Work Based Learning e-Journal
Vol. 1, No. 1, 2010

New sites and agents for research education in the United Kingdom: Making and taking doctoral identities

David Scott[a1] and Marlene Morrison[b]

[a]*Institute of Education, University of London,* [b]*Oxford Brookes University*

Abstract

Reflecting the pressures of diversity in research education in the UK, the traditional doctorate, the PhD, has in recent years been supplemented by five other types of doctorate: the practice-based doctorate, the professional doctorate, the work-based doctorate, the New Route PhD and PhD by publication, of which the professional doctorate is the most substantial and significant development. There has also been a shift in the sites and agents of research education, and a related diversification of those sites and agents in the production of knowledge, including work-based knowledge. However, the introduction of these new forms of doctorate is not just a consequence of universities meeting increased demand, as, if this were so, the long established PhD would suffice. It also reflects internal and external pressures on providers to modify the doctoral experience, such as a desire by governments to tie more closely together doctoral study and professional practice. The implications of reforms to doctoral study are profound, insofar as they potentially threaten current hegemonic knowledge structures in UK universities. They also have implications for work-based learning, as these professional doctorates, practitioner-based doctorates and work-based doctorates, now described as 'third generation' doctorates, are having a significant impact on learning structures and working practices within the workplace. Indeed, they are designed to do just this; with the result that professional and work-based knowledge is being reconstructed within the academy, the profession and the workplace.

[1] Email: d.scott@ioe.ac.uk; mmorrison@brookes.ac.uk

Keywords: Professional Doctorates; Workplace Learning; Professional Knowledge; Bureaucratisation.

Introduction

This article focuses on recent moves in the evolution and development of research education in the UK, paying specific but not exclusive attention to the professional doctorate, and considers these as part of a critical description and commentary about its diversity and fragmentation, its relation to disciplinary forms of knowledge, the sites and agents of research education, and the relation of each to the state, the university, the work-place and the professions. In particular, it examines the implications of recent transformations in the processes of doctoral study and how such identities which result from them are developed, managed, sustained, and sometimes even discarded in the juxtaposition between training and education, and at the various sites of policy development and implementation.

Reflecting the pressures of diversity in research education in the UK, the traditional doctorate, the PhD, has in recent years been supplemented by four other types of doctorate: the practice-based doctorate, the professional doctorate, the New Route PhD and PhD by publication, of which the professional doctorate is the most substantial and significant development. There has also been a shift in the sites and agents of research education, and a related diversification of those sites and agents in the production of knowledge. The highly specialised academic identity implicit in the idea of doctoral education as initiation into a discipline has been replaced by fragmentation and variation. Simultaneously, there have been direct and indirect attempts by the State to standardise both the processes of and outputs arising from such diversity, notably financial inducements and penalties for HE institutions in relation to poor doctoral completion rates, inadequate supervisions, and the incorporation of research student outputs into institutional audits such as the UK Research Assessment Exercise. Regulation is increasingly pervasive and has included the development of a set of generic skills for doctoral education (Quality Assurance Agency, 2001) against which HE institutions are held accountable; increasingly, they provide a timeline for students and supervisors alike, sometimes referred to in *softer* terms as "professional or personal development planning" and in *harder* terms as pre-specified transfer points.

A notable development has been the Professional Doctorate which, over 25 years, has emerged out of PhD study. The first professional doctorate to be validated by a university was the DClinPsy in 1989 (Donn *et al.*, 2000), an attempt by clinical psychologists to raise the professional status of their profession within the National Health Service. The first Doctorate in Education (EdD) was introduced by the University of Bristol in 1992. Over thirty universities now offer professional doctorates in education or related fields, with the numbers growing. Alongside developments in the PhD and the professional doctorate has been the introduction and consolidation of a number of different forms of doctoral study, including practice-based doctorates like the Doctorate in Coaching and Mentoring (DCaM), the New Route PhD and PhD by publication. These developments have taken place at a time of large increases in university provision at undergraduate level and an increase in the postgraduate student body from 26,700 postgraduates in 1961-62, 448,700 in 2000-2001, to 523,830 in 2003-04, with the market for UK doctoral study expanding to other countries round the world alongside increasing demand from home students.

However, the introduction of new forms of doctorate, specifically professional doctorates in the UK, is not just a consequence of universities meeting increased demand, as, if this were so, the long established PhD would suffice. It also reflects internal and external pressures on providers to modify the doctoral experience. There has been a growing interest by governments in doctoral degrees, motivated by a number of different concerns. The Winfield Enquiry (1987), the Harris Report (1996), the Dearing Report (1997) and the QAA (1999) expressed concerns about the quality and standards of awards, the narrow and specialised nature of the enquiry undertaken by the students, the restricted disciplinary orientation of the degree, the individualised and thus non-collaborative nature of the pedagogy employed, the non-transferability of the set of skills acquired by the students, and the academic emphasis of the degree with little or no relevance to the needs of the economy. These concerns are of course not restricted to the UK or even to advanced economies; they are also a concern of developing countries where there are worries about the futility of generating “useless” knowledge to affirm the control of small powerful elites rather than for economic and social regeneration.

Whereas some of these concerns reflect real and serious inadequacies, others reflect ideological disagreements and disputes about the nature of knowledge, and a desire to impose a non-disciplinary structure on universities. Thus, the implications of reforms to doctoral study are profound, insofar as they potentially threaten current hegemonic and enclosed knowledge structures in UK universities. However, they also have implications for work-based learning, as these professional doctorates, practitioner-based doctorates (Lester, 2004) and work-based doctorates, now described as "third generation" (Stephenson *et al*., 2006), are having a significant impact on learning structures and working practices within the workplace. Indeed, they are designed to do just this, with the result that professional and work-based knowledge is being reconstructed within the academy, the profession and the workplace.

Pressures to change

Cowan (1997: 184) has described the history of the PhD as the "bureaucratisation of originality" and he means by this that the original and largely individual search for a universalising and trans-cultural knowledge that originated in the university has been circumscribed by bureaucratic procedures that have reconstituted the type of knowledge that is produced. The German model, developed in the latter part of the nineteenth century (the Humboldt Reforms), was designed to change the purpose and mission of the university from the preparation of an administrative elite to serve the professions to the creation of a new type of knowledge founded on enlightenment principles that would transcend the desire for instrumental forms of knowledge. Influenced by these reforms, Oxford University established a PhD in 1917, though they called it a D.Litt. Other universities in the United Kingdom swiftly followed this example. Meanwhile, in the USA, the doctorate gradually evolved so that it embraced four elements: a taught component; a sequenced series of progression and exit points throughout the programme; systems for overseeing the work of the student; and a shorter dissertation. In France and other European countries, though not in the UK, the examination of the thesis became a public affair, as the student defended their thesis in front of members of the faculty and other interested parties.

In the UK and elsewhere recently there have been moves to provide national standards and formal procedures for doctoral completion (QAA, 1999), though professional

doctorates have been, until recently, excluded to a certain extent, from these quasi-bureaucratic procedures. (One reason for this might be that this exclusion relates to a view of professional doctorates as inferior and therefore not worthy of the attention given to traditional doctorates. Another is that they evolved during a period of increased regulation, and/or are covered in part by Masters' regulations. Therefore, no further attention was required to tighten up their processes.) However, overall, the result is, as Cowan (1997: 196) suggests, "an increasing bureaucratisation within doctoral programmes; of pedagogic sequence; of pedagogic relations, through memoranda; and of knowledge, into training methods." Alongside this increasing bureaucratisation, there has been an increased emphasis on the creation of instrumental forms of knowledge, and a desire to make doctoral programmes and doctoral completion more relevant to the perceived needs of the economy and in particular professional practice. This has been driven both by universities operating within the market and thus competing for a limited number of potential students (developing a vocational element for doctoral study widens the potential pool of applicants), the desire by the professions to give higher status (endorsement by universities) to both their forms of professional development and in some cases licensing-to-practise arrangements, and by governments determined to establish close connections between disciplinary forms of knowledge and economic productivity. These drivers have led to more diversity in doctoral study, as well as closer control by quasi-governmental bodies, of procedure, if not output.

It would, however, be misleading to suggest that developments in doctoral study round the world have coalesced into the creation of professional doctorates alone. Alongside the rapid growth in this new form of doctoral study, has gone the reinvention and reconfiguration of the PhD (Allen *et al.*, 2002). Indeed, PhD study has now begun to embrace a significant taught element (for example, The New Route PhD), and is thus coming to resemble pedagogically the type of doctoral study (the professional doctorate) that it gave rise to.

Professional doctorates are offered in a number of countries; the first Doctor of Education (EdD) was introduced at Harvard University in 1921. In the USA, they are generally pre-service rather than in-service awards. In Australia, where they have been established since the 1980s, two generations of professional doctorates can be identified (cf. Maxwell, 2003). The first conforms to a model of coursework plus thesis and is

dominated by academic interests. The second is characterised by a shift in orientation of both the site and nature of knowledge production (Seddon, 2000), so that academic interests coexist with workplace concerns. How this relationship is exercised is discussed by Bernstein (1996) in terms of regionalisation, and relates in part to the degree of control exercised by the university, and the relationship this implies between the state and the academy. It is to the different facets of this relationship that we now turn.

Professional mandates

Freidson (2001) refers to three types of specialised training: craft, technician and professional. Professional doctorates are of the last type, and he suggests that this professional training inevitably takes place in specialised schools or university faculties. He goes on to argue that the university faculty, as a part of the profession,

> "do not merely recruit, train and certify students. What gives them and their profession of which they are a part the capacity to preserve and even expand their jurisdiction is the fact that in addition to teaching, their faculties can devote themselves to systematizing, refining, and expanding the body of knowledge and skill over which the profession claims jurisdiction" (Freidson, 2001: 96).

This model of advanced professional training in specialised schools or university faculties still leaves a number of problems in relation to professional doctorates. We have already suggested that the type of knowledge developed on professional doctorate courses is different in different occupations. Further to this, the capacity of the faculty to erect a labour market shelter around their professional doctorate through controlling the supply of recruits to higher levels of the profession is limited. On the one hand, a profession such as clinical psychology in the UK (and increasingly other types of psychology professions) requires a professional doctorate qualification for entry, and increasingly rewards senior practitioners who have undertaken professional doctorates; on the other hand, in the field of Education the acquisition of a higher professional degree such as the EdD rarely has direct promotional or status benefits. Indeed with regard to some professions governments have sought to bypass university-accredited

professional qualifications and create their own. This is exemplified in the UK by current and aspiring head teachers in schools who are now required to gain a qualification which is accredited and taught outside the university sector. Finally, professional training is both pre-service and in-service, and though Freidson's model fits better with the former than the latter, it is still misconceived in that it implies a servicing arrangement by universities for the profession. University academics certainly at doctoral level also have their own agendas, which cannot be subsumed entirely, or even, in some cases, partially, into a jurisdictional claim by the profession.

Models of professional training through doctoral study then are regionalised and thus structured by the strength of the boundaries between categories, people and institutions. Bernstein (1996: 231), for example, has argued that there are:

> "punctuations written by power relations that establish as the order of things distinct subjects through distinct voices. Indeed, insulation is the means whereby the cultural is transformed into the natural, the contingent into the necessary, the past into the present, the present into the future."

Establishing and maintaining strong insulations between different forms of the doctorate, between different forms of research and research training (indeed, between training and education), between disciplinary and workplace settings, and between subject disciplines, is, as Bernstein suggests, a way of making what is constructed into a natural event, and thus legitimising it.

A key aspect of professional study relates to the different forms that professional doctorate study takes, and, in particular, that the form of identity developed by the professional doctorate student undertaking a prolonged period of study is dependent on the experiences they have, the work they undertake, the sites at which that work takes place and their life trajectories, as they understand them. It is our contention that a homogeneous model of doctoral study is misleading, and, furthermore, misconstrues the experience and the doctoral identity that derives from such experiences. Our concern then is with the type of knowledge developed within discourse communities, how these different types are developed and experienced in relation to supervisory and peer group

contexts, and which, in combination, produce a specific doctoral identity which varies even according to the site of its production and engagement. Such issues are now considered.

Identities

We have already suggested that in the making of a doctoral identity there are differences within each programme that refer to the ways in which different sets of relationships are embedded at different levels and at different sites. Further, that a key influence is the type of knowledge developed at the particular site, and as a result, identity development in relation to doctoral study is regionalised. This is not to deny that there will be common aspects of doctoral experience across these sites. So, for example, the doctoral experience for the student is likely to be hierarchical, with the student accepting that they will have less experience than their supervisor. There will also be aspects of commonality in the rites of initiation and acculturalisation into research student life. As Samier (1997), referring to Gerholm's (1985: 422) earlier studies of graduate students, attests:

> "Successful adaptation into the academic world requires learning the cultural rules of the game composed of two tacit categories of knowledge: the rhetoric of … discourses or 'front stage' communicative style of the departmental elite, and that generated by the students collectively, the 'back stage' discourse created to make sense of that experience. The *de jure* rules of conduct contained in formal documents are not sufficient for enculturation … [although] as technically rationalised societies proliferate…initiation rites [especially of the formal kind] become more pervasive."

However, and this is where differentiation occurs, disciplines which emphasise "correct" views of knowledge and fixed and agreed procedures for developing that knowledge are also likely to have a particular view about the relationship that should be established between supervisor and student, and about how the student should be positioned. In contrast, in those disciplines which are characterised by a plethora of languages or approaches, and which do not have an agreed view of knowledge or of

knowledge development procedures, the supervisor/student relationship is likely to be understood in a different way. There are of course other factors which influence difference; for example, the history of the department/supervisor, the location of the university, and so on. Yet, the impact of doctoral study "type" upon both student *and* staff/supervisor identity, remains pervasive as does its relation or resemblance to increasingly prescribed forms of generic doctoral practices and "administrative ritual" (Samier, 1997).

Doctoral boundaries

Traditional doctorates such as the PhD predate professional doctorates; in part the PhD has reflected a desire by universities to provide both training in and a marker for advancement in the academic profession. In some fields and in the minds of some academics, the traditional doctorate has a higher status than the professional doctorate, having been longer established, demanding a more extensive thesis, being concerned above all else with the development of disciplinary knowledge, and conceiving its clientele as novitiate academics whose discourse-community is predominantly the academic community. Furthermore in the past, PhD study was constructed around a relationship between the student and her supervisor, with few formal and taught courses required to be taken by the student.

The boundaries between the two types of doctorates are being eroded in the UK, and PhD students are now required to take some taught courses in most UK universities. This weakens the boundaries between the two. It has been suggested that the professional doctorate makes a contribution to practice and specifically the practice of the professional student, whereas the PhD makes a contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline. In one sense this both exaggerates and misconstrues the distinction; yet it, in part, also reflects the mixed and confused nature of doctorates, in which some PhDs *are* focused on making a contribution to practice and some Professional Doctorates *are* focused on making a contribution to the discipline. The reasons for this confusion are not difficult to discern, especially in areas like Education in which the fragmentation deriving from its inter- as well as multi-disciplinary bases proliferates as do the discourses of each. This means that research education may take a number of different forms, with different epistemological bases and different rationales. Moreover,

some disciplines are more parasitic upon the workplace than others. Again, Education is an example.

Given that we have already suggested that such knowledge bases, even within disciplines, are regionalised, this would suggest that purpose, form, setting, process, experience, identity, and even accountability, all have to be understood within disciplinary contexts and that those disciplinary contexts have fundamental differences as well as similarities. And this ignores further complexities in relation to subjects with inter-disciplinary knowledge bases. The implication is that the kind of student and doctoral identities that emerge during the process and as an outcome are likely to vary widely not just between different disciplines but within them and across the different sites of their formation. Doctoral students, whether conscious or unconscious actors, are caught up in a web of disciplinary frameworks in which there is conflict and disagreement, sometimes resolved on university sites in relation to staff by imposition, loss or increase in status for the staff concerned, and losses or increases in influence. In such worlds, generic doctoral frameworks have limited influence beyond the rhetorical other than as a means for accountability, and may even contradict principled arguments made for and against specific kinds of research approaches and methodologies. For doctoral students this implies a journey in which an identity is created, mediated, and structured by such sites and agencies of knowledge production, and, is, in turn, transformed by them by reference and recourse to a range of identities, that include "becoming" and "surviving".

Becoming and surviving

One way of looking at the processes of doctoral study might be to focus the lens firstly upon its end points. In relation to doctoral examination, there are a number of models used world-wide: firstly, the thesis is sent to a team of examiners who then pronounce on its worth; secondly, the student submits to a team of examiners who then, in private, interview the candidate (the *viva voce* system) and make their judgement either before or after the viva; and thirdly, the student is required to present in a public sense their viva either to a team of examiners or to their examiners and faculty or to their examiners, faculty and friends after which they graduate.

In each model the line between public and private dimensions of doctoral identity is drawn differently. The public version formally and explicitly embraces the new recruit to the discipline and also opens up to the public, even in a small way, the secret garden of conferment and induction. Whatever the advantage or disadvantages of a public performance, it is in the eyes of a community (however restricted) that the candidate acquires status. The private version confers a mystery on the process. As a ritual act it marks "an ending demarcation" serving "to structure changes in status" (Samier, 1997: 425). If students are inducted into such mysteries privately then knowledge remains within the boundaries of the discipline and becomes sacrosanct; that is proper knowledge can only be developed by properly inducted practitioners to the discipline, and therefore knowledge cannot be developed by anyone interested in the subject because they have not been through the required process of induction. It is, in short, the establishment of a status imbued division of labour with regards to knowledge development and the maintenance of strong boundaries within and round that discipline.

Professional doctorates, on the other hand, with their weak boundaries between disciplinary and practicum knowledge, may create different forms of identity in the student. Yet, what is significant (cf. Scott *et al*., 2004) is that even in professional doctorates the discipline retains a more powerful hold for many students than the profession. During the various rites of passage from competent professional, to novice doctoral initiate, through to finally achieving doctoral status at the convocation ceremony, 'schizophrenic' tendencies are averted for some students by the compartmentalisation of identities whilst at university and in professional employment - one being 'academic' and the other 'professional'.

Furthermore, students may conceive of the experience of doctoral study in different ways. The first of these is that the student learns the rules about how they should behave and adapt temporarily. This may be towards senior members of the discipline and about what constitutes an appropriate form of writing and talking (presentation), or what constitutes appropriate forms of knowledge in the discipline and how to apply them, or even what constitutes appropriate practices in the discipline and how to apply them. But they do not integrate them into their repertoire of actions and beliefs. In other words, they dissemble, because for a limited period only, that is, until they get their qualification, they want to be accepted into the discipline. Ultimately doctoral status is a

badge of esteem rather than a signifier of identity in the discipline. These are students who become acutely aware of the interaction rites (Erickson, 1987) and ways of enacting them in order to maximise opportunities for success.

The second alternative is that the student tries to take on this doctoral identity but for a variety of reasons they cannot or do not enter into the practices of the discipline; that is, they do not fully understand the rules of the new practice; the rules of the new practice are not clear; the rules are disputed and their understanding of them is mediated through a particular person, perhaps their supervisor (who may be a maverick); or the pull of the rules in their professional setting is so compelling that they ignore the new rules. The third alternative is that they are able to access these new rules and instantiate them fully and successfully.

There are, of course, problems with these scenarios, not least because they do not or cannot represent the experiences of all students in all disciplines. Moreover, the acquisition of knowledge requires more than *just* an understanding of its ground or underpinning rules. And disciplinary practices change. In entering into the disciplinary practice, the new recruit may change the rules, most in a small and few in a major seminal way.

Identity is a complicated notion, and it may be that doctoral identities are actually structured in different ways from professional identities, and for those hybrid doctorates which encompass both elements, doctoral identity is therefore even more complex. The doctoral student is both encouraged to follow the rules and yet also (in some disciplines more than others) encouraged to achieve self-authorship. This refers to more than *just* writing, raising, as it does, the prospect of a doctoral student moving away from a writing and thinking identity which is dependent or parasitic or imitative of others in order to assume a writing and thinking identity that is independent and novel. What we are suggesting, then, is that the process of developing a doctoral identity comprises a different set of actions to that of developing a professional identity. This applies as much to learning as it does to other aspects of the doctoral experience.

Learning

If we assume that learning is as central to the processes of engaging in doctoral study as it is for Education actors at other levels/sectors, then the experience of doctoral learning is also deeply embedded in disciplinary contexts. For professional doctoral students the prescribed link is to practice and the assumed mediation between theory and practice is usually, though not exclusively, through engagement with empirical research, commonly of the relatively small-scale, and related to *this* disciplinary framework or approach rather than *that*.

Yet, for doctoral students, learning is complex and potentially rich and rewarding, and one in which the student is presented with a mass of information, ideas, schema, opinions from a number of different sources (i.e. books, articles, lectures, seminars, emails, *e*seminars, personal communications and so on). What the student does is shape this mass of information in various ways and there is always a background to this shaping. It is also important to note that this shaping can take a number of different forms: partial shaping, complete shaping, discarding with no replacement, confusion, on-going, going backwards and forwards and so on. Shaping takes place against a scholarly background; aspects of which may or may not be implicit and where some aspects can be surfaced for deliberation. This background also includes a retrospective view of the identity of the doctoral student, a sense of their present identity(ies), a prospective view of their identity(ies), a placing of the work in various discourse communities, a particular understanding of the way the rules work in those discourse communities, and much more; all of which interact in various ways. For individuals interacting with multiple identities, doctoral learning therefore, is irredeemably social, embedded, and selective. So the student has to absorb some of the ideas they are presented with and discard or partially discard others. Even if the student is prepared to operate through a notion of multiple identities, they are still selecting, filtering, endorsing, rejecting, enhancing and discarding.

These views of learning and learners, we argue, are very different from a training model for research students currently endorsed by governments such as the UK, in which the learning metaphor is that of acquiring a set of behaviours, called skills, which once acquired, enables the student to perform a set of actions which have been designated as

appropriate or the norm for the workplace, whether the workplace is seen as the academy, as in a traditional PhD model, or the professional workplaces. This is not to deride the importance of training or professional development as aspects of doctoral study, but rather to take issue with some of the forms taken and the assumptions that underpin them. The training tendency is further exaggerated by another false assumption, that students begin their doctoral journey as deficit learners in which the deficit can only be reversed by recourse to training programmes that point to ways in which individuals might be encouraged to handle their emotional as well as learner-selves better, and so become more adept at personal planning, coping with the stress of doctoral study and so on. This is a research student version of what Ecclestone (2007) has referred to as a view of the learner as "the diminished self", increasingly referenced and revered in education policy and practice. This, of course, takes on a specific nuance with professional doctorate learners who, in other respects, are at, or approaching, the peak of their professional careers, and might be expected to have these skills in abundance; another reason why the benefits of non-discriminating generic programmes geared both to post-MA students in their 20s and mature mid-career professionals may be limited, and, in extreme cases, counter-productive. Above all, it raises issues at doctoral level about the distinction between training and education.

What we are suggesting is that in the formation of a doctoral identity, both students and staff are trying to weave a path through the discourses of training and education, and are both shaping and being shaped by them. The act of learning always takes place in terms of a background (current thinking, activity and practice within the discourse-community and within what is allowed by governments within that discourse community). In other words the student draws on that background, as does the supervisor, though there is always the possibility of resistance. The issue is the extent to which, and for a variety of reasons, either supervisor or student or both can or do try to resist or conform to those rules. In such climates it is increasingly difficult to discern the 'eureka' moments that are traditionally thought to comprise key incidents in doctoral study. 'Seeing the light' might increasingly be viewed as coming to know the rules of the game rather than the development of original knowledge, however conceived.

Time, control, and power

In the stepped training model that is increasingly a feature of doctoral study in the UK in all its forms (with the possible exception of PhD by publication), the time element is crucial. Increasingly, the individual becomes a doctoral student through controls which break doctoral study into constituent elements, each one of which is then available for inspection at specified intervals. This involves written protocols, the ascription of responsibility and potentially blame to a named person (increasingly important in litigious contexts), a time-scale for delivery, a form of knowledge which allows this process of inspection to take place, a mechanistic view of the relationship between supervisor and student, and on the part of the student, forms of trust which are abstract, rather than mediated, concrete or personalised. By abstract we mean that the student has to base their trust in expert systems of which they have no real knowledge, have not been involved in their creation or construction, and only with the greatest effort can see their relevance to the purposes of the enterprise. By mediated trust, we mean that the student is an active participant in the system and has good grounds for being sceptical about the surveillance mechanisms. Concrete trust refers to that which is embedded in solidarity between supervisor and student; personalised trust is expressed through personal loyalty, friendship or through a caring relationship.

Abstract forms of trust create particular types of learning environments and particular types of knowledge, as do the other forms of trust but in different ways. Doctoral education can therefore be configured variously; the training/education dichotomy provides one starting point for considering the new ways in which doctoral identity and study are being reconfigured (along with that of the person(s) assigned the role of supervisor(s)). For the professional doctorate student such reconfigurations take specific forms and relations to power.

Professional doctorate students have a number of discourse communities that they move between: the academic discourse community (regionalised and evolving), their professional discourse community (again, evolving) and their personal discourse community (which operates outside of academic and professional communities and has been formed through many iterations of life experiences). The doctoral student is a learner in a more profound sense than an academic, in that the background to their

learning is more positionally constrained. Power works in different ways for the doctoral student than for the academic; so, the doctoral student has to accept that they have a less sure grasp of what they are expected to do than an academic (if they don't accept this, then they are likely to be subject to various types of sanctions), and they have less opportunity to shape the discourse community than an academic (though of course academic life is stratified in various significant ways). For example, in the social sciences there are epistemological debates which are sometimes expressed as a quantitative/qualitative divide. These debates and their partial resolutions are the background to policy decisions (i.e. the UK Economic and Social Research Council's designation of research student training as comprising programmes of qualitative *and* quantitative data collection and analysis, with the sanction that students who are not trained in both cannot qualify for state funding); and to decisions by doctoral programme directors as to what doctoral education should consist of. The point is that the doctoral student is constrained epistemologically and has to learn about the nature of these debates in both a political and epistemological sense.

Conclusions

The intentions of this article have been to chart and explain the recent evolution and development of research education in the UK, paying specific but not exclusive attention to the professional doctorate, and to consider these as part of a critical description and commentary about its diversity and fragmentation, its relation to disciplinarity, the sites and agents of research education, and the relation of each to the state, the university, the work-place and the professions. Our specific interest has been to focus upon the implications of recent transformations on the processes of becoming and being a doctoral student and how such identities are developed, managed, sustained, and sometimes even discarded in the juxtaposition between training and education, often presented in unison as if they were less than problematic mantras for doctoral study.

It should not be assumed, moreover, that we are harking back to some earlier halcyon, fictionalised days when doctoral study produced, more *fairly* or *justly*, individuals who were necessarily more or less *self-fulfilled*, more or less *useful* or *enlightened* to live or work in the societies inhabited by them. Indeed, horror stories of the idiosyncratic

nature of doctoral processes and outcomes abound (and sadly persist). Instead, we question whether the homogenising, bureaucratic, and skills-dominated agendas have brought success, even in the state's own terms, where, paradoxically, though the value of doctoral study is widely trumpeted, it has remained, with exceptions, one of the most under-resourced areas in terms of the allocation of university staff time and resources. Writing in 1997, Ronald Barnett bemoaned Higher Education's lack of "critical capacities" both "for assisting an organization's economic position (including the University's) and for 'self-reconstitution', and where critical practices have been reduced to 'low level' 'critical competences' to the extent that both students and staff end up 'speaking' and 'practising them" (Barnett, 1997: 177 and 178). "Higher education *is* a critical *business"* (*ibid*, our emphasis). Our contention is that the juxtaposition between instrumentality and criticality now precariously positioned in some doctorates requires further interrogation in settings where students continue in their struggle to make and take doctoral identities.

References

Allen, C., Smyth, E. & Wahlstrom, M. (2002). 'Responding to the field and to the academy: Ontario's evolving PhD', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 21(2), pp. 203-14.

Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: A critical business.* Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Cowan, R. (1997). 'Comparative perspectives on the British PhD' in N. Graves & V. Varma (Eds.) *Working for a Doctorate: A guide for the Humanities and Social Sciences*. London: Routledge.

Dearing Report (1997). *The National Committee of Enquiry in Higher Education*. London: HMSO.

Donn, J., Routh, D. & Lunt, I. (2000). 'From Leipzig to Luxembourg (via Boulder and Vail): History of Clinical psychology training in Europe and the United States', *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice,* 31(4), pp. 423-8.

Ecclestone, K. (2007). 'Resisting images of the 'diminished self': The implications of emotional well-being and emotional engagement in education policy', *Journal of Education Policy,* 22(4), pp. 455-70.

Economic and Social Research Council (2001). Postgraduate training guidelines. www.esrc.ac.uk/esrccontent/postgradfunding/postgraduatetrainingguidelines2001.asp

Erickson, F. (1987). 'Conceptions of school culture: An overview', *Education Administration Quarterly,* 3(4), pp. 11-24.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The Third Logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gerholm, T. (1985). 'On tacit knowledge in academia' in L. Gustavson (Ed.) *On communication: No.3.* Linkoping: University of Linkoping, Department of Communication Studies.

Harris, M. (1996). *Review of postgraduate education*. Bristol: HEFCE, CVCP.

Lester, S. (2004). 'Conceptualizing the practitioner doctorate', *Studies in Higher Education,* 29 (6), pp. 756-770.

Maxwell, T.W. (2003). 'From first to second generation professional doctorate', *Studies in Higher Education,* 28(3), pp. 279-91.

Quality Assurance Agency (1999). *Code of practice for the assurance of academic quality and standards in higher education: postgraduate research programmes*. London: QAA.

Quality Assurance Agency (2001). *The National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*. London: QAA.

Samier, E. (1997). 'Administrative ritual and ceremony', *Education Management and Administration,* 25(4), pp. 417- 36.

Scott, D., Brown, A., Lunt, I. & Thorne, L. (2004). *Professional doctorates*: *Integrating professional and academic knowledge*. London: Open University Press McGraw-Hill Education.

Seddon, T. (2000). 'What is doctoral in doctoral education?'. Paper presented at the *3rd International Professional Doctorates conference, Doctoral Education and Professional Practice: the Next Generation*. Armidale, 10-12th September.

Stephenson, J., Malloch, M. & Cairns, L. (2006). 'Managing their own programme: a case study of the first graduates of a new kind of doctorate in professional practice', *Studies in Continuing Education, 28* (1), pp. 17-32.

UK Council for Graduate Education (2002). *Report on professional doctorates*. Dudley: UKCGE.

Winfield Enquiry (1987). *The social science PhD: The ESRC enquiry on submission rates*. London: Economic and Social Research Council.