



THE GLOBAL SCHOLAR

IMPLICATIONS FOR
POSTGRADUATE STUDIES
AND SUPERVISION

EDITORS
PETER RULE
ELI BITZER
LIEZEL FRICK





TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL EDUCATION

CRITICALLY EXPLORING FAMILIAR NARRATIVES IN
STUDENT EXPERIENCES

Sherran Clarence

INTRODUCTION

For many students in different university and disciplinary contexts, doing a doctorate can be a lonely, isolated, frustrating, uncertain, difficult business. Many different research studies, published papers and books, as well as tweets and Facebook posts convey this. There is a sense that many doctoral students are not overflowing with excitement, happiness, and constructive confusion as they work their way steadily towards a completed thesis with a super-supportive supervision team and friends and family cheering them on. Rather, the sense is that many students are struggling, feeling mostly frustrated, paralysed or stuck in response to feedback, uncertain, like a fraud, with small bursts of triumph and excitement that cut through the struggle every now and then. Levels of support, especially from supervisors, seem uneven across the field of doctoral studies and in most, if not all, higher education contexts given the wide-ranging published research, Twitter posts and blogs online.

I completed my own doctorate in 2014 after a somewhat bumpy start in 2010 that led to a temporary suspension of registration in 2011 and a complete change of project. I did not find doing my doctorate easy, and parts of the research and writing process were deeply frustrating and challenging. But, looking back now and even at the time, my overall experience – my narrative – was one of constructive engagement with my study, supervisor and peers, and pleasure, even enjoyment, in the mental and emotional challenges the process engendered. However, when I

PART THREE • TRAJECTORIES

shared this with fellow PhD travellers at the time, I was struck by two things: that my narrative was not a very familiar one, and that in enjoying, and dare I say, loving the experience of doing my doctorate, I was an odd bird.

This has bothered me for a long time. I now work with postgraduate students as both a writing mentor and a research supervisor and I interact with many doctoral students especially through my professional role in my university, through my social media profile on Twitter, and through my blog, which is written for postgraduate student researchers and research supervisors. Over and over, I see a different narrative than my own being reinforced, so much so that this has become *the* narrative of doctoral study. This is the narrative of isolation, frustration, struggle and suffering, and it is a familiar one for anyone conversant with both research and practice in doctoral education the world over (see, for example, Aitchison & Mowbray 2013; Carter, Blumenstein & Cook 2013; Mewburn 2011; Trafford & Leshem 2009).

This narrative seems to cut across national and regional higher education boundaries, and across race, class, gender, sexuality and able-bodiedness. Several studies have looked particularly at how women experience doctorates differently to men, given the gendered nature of domestic labour and a different form of work-life-PhD balance (Aitchison & Mowbray 2013; Brown & Watson 2010; Carter *et al.* 2013); at the experiences of working-class students (Gardner & Holley 2011; Holley & Gardner 2012); and at the experiences of students of colour (Crumb, Haskins, Dean & Avent Harris 2019; Felder, Stevenson & Gasman 2014). Many of the published studies that have looked at different intersections of issues of race, class, and gender, particularly and the experience of the doctorate have been prompted by concerns about student success, equity, access and social justice. To differing extents, they have tried to unpack aspects of this familiar narrative: the nature of students' doctoral experiences, the reasons for their struggles, and what those of us invested in enabling success at this level can do about it. These concerns about equity of access and success and socially just postgraduate education are global in nature, as they should be, and are part of the wider issues addressed in this book.

Students and supervisors from a range of national, linguistic, ethnic and cultural backgrounds constitute contemporary doctoral education in many contexts (for example, in Australia, South Africa, the UK and the USA). Differences in approaches to feedback, to managing authority, to engaging in debate may lead to successful or fraught supervision relationships, and in some contexts fears that these differences may impede student success may lead universities to aim for assimilation. For example, guiding international students into the host's ways of doing things (Manathunga 2007). This may contribute to difficult emotions for many students and supervisors

CHAPTER 11 • TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL ...

which go beyond personal feelings and can be linked to the structural and cultural dimensions of doctoral education and support. Given increasing global movement within academia there is a need to explore the ways in which tensions between what students need and what they bring with them into their studies, and what universities and supervisors regard as ‘appropriate’ or ‘successful’ ways of working and being may create complex emotional labour that can have an impact on students’ feelings about their studies, and academia more generally.

In this chapter, I want to pick up a particular strand in this wider body of research that is under-explored: the role of emotions in doctoral study and how we can better understand, theorise and incorporate emotions in both research candidature and in research supervision and support. This is a conceptual undertaking, starting with an initial exploration of dominant approaches to understanding emotions in the doctorate, before moving to propose a feminist sociological framework for understanding both the nature and the role of emotions. It is near to impossible to provide any singular definition of ‘emotion’ here, as how emotion is conceptualised and understood is largely dependent on the context in which it is being used or has meaning. In this chapter, following Sara Ahmed, Megan Boler and Arlie Russell Hochschild, the focus is less on what emotion is and more on what emotions do, and how we can understand the social and cultural dimensions of emotions as embodied, as powerful, and as collective, rather than limited to be of the mind and individually felt and experienced (see Ahmed 2014, Chapter 1 especially). The framework developed in this chapter represents an alternative language of description for this under-explored, often tacit dimension of doctoral education.

UNPACKING A FAMILIAR NARRATIVE

The first step, following Ahmed (2014:1), is to look more closely at this “familiar narrative”, and offer a “close and careful reading” instead of taking it for granted as a norm, or as just the way things are. An opening question, then, must be, “Why is *this* the familiar narrative?” When we think about doing a doctorate, why are some of the first emotions that come to mind fear, uncertainty, anxiety and feeling like a fraud (Imposter Syndrome)? Although several studies highlight that a doctorate brings both pleasure and pain – feelings of excitement, constructive growth and challenge, enjoyment of writing, alongside these “negative feelings” (Trafford & Leshem 2009:312) – the pain seems to be predominant, especially for students (see McAlpine & Amundsen 2009; Mewburn 2011). It is important to understand both the nature of the narrative and some of its key effects, because these are powerful forces in shaping doctoral learning, and this is a ‘high stakes’ space for universities, supervisors and students.

PART THREE • TRAJECTORIES

Universities around the world invest substantial resources in doctoral education and have high expectations of 'output' at this level. This is largely because of pressure from governments to increase the number of graduates with doctorates, which many believe will, in turn, increase economic productivity and growth (Cloete 2015; Nerad 2019). The demand for more doctoral students puts pressure on universities to put in place sufficient resources, including the availability of research supervisors and other forms of support, particularly for doing and writing research. Students and supervisors are under pressure to succeed and this can create intellectual, physical, psychological and emotional stress that plays out in a range of ways across different university and departmental contexts. A logical deduction to draw from this global situation is that these stresses can have an impact on supervisor and student well-being, and on the timely completion of research projects. Slowed completion can lead to blockages in the 'academic pipeline', which can then cause further stress, including financial stress for students especially. Further, poor experiences can then be taken forward as 'baggage' that shapes current students' future supervision and research practice.

A great deal has been written, both in peer reviewed research and in more popular sources such as *Times Higher Education* and *The Conversation*, about different approaches to enabling both greater access and enhanced success at the doctoral level, from diverse contexts including Australia, New Zealand, Southern Africa, the USA, the UK, and Europe. This is, indeed, a global conversation. A great deal of this work focuses on aspects of doctoral study such as research supervision, giving students feedback on their thesis writing, supporting the writing of a doctoral thesis, and enabling students to grow intellectually as they progress through the PhD 'journey'. What is less overtly focused on is the nature and role of the emotion underlying all of that intellectual labour, and the ways in which emotion work, feelings and emotional labour can both enable and also powerfully constrain success at this level. This is intriguing, because it is an oblique focus or an 'elephant in the room' in many studies that overtly focus on the more intellectual or 'academic' dimensions of completing a doctorate successfully.

Emotion is referenced often in research on doctoral education, especially in relation to writing, feedback and supervision. Both in the titles of papers and in the research findings, emotions clearly play a central role in being a doctoral student and in being a supervisor (see, for example, Aitchison, Catterall, Ross & Burgin 2012; Doloriert, Sambrook & Stewart 2012; Strandler, Johansson, Wisker & Claesson 2014). These studies, among many others, explore different kinds of 'becoming' and behaviours that are considered valued by or appropriate in postgraduate scholarship. Students need to be able to 'manage' their emotions, but so do supervisors (Strandler

CHAPTER 11 • TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL ...

et al. 2014). Key examples in published studies are of students needing to repress ‘inappropriate emotions’ with supervisors and peers, so as to appear in control (Aitchison & Mowbray 2013), especially in relation to feedback on their writing; on the other side of this, supervisors need to be mindful of offering feedback in ways that produce more ‘positive’ emotional and intellectual engagement (rather than making students feel stupid, fraudulent, or overly anxious and paralysed) (Aitchison *et al.* 2012). But what makes expressing, or even having, these feelings ‘inappropriate?’ What are ‘appropriate’ emotions?

Studies suggest that the kinds of emotions that are valued and ostensibly nurtured in doctoral education around the world are confidence, assertiveness, self-confidence, self-regulation, and proactivity (Gurr 2001; Stracke & Kumar 2010). The development of a scholarly identity is the focus of a relatively large body of research in doctoral education, and these studies suggest that students draw on significant personal, emotional and intellectual resources within themselves and within their study and home environments to do the hard work of developing a doctoral identity alongside researching and writing a doctoral thesis (McAlpine & Amundsen 2009; McAlpine & Lucas 2011). Many of these studies suggest that supervision plays a key role in both engendering the development of this identity and associated ‘positive’ or ‘appropriate’ emotions, and in undermining students’ efforts to construct and assert a doctoral identity and voice.

Studies that do focus on the role of emotion in supervision (for example, Doloriet *et al.* 2012; Strandler *et al.* 2014) suggest that emotions are individually felt and experienced phenomena for both students and supervisors. Strandler *et al.* (2014) show that, while managing emotions effectively is part of developing a professional, scholarly identity, doing this as part of supervision is tricky. This is, at least in part, because emotions are viewed by many supervisors and students through a psychotherapeutic lens, as part of students’ ‘private lives’. In other words, if emotions are openly brought into the supervision space, supervisors will have to be either their students’ therapist or their friend (see also Manathunga 2007), and neither of these roles feels appropriate or professional in this scholarly space. While emotions and feelings certainly can be linked to underlying mental health concerns (such as depression or anxiety) as well as personal issues (such as having a baby or getting divorced during one’s candidature), conflating the creation of a space within doctoral education for emotion work and emotional labour with a supervisor becoming either a psychotherapist or a “mate” (Manathunga 2007:217) is problematic. This move obscures an understanding of emotions as “social and cultural practices” (Ahmed 2014:9), and as powerful mechanisms that position bodies, ideas and ways of being

PART THREE • TRAJECTORIES

within particular hierarchies in education. It also limits critique of the ways in which doctoral education, and education more broadly, privileges some ways of being, ideas and bodies over others, which is a crucial part of socially just education.

Many studies talk about the 'negative' and 'positive' feelings and experiences associated with different aspects of postgraduate study, yet few really spend time theorising emotion in a way that enables the field to understand how emotions are generated by, and also engender, particular experiences of the doctorate. We know that these experiences are 'raced', gendered and 'classed', and this knowledge is important for developing and sustaining more socially just, inclusive and critical supervision and university support structures. But how we understand the social and cultural nature and effects of emotions in doctoral education is less well understood, and I argue here that this is a problematic gap in both research and related practice, especially given the increasingly diverse, global nature of doctoral education. This chapter adds to work in sociology, feminist theory and education that argues for reclaiming a sociological understanding of emotion and understanding its role in shaping education, specifically who gets access, how this access is managed, and the ways in which success is both enabled and constrained.

What I want to begin to understand is how we can more deeply understand why this familiar narrative of the doctorate has to consist, even when it is pleasurable and enjoyed by the student, of suffering, paralysis, frustration, anxiety, uncertainty, fear, and feelings of not being (clever, good, productive, engaged) enough. Further, I want to understand the ways in which dominant forms of supervision and research practice at this level work to elevate certain emotions and denigrate others, creating social and cultural spaces that privilege certain forms of participation and embodiment over others. Drawing on the work of Megan Boler, Sara Ahmed and Arlie Russell Hochschild, the remainder of this chapter will begin to build a feminist sociological framework for exploring, theorising, and more critically understanding the nature and role of emotion work and emotional labour in doctoral education.

CONSTRUCTING THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR RESEARCHING EMOTIONS

I propose a framework for researching emotions in doctoral education constructed from aspects of the work of three feminist sociologists: Megan Boler (*Feeling Power. Emotions and Education* 1999), Sara Ahmed (*The Cultural Politics of Emotion* 2014) and Arlie Russell Hochschild (*The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling* 1983 [2012]). This section of the chapter is an exposition of pertinent aspects of these three texts, followed by a discussion that links them to the focus of my contribution, which is doctoral education.

CHAPTER 11 • TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL ...

The nature of the university and hierarchies of feeling: Megan Boler and Feeling Power

Megan Boler's book, *Feeling Power. Emotions and Education*, begins with a personal account of a lecture she gave at different universities in the late 1990s on gender, power, emotion and education, about which she asked students in attendance to provide written feedback. The many different pieces of feedback showed Boler that many students, women especially, recognised intimately the "gendered rules of emotional conduct" (x) in the academy. But the feedback also indicated that these rules were largely tacit, unnamed and therefore unable to be critiqued, challenged, and reimagined.

These "gendered" rules that so many students so closely identified with exist because of a peculiar confluence of social, cultural and economic factors, especially in Western, capitalist, patriarchal societies (in which many academics teach, supervise, study and conduct research). Education at every level serves a crucial role in society: it "shapes our values, beliefs and who and what we become" (Boler 1999:xiv); in that society. This has been referred to in some studies as part of the 'hidden curriculum' – not overtly named and taught, but a powerful undercurrent pulling the knowledge, skills and aptitudes that are named and taught together for a larger purpose. Education thus frames particular emotions as appropriate and others as inappropriate, and this framing invokes much deeper sets of belief about how to be the 'right' kind of citizen and student.

In much of the Western world, this citizen and student is rational, objective, capable of reason, and master of their emotions and feelings. This, Boler argues (along with other feminist philosophers), is a result of the post-Enlightenment casting of reason, objectivity and rationality as appropriate and highly valued, and 'hysterical' outbursts of emotion, including passion, as inappropriate. Given that the prominent scientists, writers and thinkers in the years that marked the Age of Enlightenment were men, these appropriate emotions became associated with or perhaps were valued because of their association with hegemonic, privileged forms of masculinity. In valuing these masculine emotions as appropriate and conventional or 'the norm' we should all aspire to, we simultaneously devalue and denigrate their opposites, pathologising emotions that are feminised and thus rendered wholly inappropriate.

Boler argues that we have to confront and address emotions in our classrooms – and would add here supervision – if we are serious about social justice in education. This is important because of the way in which emotions have become a critical site of social control, within and outside of education. Think, for example, of how we

PART THREE • TRAJECTORIES

teach students in different disciplines to make arguments and the kinds of 'rules' we invoke: you cannot say 'I', 'you must use this citation format', 'you need to change your tone', and so on. What does this feedback communicate about the dominant forms of scholarly identity we want our students to invest in and develop? What ideological beliefs underpin our notions of what it means to successfully acquire the valued identity (Boler 1999)? Boler suggests that this is far from a merely intellectual exercise; implicated in the ways in which we write our curricula, teach, supervise and assess our students' work are deep emotional investments that connect with the dominant sets of values and beliefs that our societies espouse in tacit, unnamed and unexamined ways. This is, to some extent, why some students may find the adoption and development of a particular form of doctoral identity relatively unproblematic and even comfortable, while others experience this process as a deeply jarring, even cruel, process that undermines and even fractures their sense of self, and self-worth.

From Boler's work, my proposed framework takes two important insights: the first is that education is, in Western, patriarchal, capitalist societies, marked by intense competition which valorises a particularly masculinised, heteronormative, middle-class form of hyper-individualism; and the second is that the result of this form of identity being placed at the top of social and educational hierarchies is that other forms of identity are relatively positioned in marginal, subordinate and even denigrated positions. The consequences of ranking forms of identity and assigning them different relative values are social injustice, narrowed access, and diminished success for students (and supervisors) who do not, or cannot, conform. Even though this hierarchy of identity or subject positions and attendant emotions is seldom named, made visible and opened for critique, we know it exists, because we all work to conform or resist the positioning in certain ways. We are aware of the powerful work done by emotions and the management of emotions, whether or not we have a name for all of it. This brings the framework to the next contribution, from the work of Sara Ahmed.

Emotions are not just private, personal feelings: Sara Ahmed and The Cultural Politics of Emotion

Like Boler, Sara Ahmed is a feminist theorist, and she, too, understands education in Western patriarchal societies to be essentially, tacitly, masculine and heteronormative in terms of its underlying ideological orientations, beliefs and values. Adding to Boler's notion of a hierarchy of identity, Ahmed (2014:3) makes explicit the hierarchy between emotion and reason: emotion is "associated with women, who are represented as 'closer' to nature, ruled by appetite, and less able to transcend

CHAPTER 11 • TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL ...

the body through thought, will and judgement". She further argues that this hierarchy between emotions and reason is displaced into a hierarchy between emotions, where some are elevated as being symbolic of the ability to cultivate the 'right' temperament or the appropriate form of identity, while others are signs of weakness or an inability to 'fit in'. In doctoral education, indeed education writ large, an appropriate scholarly temperament is evidenced through confident, reasoned engagement with ideas, and calm, reasoned interaction with peers; this presupposes the confident, assertive, self-regulated scholarly identity so valued by the field. Inappropriate would be, for example, losing your 'cool' and crying in a supervision meeting, expressing anger at unconstructive feedback, or becoming overwrought about aspects of writing or research (see, for example, Aitchison & Mowbray 2013).

Ahmed's fundamental argument is that emotions are "social and cultural practices" and as such resist both privatisation and pathologisation (see also Boler 1999). Part of the problem with privatising and pathologising emotion – particularly those emotions considered inappropriate by the dominant social and cultural context – is that we can then locate discomfort, an inability to 'fit in', struggle and resistance within individuals and put the onus on them to 'play the game' properly. We do not have to look too hard at social structures that set the game up in particular ways and that position bodies, values, beliefs and identities in competition with one another, and in relative positions of centrality or dominance (see also Boler 1999). If a student cannot produce writing or thinking that evidences an ability to 'play the game' of academic research and scholarship, an immediate response is to try and work out how to make the rules more apparent to them, rather than to question the rules in the first place and what kinds of emotional investments or "histories" they invoke and also reinforce (Ahmed 2014:7). This is a crucial point for doctoral scholarship, especially in the global South where current discourses on decolonisation in education are challenging educators and policymakers to reflect critically on where certain valued identities or subject positions come from, and what kinds of inclusion and exclusion are created when they are enforced as the 'norm' or the ideal to aspire to.

A key insight my framework draws from Ahmed's work, at this stage, is that, as social and cultural practices, emotions have histories. Having an emotion at a particular point in time that is assigned "affective value" (2014:11) in that space and time creates an impression, both on the person experiencing the emotion, and on others and the environment surrounding them. Over time, emotions accumulate value based on the impressions or traces they leave behind, as well as the ways in which they cohere or jar with the dominant hierarchies or positionings in play. This means that emotions can be anticipated as well as experienced: If a 'bad' emotion

PART THREE • TRAJECTORIES

such as feelings of being fraudulent and not good enough (Imposter Syndrome) is experienced often enough within a particular space (academia) and this emotion is shared, it begins to accumulate a history and becomes part of grappling with the process of taking on a scholarly identity (for some, i.e. women or people of colour perhaps more than others, i.e. white men).

This means, for doctoral education, that before a student has even started their research or formed a relationship with their supervisor, they can feel anxious, worried that they are not good enough, afraid of their supervisor's criticism, nervous about being isolated and neglected, and so on. How do they know to feel these things? How do they 'know' this narrative before they have actually experienced it? Ahmed's work may help us to unpack the ways in which emotions 'circulate' and 'accumulate' in doctoral education spaces, and why some 'stick' more than others. Combined with Boler's work, we can start to ask, and answer, crucial questions about how different bodies, ideas, and ways of being are then positioned by the emotions that move, stick and accumulate within different national, disciplinary and university contexts, and what the effects of this are for access, success and social justice.

Part of our work as scholars and supervisors who want to be successful is to figure out which emotions are 'appropriate', 'inappropriate' and valued, and manage our own selves and emotions accordingly, both in private and in public, primarily to fit in, but as Boler and Ahmed both suggest, also to resist, reimagine and engender change. This brings us to the final part of the alternative framework, which draws in Arlie Russell Hochschild's concepts of emotion work, emotional labour, and feeling rules.

Emotion work, emotional labour and feeling rules: Arlie Russell Hochschild and The Managed Heart

Hochschild's contribution to scholarship on emotions represented an important development of work on emotions which, up until she began publishing her work in the late 1970s, was largely focused on their psychological, personal and private dimensions. In essence, Hochschild makes three key contributions central to my framework.

The first is that emotion work has both internal and external dimensions. We engage in both 'surface acting' and 'deep acting' when we do emotion work, which is the work we do in our private spaces to make sense of and manage emotions (i.e. on our own or with immediate family). 'Surface acting' is when we read the situation, assess the appropriate or expected emotion, and then perform that emotion even if there is a "dissonance" (Aitchison & Mowbray 2013:862), or deception involved in that you do not really feel that way, such as smiling through a supervision meeting

CHAPTER 11 • TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL ...

when you really feel angry and upset. ‘Deep acting’ is when you actually work to change how you feel so that what you truly feel and what you are expected to feel in a given situation or context aligns. What Hochschild highlights in this performance of emotion ‘work’ is the work itself: emotions are not animalistic, raw, unconscious things, nor are they overly performed and scripted, focused mostly on an audience external to ourselves. Rather, emotion work involves reflexivity, awareness of context and self, and acts of trying to feel as much as acts of simply feeling. Students and supervisors perhaps engage in emotion work both consciously and unconsciously. Becoming more aware of what kinds of work we are doing, why, when and in what circumstances would be an important part of theorising emotions as part of the shared doctoral education space, rather than as private, personal feelings that belong uniquely to each individual. If we can theorise emotion work in a more sociological way, we can begin to find ways to challenge and change this narrative, especially for students who do not or cannot conform to a dominant doctoral identity.

This notion of change, resistance and reimagination, also important in both Boler and Ahmed’s work, is linked to Hochschild’s next contribution, which draws on Erving Goffman’s work on framing, to theorise feeling ‘rules’ and feeling ‘frames’. In essence, Hochschild argues that certain events or situations invoke or are shaped by particular sets of ‘feeling rules’ which act to ‘frame’ both conventional and unconventional approaches to feeling emotion. Think, for example, of laughter at a funeral, or booing people at a university graduation ceremony. These events – funeral, graduation – are framed by the dominant emotions they invoke or engender – sadness, happiness and celebration. Thus, there are conventional approaches to what we ‘should feel’, expressed as a set of ‘feeling rules’. You should, and must, for example, express sadness or grief at the funeral, and if you must laugh, it should be within certain limits, such as laughing at a funny story told by someone about the deceased (followed by a wave of sadness that this person is now gone). The funeral provides a frame within which certain social practices are considered appropriate, and we must, therefore, perform emotion work within ourselves to render the right kinds of emotions, which may involve both surface and deep acting (Hochschild 1979).

Like Boler and Ahmed, Hochschild links feeling rules and frames to ideological beliefs and values that operate normatively at deeper levels within society to shape what counts as ‘conventional’ and ‘unconventional’, that create and maintain rules around the ‘should feels’ and ‘shouldn’t feels’ in different contexts, times, and spaces. This means, then, that we do not engage in emotion work and emotional labour (defined as the work to create a “publicly observable facial and bodily display” (Hochschild 1983 [2012]:7)) on our own. We do engage privately *and* publicly in emotion work

PART THREE • TRAJECTORIES

and emotional labour because, as Ahmed also shows us, we share our emotions with others in “emotion-work systems” (Hochschild 1979:562). Within these systems, emotional labour in particular has exchange value. What Hochschild means by this, in essence, is that we manage our emotions out of a sense of expectation, or owing or being owed. She offers the examples of a graduate expressing happiness towards her parents at graduation as something she owes them in exchange for sacrifices they may have made to pay for her education, or an airline employee being polite and kind in exchange for the money passengers have paid for their airline tickets and flight experience. This exchange value is important to consider here, because there are certainly similar kinds of expectations attached to behaviour and becoming in doctoral education that are often unconscious, unnamed and unexamined, on the part of universities and supervisors especially.

Hochschild’s concepts for feeling rules and frames and her sociological conceptualising of both emotion work and emotional labour enable a study interested in emotions in doctoral education to ask important questions about what kinds of frames dominate doctoral supervision and support in different contexts, and what sets of feeling rules are created and maintained. Who benefits and how? Who loses out and how? What is the import of this for such a high stakes endeavour? This is important work because, as all three theorists make clear, emotions are not comfortable things to talk about and shine a light on; they are messy and slippery and the boundaries between personal and private, and public and shared are challenged when the conversation turns to emotions and feelings. Yet, it is impossible to talk about writing, learning, thinking, building relationships, growing as a scholar and researcher – all core activities in building a doctoral identity – without talking about emotions, feelings, and how these operate as mechanisms of management and control within education.

PULLING THE FRAMEWORK TOGETHER: STARTING POINTS FOR RESEARCHING DOCTORAL EMOTIONS

All three of these theorists are feminists and the value of feminist theory to the study this chapter marks the commencement of, is its offer of a language and tools with which to dig deeper into the ways in which feeling rules and social structures are raced, classed, gendered, and also biased around able-bodiedness and sexuality as well. Feminist scholars are often more comfortable in the messy spaces in between, in my humble opinion, and their work over the last five decades has tackled many difficult, uncomfortable questions and problems with criticality and care. This approach is at the heart of my proposed research into doctoral emotion work and emotional labour as well. Taken together, the insights I have drawn from the work of Boler, Ahmed and Hochschild work to create a powerful, novel language and set of

CHAPTER 11 • TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL ...

conceptual tools within which to approach research that seeks to better understand the nature and effects of emotion within doctoral education, across disciplinary and national higher education boundaries.

The theoretical framework proposed in this chapter enables further empirical work that focus on issues related to access, success and social justice. Pulling these three threads together, we have a language now to ask more pointed questions related to how we conceptualise, enable, and continue to constrain wider forms of access, success and social justice in doctoral education, in our own and across different local and global contexts. As just a few examples:

- When we admit students into doctoral programmes, what are we recognising in them – their writing, their presentation of themselves, their applications – and what emotional investments or attachments does this point to?
- When we construct doctoral programmes, especially those that have formal, taught elements or structures, what kinds of engagement do we expect, and why? Are our expectations ‘neutral’ as we may suppose them to be, or are we invoking deeper, unnamed and unexamined ideological beliefs about what it is to be a ‘good’ scholar?
- What is the effect of imposing a dominant ideology and identity on students who do not live in this ideal body, speak this ideal language, perform this ideal identity? In what ways can the ‘ideal’ be reimagined, and what might we have to confront and examine within ourselves and the structures we are invested in to do this emotion work?
- What bodies and ways of being are privileged in different contexts and programmes and what underpins this? What might the effects be on scholars who cannot, or do not, ‘fit in’ – both students and supervisors?

By collectively challenging accounts that restrict discourses on emotions to the private, individualised and psychological sphere, Boler, Ahmed and Hochschild together offer me, as both a researcher and a supervisor, a way to look at how emotions are part of structuring, maintaining and enacting a shared doctoral education and support space. There must be space for emotion work and emotional labouring within doctoral supervision and support, and we need to take the sociological and political nature and role of emotions seriously if, as Boler argues, we are serious about socially just educational praxis. We need more research that critically unpacks, critiques, and reimagines education in ways that truly widen and deepen what we consider to be success in academia. To do this research we need the kind of critical social theory I am drawing on here, and a willingness to look at ourselves just as hard as we look at others.

PART THREE • TRAJECTORIES

REFERENCES

- Ahmed S. 2014. *The cultural politics of emotion*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Aitchison C, Catterall J, Ross P & Burgin S. 2012. 'Tough love and tears': Learning doctoral writing in the sciences. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(4):435-447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2011.559195>
- Aitchison C & Mowbray S. 2013. Doctoral women: Managing emotions, managing doctoral studies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(8):85-870. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2013.827642>
- Boler M. 1999. *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. London and New York: Psychology Press.
- Brown L & Watson P. 2010. Understanding the experiences of female doctoral students. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 34(3):385-404. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2010.484056>
- Carter S, Blumenstein, M. & Cook, C. 2013. Different for women? The challenges of doctoral studies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(4):339-351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2012.719159>
- Cloete N. 2015. Nurturing doctoral growth: Towards the NDP's 5000? *South African Journal of Science*, 111(11-12):1-3. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2015/a0127>
- Crumb L, Haskins N, Dean L & Avent Harris JR. 2019. Illuminating social-class identity: The persistence of working-class African American women doctoral students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000109>
- Doloriert C, Sambrook S & Stewart J. 2012. Power and emotion in doctoral supervision: Implications for HRD. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(7):732-750. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090591211255566>
- Felder PP, Stevenson HC & Gasman M. 2014. Understanding race in doctoral student socialization. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 9:21-42. <https://doi.org/10.28945/1947>
- Gardner SK & Holley KA. 2011. "Those invisible barriers are real": The progression of first-generation students through doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(1):77-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.529791>
- Gurr GM. 2001. Negotiating the "Rackety Bridge" – A dynamic model for aligning supervisory style with research student development. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 20(1):81-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07924360120043882>
- Hochschild AR. 1979. Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3):551-575. <https://doi.org/10.1086/227049>
- Hochschild AR. 1983 [2012]. *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Updated ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Holley KA & Gardner S. 2012. Navigating the pipeline: How socio-cultural influences impact first-generation doctoral students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5(2):112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026840>

CHAPTER 11 • TOWARDS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXPLORING EMOTION IN DOCTORAL ...

- Manathunga C. 2007. Supervision as mentoring: The role of power and boundary crossing. *Studies in Continuing education*, 29(2):207-221.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01580370701424650>
- McAlpine L & Amundsen C. 2009. Identity and agency: Pleasures and collegiality among the challenges of the doctoral journey. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 31(2):109-125.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01580370902927378>
- McAlpine L & Lucas L. 2011. Different places, different specialisms: Similar questions of doctoral identities under construction. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(6):695-706.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.570432>
- Mewburn I. 2011. Troubling talk: Assembling the PhD candidate. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 33(3):321-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2011.585151>
- Nerad M. 2019. Are they converging? Postgraduate education worldwide: Trends and future challenges. Keynote address, 7th Postgraduate Supervision Conference, Stellenbosch. 26-29 March 2019.
- Stracke E & Kumar V. 2010. Feedback and self-regulated learning: Insights from supervisors' and PhD examiners' reports. *Reflective Practice*, 11(1):19-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940903525140>
- Strandler O, Johansson T, Wisker G & Claesson S. 2014. Supervisor or counsellor? – Emotional boundary work in supervision. *International Journal for Researcher Development*, 5(2):70-82. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRD-03-2014-0002>
- Trafford V & Leshem S. 2009. Doctorateness as a threshold concept. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46(3):305-316.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290903069027>