

International Research Network for Research on Doctoral Education in Educational Sciences

International conversations: Studies of the intellectual organization of doctoral programs in Educational Science – some guidelines

As outlined in the accepted proposal to WERA, the purpose of the international research network (IRN) is to map, analyze and discuss the programmatic and intellectual organization of doctoral education in educational science(s) and research in different national and regional contexts. Accordingly, the network will examine research on doctoral education by conducting systematic reviews and analyses of conversations (for an example, see Gross et al, in print) on doctoral programs/research and on educational research (John & Denicolo, 2019). This will form a foundation for a mapping of the international landscape and identification of similarities and differences.

Academic cultures may be taken for granted, and perhaps viewed as timeless. The starting point here is that academic cultures should be seen as historically contingent and as shifting ideals in response to changes in the intellectual and social organizing of doctoral programs. We can also anticipate that there may be differences within and between contexts, national, and disciplinary orientations etc.

For cross cultural conversations, the analyses should be based on a shared framing. The focus on academic cultures is on what counts as relevant knowledge and what kinds of agents that are involved, including the academy, the profession and politics.

We invite you to present an analysis of your own context/academic culture and to identify major developments or turning points related to:

- **Analyses of the making of doctoral education and experiences of this system**, and in relation to globalization.
- **Academic cultures.** Here this refers to the intellectual and social organization of doctoral programs, including major agents involved.

The historians of science, Daston and Galison (2007), use the term “epistemic virtues” to explore disciplinary norms internalized in the making of the scientific self, norms enforced by appeals to ethical values, as well as to pragmatic efficacy in securing knowledge. Lawn and Keiner (2006) define an academic discipline as “multi-dimensional socio-communicative networks of knowledge production” (p 158). It encompasses both the objects of study (i.e., the topics) and the objects of knowledge (i.e., the phenomenon under study as a set of concepts/theories for the organization of knowledge). It is also institutionally anchored.

The analysis should for instance identify major turning points over time, and important agents involved in this development.

Thus, the making of doctoral education and academic cultures is not neutral or universal. Global politics of knowledge refers to the diversity of ideas that have travelled – and travels –

around the world in the making of geopolitical hierarchies and in shaping what counts as relevant knowledge. Ideas about the making of doctoral education and its academic cultures are largely rooted in the Global North. Supranational organizations, such as the World Bank, UNESCO and the OECD, can play a vital role when it comes to travel of ideas. Nevertheless, analysis of geopolitical dimensions of politics of knowledge can relate to both the global South and the global North (Connell, 2017).

References:

Connell, R. "Southern theory and world universities." *Higher Education Research & Development* 36.1 (2017): 4-15.

Daston, L., & Galison, P. L. (2021). *Objectivity*. Princeton University Press

Gross, B., Lindblad, S., Keiner, E., Popkewitz, T., & Samuelsson, K. (In print): Nodes and nets in educational research communication and organization—an international mapping of educational research publications. *Global Perspectives on Education Research*, 5.

John, T., & Denicolo, P. (2013). *Doctoral education: A review of the literature monitoring the doctoral student experience in selected OECD countries (mainly UK)*. Springer Science Reviews, 1, 41-49.

Lawn, M., & Keiner, E. (2006). Editorial. *European Journal of Education*, 41(2), 155–167.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3700110>

IRN, proposal