassocks: Harvester Press.

Garrick, J and Rhodes, C. (1998). 'Deconstructive organisational learning: the possibilities for a postmodern epistemology of practice'. *Studies in the Education of Adults* 30 (2), 172-183.

Gibbons, M, Limoges, C, Nowotny, H, Schwartzman, S, Scott, P and Trow, M (1994). *The New Production of knowledge*. London: Sage.

Goffman, E (1959). *The presentation of Self in everyday life*. London: Penguin.

Green, H and Powell, S (2005). *Doctoral Study in Contemporary Higher Education*. Berkshire: Open University/McGraw-Hill.

Greene, M (1988). *The Dialectic of Freedom*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Halse, C. and Mowbray, S. (2011). 'The impact of the doctorate'. *Studies in Higher Education*. 36 (5), 513-525.

Heidegger, M (1962). *Being and Time*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hurst, D.K, (1995). *Crisis and Renewal*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.

Knight, P and Yorke, M (2004). *Learning, Curriculum and Employability in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

Lee, A and Dunston, R (2011). Practice, Learning and Change: towards a re-theorisation of professional education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16 (5), 483-494.

Lee, A., Green, B and Brennan, M. (2000). Organisational knowledge, professional practice and the professional doctorate at work in J. Garrick and C. Rhodes (eds)

Research and knowledge at work; perspectives, case-studies and innovative strategies.

London: Routledge.

McCulloch, G (1995). 'The power of three: parity of esteem and the social history of tripartism' in E. Jenkins (ed.) *Studies in the History of Education (113-32)*. Leeds: University of Leeds Press.

Mills, C. Wright (2000). *The Sociological imagination (40th anniversary edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neumann, R (2005). 'Doctoral differences: Professional Doctorates and PhDs compared'. *Journal of Higher Education, Policy and Management*. 27 (2), 173-188.

O'Sullivan, T (2005). 'Some theoretical propositions on the nature of practice wisdom'. *Journal of Social Work*. 5, 221-242.

Park, C (2007). *Redefining the doctorate*. London: Higher Education Academy.

Polanyi, Michael (1967). *The Tacit Dimension*. New York: Anchor Books.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2007). 'Validity Issues in Narrative Research'. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 13 (4), 471-486.

Rizvi, F (2008). 'Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning'. *Australian Educational Researcher*. 35 (1), 17-36.

Roberts, G. (2002). 'SET for success: The supply of people with science, technology, engineering and mathematics skills'. *The report of Sir Gareth Roberts' Review*. London: HMSO.

Robinson, Peter (1996). 'The education debate: have we got our priorities right?' *Centrepiece*, 1 (2).

Rytivaara, A. and Kershner, R. (2012). 'Co-teaching as a context for teachers' professional learning and joint knowledge construction'. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 28, 999-1008.

Sartre, J, (1958). *Being and Nothingness A Phenomenological Essay On Ontology*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes. London: Routledge.

Saunders, V and Zuzel, K (2010). 'Evaluating Employability skills: employer and student perceptions'. *Bioscience Education*. 15, 15-18.

Senge P (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of Learning Organisations*. Random House: London.

Shulman, L, Golde, C, Bueschel, A and Garabedian, K (2006). 'Reclaiming education's doctorates: a critique and a proposal'. *Educational Researcher*. 35 (3), 25-32.

Sheppard, M (1995). 'Social work, social science and practice wisdom'. *British Journal of Social Work*. 25, 265-293.

Stacey, R , Griffin, D and Shaw, P (2000). *Complexity and Management: Fad or Radical Challenge to Systems Thinking*. London: Routledge.

Usher, R (2002). 'A diversity of doctorates: fitness for the knowledge economy?' *Higher Education Review and Development*. 21 (2), 143-153.

Usher, R and Edwards, R (2000). 'Virtual Research in Performative Times' in J. Garrick and T. Rhodes (eds) *Research and Knowledge at work*. London: Routledge.

Wellington, J. and Sikes, P (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), 723-734.

Wellington, J (ed.) (1993). *The Work Related Curriculum: Challenging the vocational imperative*. London: Kogan Page.

Wellington, J (2012). 'Searching for Doctorateness'. *Studies in Higher Education*.
DOI:10.1080/03075079.2011.634901 for on-line access

APPENDIX ONE: STRUCTURE AND APPROACH USED IN CONTACTING STUDENTS

The impact of the EdD on your professional life and practice

What is this about?

The professional doctorate (PD) is founded on a range of statements relating to: its 'impact on professional practice'; its aim of producing 'reflective practitioners; and its role in developing 'professional knowledge' and 'work based research'. Sometimes these claims are used as a means of marketing the PD, whilst sometimes they are used as a way of separating it from the traditional PhD. Some of the rationale and rhetoric 'behind' professional doctorates involves the claim that we are developing 'researching professionals' and that the PD will improve practice and enhance professional development.

All of the above terms and claims are problematic. The aim of our study is to explore the extent to which students who have completed, or are still engaged in, a PD consider that either the **product** of their doctorate or the **process** of doing it, have 'impacted' on their professional practice. We are hoping to collect a range of case studies/narratives/stories from students who are willing to openly engage in the activity of personal, critical reflection on this question:

How has your professional doctorate influenced/impacted upon/altered your own professional life, practice and development?

Your involvement

We are asking a sample of students, by e-mail, to provide their own reflective accounts of this interaction. We envisage that some will not wish to participate but we expect that some will wish to tell their 'story'.

Please be assured that this is purely voluntary and we appreciate that you may not want to engage in this or you may be really pushed for time at present. If you do join in, you can write as much or as little as you wish. All responses will be subject to the usual ethical guidelines such as informed consent and guaranteed anonymity.

We are asking you to reflect on *positive* aspects of the interaction between the process and product of the PD and your professional life – but we would also like you

to reflect on any *negative* interactions or even 'dissonance' which might have occurred.

A possible structure for critical reflection

The following points may help in your critical reflection but please feel free to follow your own pattern if you wish:

- Have your underlying values, feelings and basic assumptions regarding professional practice changed as a result of doing a PD?
- Have your perceptions and attitudes towards yourself changed?
- Have your actions or ways of 'behaving' changed?
- Has the way you use language (your discourse) in, for example, meetings, seminars and written reports changed or been influenced by the PD?
- Have your own personal circumstances changed?
- Can you attribute any of these changes to the influence of the PD?
- Can you recall and recount any '**critical incidents**' which might indicate the connection between the PD and your professional practice?
- Your personal experience is part of the broader departmental, institutional and national context in which you are a professional- have there been any incongruities/ dissonances/ contradictions between your professional practice and the context you work in? Can these be attributed to your experience of the PD?
- Completing a PD involves both a product (i.e. your written assignments and dissertation) and a process e.g. your own personal development. Can you separate and reflect on both aspects (i.e. process and product) in terms of their influence on your professional life?

Notes on contributors

Hilary Burgess joined the University of Leicester in September 2010 where she is a professor and Director of Studies in the School of Education. Before taking this post, she worked for The Open University as Director for Postgraduate Studies in the Centre for Research in Education and Educational Technology (CREET). Her areas of research focus on schools as learning communities; mentoring in primary and secondary schools; and doctoral students' learning. She has published widely in the field of primary education, teacher education and teacher professional development. She is the Chair of the National Doctorate in Education Director's Network and a Council Member of the British Educational Research Association.

Gordon Weller is the Framework leader for the Doctorate in Professional Studies (DProf) Health Pathway in the School of Health and Social Sciences at Middlesex University. Previously he has worked in the field of work based learning within a number of subject boundaries including business & management, health & social care and education. His research interests focus on leadership, management and professional development for teachers and learners in higher education and professionals within the public and private sectors.

Jerry Wellington is a professor and head of research degrees in the School of Education at the University of Sheffield. He has supervised a large number of PhD and professional doctorate students, and has been external examiner for a wide range of doctoral theses at Universities in the UK and overseas. Currently, his main interests are in research methods and in post-graduate education. He has written forty-six journal articles and ten books on education, methods and methodology.