CONCEPTUALISING DOCTORAL WRITING AS AN AFFECTIVE-POLITICAL PRACTICE

James Burford *   Thammasat University,   jburford@tu.ac.th
                       Pathum Thani, Thailand

* Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Aim/Purpose	This article offers a conceptual summary and critique of existing literature on doctoral writing and emotion. The article seeks to intervene in current debates about doctoral writing by re-positioning it as an affective-political practice
Background	Over recent decades public interest in the doctorate has expanded as it has become re-framed as a key component of national success in the global knowledge economy. It is within this context that the practice of doctoral writing has crystallised as an object of interest. While researchers have examined the increased regulation, surveillance, and intensification of doctoral writing, often this work is motivated to develop pedagogies that support students to meet these new expectations. At this point, there has been limited attention to what broad changes to the meanings and practices of doctoral writing feel like for students.
Methodology	The paper offers a conceptual review that examines the ways in which doctoral writing tends to be understood. A review of literature in the areas of doctoral writing, doctoral emotion, and critical studies of academic labour was undertaken in order to produce a more comprehensive understanding of the political and emotional dynamics of doctoral writing.
Contribution	It is intended that this conceptual research paper help researchers attend to the emotional context of doctoral writing in the current university context. Critical studies of academic work and life are identified as a possible platform for the development of future doctoral education research, and the conceptual tool of "affective-politics" is advanced as a novel frame for approaching doctoral writing research.
Keywords	affect, affective-politics, doctoral writing, doctoral education, emotion, neoliberalism

INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this article to re-frame doctoral writing as an affective-political practice. By talking about 'doctoral writing' I am referring to the production of a broad number of texts - from dissertations to funding applications and annual progress reports. Rather than adding to the body of

Cite as: Burford, J. (2017). Conceptualising doctoral writing as an affective-political practice. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies, 12,*17-32. Retrieved from http://www.informingscience.org/Publications/3689

empirical knowledge about doctoral education, this article pursues a different goal. It seeks to offer conceptual tools that can assist researchers to think about the practice of doctoral writing in alternative ways. The article extends an expanding body of research on the social practice of doctoral writing (Barnacle & Dall'Alba, 2014; Bosanquet & Cahir, 2015; Hopwood & Paulson, 2012; Kamler, 2008; Kamler & Thomson, 2006, 2008, 2014; A. Lee & Aitchison, 2009, Starke-Meyerring, 2011), as well as studies that have taken doctoral education as an emotionally and politically implicated phenomenon (Burford, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2015a, 2016a; Devine & Hunter, 2016; Nutov & Hassan, 2011). While a group of researchers (myself included) have been advancing conversations about neoliberal change to universities and its impact on doctoral emotions, to date there has been no conceptual review published which critically analyses relevant literature, nor has there been any term available to group together this body of work. It is into this gap that this article enters by offering a review of relevant literature and advancing the framework of *affective-politics*.

This article begins by characterising recent transformations to higher education and the impacts these have had on doctoral students and doctoral writing. Following this analysis, it is positioned in relation to two key debates in the postgraduate writing literature. First, a differentiation is made between 'study skills' approaches and those that view academic writing as a social and embodied practice. The second key debate that is drawn together concerns whether or not doctoral writing ought to be considered an emotionally involved activity. The central argument advanced across this article is that gaps exists in the way doctoral writing has been researched to date, which leaves the field under-resourced to offer readings that bridge politics and emotion. In order to address these gaps I identify existing critical analyses of the emotional context of academic work, which I argue could form a helpful foundation for undertaking future doctoral writing research. I conclude the article by demonstrating how an affective-political approach has the potential to illuminate new strategies for researching doctoral writing in the present.

The primary contribution this article offers to doctoral education scholarship is a conceptual frame that understands emotions as not only psychological states experienced by individuals but as cultural practices that are linked to the political realm of social, economic, and cultural phenomena. This framework enables forms of analysis that can mediate between the macro-political changes that have transformed the meanings and practices of doctoral writing, and the ways these reforms reverberate in the bodies of doctoral writers themselves.

THE CHANGING CONTEXT OF DOCTORAL EDUCATION

Doctoral education has a rich history stretching back to twelfth-century Europe (Wellington, Bathmaker, Hunt, McCulloch, & Sikes, 2005, p. 6), where the doctorate was initially a license to instruct in a particular knowledge discipline. The contemporary research-based award, the PhD, originates from Berlin in the early nineteenth century and was a product of a series of educational reforms that saw research and a dissertation positioned as the appropriate foundation for scientific training. While doctoral education in the mid-twentieth century might be characterised by rapid expansion and its close governance by fairly autonomous universities, by the end of the century the doctorate had been dragged 'into the spotlight of public discussion and governmental concern' (Boud & Lee, 2009, p. 1). Historically understood as integral to the reproduction of disciplinary knowledge (Boud & Lee, 2009), today the doctorate carries additional significance having become re-imagined by policymakers as a key contributor to national success in a competitive global economy (Tennant, McMullen, & Kaczynski, 2010). Across international higher education policy debates we can observe the gradual reframing of the doctorate as a tool that can help secure the economic future of the nation by building human capital, and contributing to innovation (Bansel, 2011; Deuchar, 2008, McWilliam & James, 2002).

While these trends are evident internationally, this article will take a particular focus on how they have impacted doctoral education in the Anglophone countries of the Global North (e.g., Bansel, 2011). By limiting the focus in this way I do not wish to infer that the concerns of the Global South

are unworthy of consideration, nor do I suggest that countries in the Global South have not experienced neoliberal reforms. Indeed, an emerging body of scholarship has tracked the impact of such reforms in countries such as Thailand (Lao, 2015) and Indonesia (Mulya, in press). Instead, by limiting the focus I recognise that there are particular contextual factors that shape doctoral education in countries like the UK, Canada, US, Australia, and Aotearoa New Zealand.

In these five countries heightened interest in doctoral education is set in context by a number of broad shifts that have transformed higher education institutions over recent decades. Key trends here include massification (Pearson, 1999; Pearson, Evans & Macauley, 2008), internationalisation (Nerad, 2010; van der Wende, 2007), and managerialism (Bansel, 2011, Kenny, 2008). The movement of higher education from an elite to a 'mass' system and growing flows of international students have both led to a rapid global expansion of doctoral education. The increasing diversity of doctoral students has also given rise to anxiety about its 'quality'. There has been concern expressed that students now come to doctoral study with more varied levels of academic preparedness and English language proficiency, a concern that has been heightened by a series of plagiarism scandals (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2015), and ongoing talk of a doctoral 'literacy crisis' (A. Lee & Aitchison, 2009, p. 88).

The changing cultural meaning of the doctorate, as well as its expansion and diversification, have also augured greater surveillance of the degree. This surveillance has been enacted as a part of a broader trend toward new managerialist models that have been imposed on universities and other public organisations, in what is sometimes called the rise of the 'enterprise university' (Bansel, 2011; Davies & Petersen, 2005; Ditton, 2009; Sullivan & Simon, 2014). Increasingly, the 'scientific-technical' (Bansel, 2011, p. 546) approaches of business management dominate, with a focus on 'quality assurance, audit and evaluation [and]… metrics to determine both the value and impact of knowledge' (Bansel, 2011, p. 546). Policy-makers increasingly speak about prudent financial management on behalf of 'taxpayers' (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2006) and rely on logics of 'deliverables, economic bottom-lines and cost-benefit analyses' (Bansel, 2011, p. 546). Institutions have also expanded their own accountability regimes to more closely follow the progress of students through their degrees (Blackmore, 2009; Cribb & Gewirtz, 2006). With growing doctoral enrolment and strong competition for academic and other professional employment, concern has also arisen about 'what completed "doctors" will do in the future, and where they will work' (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. x). Policy-makers and doctoral students alike are worried about the appearance of 'unemployment or under-employment among the most expensively trained and highest qualified of the workforce' (Taylor & Beasley, 2005, p. 12).

Altogether, these changes have contributed to a profound unsettling of doctoral cultures and practice over recent times. Today's doctoral students are called to think of themselves and their doctoral projects in new ways – ways that are 'increasingly narrow, utilitarian and economistic' (A. Lee, Brennan & Green, 2009, p. 276). This has had resulting impacts upon the experience of doctoral degrees, which are arguably now more pressurised, audited, competitive and stressful (Divaris, Polychronopoulou, Taoufik, Katsaros, & Eliades, 2012; Stubb, Pyhältö, & Lonka, 2011).

THE IMPACTS OF CHANGE ON DOCTORAL WRITING PRACTICE

As I argued above, the doctorate is increasingly viewed as a high-stakes enterprise, with implications for the innovation and economic success of the nation. It is within this context that doctoral writing has crystallised as an object of concern across different countries. Increasingly, governments and institutions alike have begun to identify writing as 'a key location for the collapse of high-level scholarly achievement' (A. Lee & Aitchison, 2009, p. 93). There are two primary issues that have driven debate around doctoral writing. The first clusters around attrition rates (Bair & Haworth, 2005; Taylor & Beasley, 2005, p. 12), and times to submission (Bair & Haworth, 2005; Ehrenberg, Jakubson, Groen, So, & Price, 2007; Styles & Radloff, 2000; Tennant, 2004). These concerns are founded on the argument that doctoral students who do not finish within a given timeframe may be less employable outside of academia, and by failing to complete, or taking 'too long' to graduate, they are said to 'waste' not only their own time but also national educational funding (Taylor & Beasley, 2005, p. 12).

Increasingly, governments have put in place financial incentives for institutions to ensure that doctoral students complete their degrees, and that they do this 'on time'. Arguably, this has seen institutions become 'relentlessly' attentive to the productivity of their students (Hopwood, Alexander, Harris-Huemmert, McAlpine, & Wagstaff, 2011, p. 228), drawing upon managerial practices of surveillance in forming responses to the 'problem' of timeliness and completion. In order to address the doctoral writing 'problem space' (Starke-Meyerring, Paré, Sun, & El-Bezre, 2014) many universities have instituted mechanisms such as confirmation of candidature, standard timelines for research milestones, annual reporting for supervisors and doctoral students (Bansel, 2011; Cribb & Gewirtz, 2006), financial incentives for timely completion, as well as the incorporation of on-time completion rates in academic workload agreements and research performativity measures (Bansel, 2011). These reforms have been criticised for imposing arbitrary timeframes which can encourage safe projects and an 'aversion to risk taking and creativity' (Hopwood et al., 2011, p. 228), as well as 'under-theorised doctoral theses' (White, 2013, p. 192).

At the same time as the expectation for a 'timely finish' has risen to greater importance, doctoral writing has also become a more intensified practice. Doctoral students are under pressure to write and publish an increasingly diverse array of texts (see Aitchison, Kamler, & Lee, 2010; Aitchison & Mowbray, 2015; Kamler, 2008; Marchant, Anastasi, & Miller, 2011; McGrail, Rickard, & Jones, 2006). Doctoral students' written texts are also now expected to have a higher 'impact', with publication prior to graduation a growing requirement (Maher et al., 2008; Prasad, 2013). But students are increasingly called to produce other forms of writing too: reports in partnership with the business sector, conference papers, peer reviews, funding applications, social media posts, as well as reporting back on these activities as a part of an expanded set of accountability measures (see Badenhorst & Guerin, 2016; Paré, Starke-Meyerring & McAlpine, 2011). Some of this added pressure on writing has been mandated directly by institutions, which are 'increasingly dependent on doctoral outputs in order to attract government funding and industry grants to build their reputation' (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2015, p. 288). Other pressures are indirect, implications of a competitive academic job market where CVs ought to be replete with writing-related outputs. For today's doctoral students then, there is increased pressure to finish the doctorate as well as to meet heightened expectations of quantity and 'impact' regarding its written outputs. These features add up to an overall picture of doctoral writing as a practice that has been unsettled by increased regulation, intensified responsibility, and growing surveillance.

TRENDS IN DOCTORAL WRITING RESEARCH

According to Hopwood and colleagues (2011), the historical scarcity of research on the doctorate may be explained by widely held uncertainty as to whether it ought to be considered 'education' at all. However, recognition of the doctorate as a site of teaching and learning (Connell, 1985), and increased attention from policy-makers, institutions and practitioners, has prompted a swift growth of projects. In spite of the recent attention, many features of this complex practice remain relatively unexplored, including the practice of writing. Various authors have characterised the marginal space doctoral writing occupies in the field. For Kamler and Thomson (2014), doctoral writing is 'something that everybody is worried about, but about which there was too little systematic debate and discussion' (p. vii). A. Lee and Aitchison (2009) also see doctoral writing as under-researched, describing an 'almost deafening silence' (p. 90), a description echoed by Simpson and Humphrey (2010), who position writing as an 'area of opacity' (p. 70). Many explanations have been offered as to why the practice of writing remains overlooked, but a broad consensus amongst doctoral education researchers is that it tends to be understood as 'ancillary or marginal to the real work of research' (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 2).

Broadly speaking, there are two discernible research communities in the doctoral writing literature: study skills-based approaches (Lea & Street, 1998, Lillis & Curry, 2006) and researchers who view doctoral writing as a discursive, social, and embodied practice (Barnacle & Dall'Alba, 2014; Bosanquet & Cahir, 2015; Hopwood & Paulson, 2012; Kamler, 2008; Kamler & Thomson, 2006, 2008,

2014; A. Lee & Aitchison, 2009, Starke-Meyerring, 2011). The first category is the most prevalent, and can be seen across the popular writing guidebook genre. These projects tend to frame writing as a skill that is possessed (or not) by the individual doctoral student. Writing tends to be framed as universal, something 'that doctoral students should simply have – perhaps learned once and for all in high school or in their undergraduate or master's programs' (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, p. 82). Within these accounts, writing tends to be understood straightforwardly as a set of portable techniques for spelling, punctuation, grammar, structuring the thesis, and developing work habits. Any perceived writing 'problems' tend to be interpreted as deficits and something that the individual student ought to fix. Given the focus of study skills research, the primary approaches used are instrumental or evaluative. That is, research tends to focus on either providing 'how to' strategies, or measuring the effectiveness of such strategies. A characteristic assumption of these studies is that practitioners can ascertain and predict 'what works' to promote effective doctoral writing, and then apply this broadly across contexts. The effect of this kind of work is to constitute doctoral writing as 'mechanical' and 'predictable', and thus a relatively straightforward enterprise (White, 2013). In explaining why study skills approaches tend to find favour at an institutional level, Badenhorst, Moloney, Rosales, Dyer, and Ru (2015) argue that it is simply much easier to offer such interventions: 'add-on writing skills courses, once-off thesis-writing workshops, and the odd how-to programme are attractive options for university administrators who are operating within managerialist approaches to learning and see these as the answer to quicker completion rates in graduate research' (p. 2). This analysis is extended by Aitchison and Mowbray (2015), who suggest that writing is often perceived 'in its narrowest sense – as an output with revenue-raising potential and as a reputation-building value' (p. 288). Doctoral writing, then, becomes understood as a countable output, which in turn 'justifies a limited and very particular kind of provision for developing writing expertise; that is, it prescribes a product focussed curriculum favouring the teaching of textual structure and form' (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2015, p. 289).

However, there is a growing number of scholars who have criticised the 'study skills' paradigm, arguing these approaches reduce the complexity of writing by viewing it as merely 'a set of arbitrary rules and matters of etiquette' (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 6). The tendency for study skills approaches to identify individuals who don't 'get it' or don't 'have it' (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 4) has also been identified as a deficit discourse (Badenhorst, et. al, 2015) that works to displace the collective responsibility of institutions. In contrast, recent critical work has focused on doctoral writing from an academic literacies perspective (Badenhorst, et. al, 2015; Lillis & Curry, 2006, Lillis & Scott, 2007). Rather than placing the 'deficit' with the student, this approach draws attention to the areas of the doctoral curriculum that create barriers to student success (Badenhorst, et. al, 2015; Lillis & Scott, 2007). Academic literacies researchers also critically explore the tendency to associate certain groups of learners with individual writing deficit. In particular, the 'new' students, who have arrived to university through efforts at widening participation (and may be 'mature', 'disadvantaged', 'non-traditional', 'part-time' or 'international'), are often positioned as the doctoral bodies who are bringing the 'writing problem' (Badenhorst, et. al, 2015. p. 3). Whereas study skills approaches tend to see writing as an 'individual, neutral, cognitive issue' (Badenhorst, et. al, 2015, p. 2), academic literacy approaches take doctoral writing as a complex 'social action' (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 6) that is embedded in relations of power, and grounded in disciplinary epistemic practices (Starke-Myerring, 2011). This means that pedagogical approaches that seek to address doctoral writing ought to go beyond simply giving 'advice and tips' (Kamler & Thomson, 2014, p. 13) and must instead be understood as a 'socially constructed communicative or rhetorical event shaped by power relations and with personal and social consequences' (A. Lee & Aitchison, 2009, p. 91). The implication of this critique is that notions of doctoral writing as an individual skill alone are too shallow. What is required is an understanding of doctoral writing as a 'culturally specific knowledge-making practice' (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, p. 85) where students learn 'what knowledge is valued, what questions can be asked and who is allowed to ask while at the same time learning what they know and how to write what they know' (Badenhorst, et. al, 2015, p. 2).

In summary then, critical doctoral education researchers have increasingly sought to re-position writing as a complex practice that is enacted within wider social and disciplinary contexts. However, within these debates there appears to be only a limited engagement with important questions about how widespread transformation to the experience of doctoral writing *feels* for doctoral students. In the section that follows I move into this territory by accounting for some of the ways in which emotions have tended to be understood within the doctoral education literature.

EXPLORING DOCTORAL EMOTION RESEARCH

Despite some notable exceptions emerging from the Global South (e.g. Herman, 2008) and Global North (e.g., Aitchison & Mowbray, 2013; Aitchison, Catterall, Ross, & Burgin, 2012; Bosanquet & Cahir, 2015; Cameron, Nairn & Higgins, 2009; Cotterall, 2013; A. Lee & Williams, 1999; K. Lee, 2005; Wellington, 2010) empirical research on doctoral emotions remains relatively scarce. In general terms there are two broad ways in which emotions tend to be understood in doctoral education research and the advice literature that many students call on to support their studies. The first is to frame emotions, and particular kinds of emotional performance, as a problem (Wellington, 2010) or pathology in the development of the 'licensed independent scholar' (A. Lee & Williams, 1999, p. 6). Examples of this framing can be seen in Joan Bolker's *Writing your dissertation in 15 minutes a day* and its description of 'dissertation paranoia' (1998, p. 27), or Rudestam and Newton's *Surviving your dissertation* (2001) which argues that it is important to be wary of emotions in topic selection. Students are advised they should 'avoid topics that may be linked too closely with emotional issues in your own life [and/or]… a topic in which you have a personal axe to grind' (Rudestam & Newton, 2001, p. 10). These kinds of understandings often begin with the assumption that emotions ought to be absent, or at least carefully managed, so as not to cause a disturbance to the doctoral experience. The metaphors that tend to be used in these accounts configure emotions as blocks and obstacles that need to be overcome in order to become an *effective* doctoral student. This is a 'rational and emotionless' understanding of doctoral education that sits within broader discourses that tend to disassociate the properly 'academic' from the emotional and embodied (Hopwood & Paulson, 2012; Lynch, 2010). Within this discourse bodies are typically positioned outside of the PhD and seen as largely irrelevant to the undertaking of doctoral research. For example, Peseta (2001) gives an account of the warning she received at the beginning of her doctoral experience that questions about whose body was imagined as 'standard' and 'assumed' (p. 85) within doctoral pedagogy (e.g., by ethnicity) were 'unscholarly' (p. 84) and 'perhaps more appropriate to therapeutic discussion' (p. 83). This 'rational' way of knowing bodies and emotions has been criticised by feminist scholars who have identified the tendency to dichotomise 'rational-man' and 'emotional-woman', and argued that emotional and relational work is an inherent part of any research practice (A. Lee & Williams, 1999). Indeed, the idea of the independent doctoral scholar itself evokes an autonomous, masculine figure, who 'is able to overcome supervisory neglect and indifference through intellect, perseverance and superior ability' (Badenhorst, et. al, 2015, p. 3). It is also an assumption that finds a happy marriage with neoliberal values, such as self-resilience, and the responsibilisation of individuals (Badenhorst & Guerin, 2016; Hartman & Darab, 2012).

The studies in a second category of doctoral education knowledge have less of a pathologising focus and are more concerned with understanding the emotional subjectivities of higher education's inhabitants (Aitchison et al, 2012). For example, A. Lee and Williams (1999) argue that the emotional dimensions of doctoral candidature are necessary in the production of doctoral subjects. This is because the process of doctoral writing is transformative, not only 'in the sense of developing our knowledge and understanding of a subject matter…it is transformative of writers themselves' (Starke-Meyerring, 2011, p. 80). One tendency is for doctoral education researchers to understand particular kinds of feeling as evidence of the natural struggles of doctoral identity work. For example, researchers might read feeling bad, or periods of emotional intensity, as a feature of the doctoral degree, where students are 'not yet positioned as, and do not yet see themselves as fully fledged academics' (Kamler & Thomson, 2004, p. 197), but who must work hard to 'identify and master complex linguistic practices and position themselves as independent scholars in their discourse communi-

ties' (Aitchison et al, 2012, p. 446). The stakes here are high, as Antoniou and Moriarty (2008) identify, 'to write… is to make oneself visible, to expose one's ideas and identity to public scrutiny' (p. 165). Such accounts often look for continuities in doctoral emotions, noting for example, that doctoral writing tends to be structured by the 'defensive' positioning of doctoral students (Carter, 2011), or that the 'careful and highly-substantiated thesis genre' can lead to 'tentative and sometimes highly anxious scholar identities' (Kamler & Thomson, 2004, p. 198).

Accounts that take a broad view of emotions and the identity/textual work of the doctorate are useful for examining continuities of doctoral education. They account for the way that the PhD experience often has rhythms as particular steps are confronted – in social research these may include 'stages' of literature review, research design, data collection, and so on. The argument seems to be that these rhythms can give rise to certain overdetermined patterns of feeling, for example, the excitement that often accompanies the beginning of a PhD, or the stress that frequently accompanies its end. However, at their least helpful, these accounts can narrate predictable accounts of doctoral emotion, which can miss competing stories and the non-seamless, 'complex, messy and not-always rational' (Bansel, 2011, p. 554) aspects of the doctoral experience. Additionally, by examining emotion within models of doctoral identity development these accounts are less resourced to offer temporal and political readings, which might account for the features of doctoral education that have experienced significant change (for example, the rapid intensification of the doctorate or the creep of surveillance culture). Answers to what doing a PhD feels like *may* be found by thinking about how the 'literature review' or 'conclusion chapter' tend to be experienced, or by tracing the socialisation and identity work that the degree demands, including the shift from novice-student to scholar (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2013; Bosanquet & Cahir, 2015; Petersen, 2007). However, I am also suggesting that important information regarding the affective context of the PhD may be missed in such accounts. I argue that we also need studies that examine how the experience of doing 'doctoralness' (Blass, Jasman & Levy, 2012) may have changed in recent years as a result of neoliberal reforms to higher education.

To date researchers have not substantially grappled with the changing conditions that doctoral education has been experiencing. Some writers have, for example, explored the intensified demands on doctoral students. But these studies have often focused on developing interventions designed to assist students to *meet* new expectations of quantity, dexterity, and 'impact' regarding their writing outputs (A. Lee & Aitchison, 2009), rather than questioning the effects and affects of such increasing demands (for an exception see Prasad, 2015). Perhaps then the biggest difference between the affective-political framework I will advance in this article and existing doctoral education research is that my interest is not in finding solutions to the 'problem' of teaching doctoral students how to be effective under the current conditions of the doctorate. I also do not seek to develop an intervention that might address the 'problem' of their unruly feelings about their doctoral experience. Instead, I am interested to explore what happens when we take doctoral education as a rich and complex cultural site and subject it to theoretical engagement. I locate my own approach alongside doctoral education research that has critically explored how emotions are linked to relations of power (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2013; Wall, 2008) and the consequences of neoliberal reform (Aitchison and Mowbray, 2015). Indeed, Aitchison and Mowbray's (2015) article on the rise of the commercial 'grey zone' for postgraduate writing support services is an example of the kind of work I think is necessary in the field. The authors situate their research within the significant changes that have occurred to the postgraduate experience, arguing that funding cuts, shortened times for candidature, the 'push to publish,' and the increased number of students who study in an additional language or at a distance all contribute to doctoral education becoming a 'pressure point and a site of problem' (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2015, p. 289). Crucially, it is doctoral education's changing context that is identified as contributing to growing concern and anxiety.

In this article then, I am arguing that there has been insufficient conceptual consideration of doctoral education as a politically and affectively interesting practice. In order to address these gaps the next section turns to one promising approach evident within higher education research: affective-politics.

THE CASE FOR EXAMINING THE AFFECTIVE AND POLITICAL TOGETHER

In this article I make a case for examining doctoral education as an affective-political practice. By linking together *affect* and *politics* I am positioning emotions as not only psychological states that are contained within individuals, but as culturally generated phenomena that exist in social circulation (Abu-Lughod & Lutz, 1990; Ahmed, 2004). Rather than badging the kind of thinking that has emerged following Deleuze – which tends to see affect as a 'nonlinguistic, bodily "intensity"' (Leys, 2011, p. 442) – affect is taken here to mean 'embodied meaning-making' (Wetherell, 2012, p. 4), 'a category that encompasses affect, emotion, and feeling, and that includes impulses, desires and feelings that get historically constructed in a range of ways' (Cvetkovich, 2012, p. 4). An affective-political line of inquiry encourages greater curiosity about the neoliberal transformations to doctoral education and the consequences these have had in reshaping the emotional subjectivities of doctoral writers. It is a style of knowing that attends to how doctoral education *feels* in a context where students appear to be squeezed between competing demands for increased writing output on the one hand, and a compressed timeframe on the other. An affective-political practice approach encourages researchers to take seriously questions like 'how do I feel?' and 'how does capitalism feel' (Cvetkovich, 2012, p. 5).

After deciding to approach doctoral education as an affective and political practice, I set out to explore existing higher education research that has taken up this kind of enquiry. I found that research on the contemporary conditions of academic labour has offered some of the richest accounts of the ways in which the neoliberal university shapes the affective lives of its inhabitants (Barcan, 2013; Bryson, 2004; Burrows, 2012; Court & Kinman, 2008; Cvetkovich, 2012; Davies, 2006; Davies & Petersen, 2005; Ditton, 2009; Gill, 2010; Grant & Elizabeth, 2014; Hartman & Darab, 2012; Hey, 2011; Kinman, 2014; Leathwood & Hey, 2009; Lynch, 2010; Pelias, 2004; Saltmarsh & Randell-Moon, 2014; Sparkes, 2007; Sullivan & Simon, 2014). Within current higher education debates, it is routinely observed that the neoliberal reconfiguration of universities has resulted in significant changes to the nature of academic work. As Barcan (2013) notes, these reforms have taken shape as a 'super-adding of requirement after requirement, task after task' (p. 6) which 'has left academics unsure, confused, overburdened and – to put not too fine a point on it – wondering how much more work can be compressed into a week' (p. 6). The practice of writing is also implicated in this scenario. As Elizabeth and Grant argue, within the managerial context, 'audit practices privilege the writing and publishing (in contrast to the teaching, serving, or even researching) version of the academic self' (2013, p. 124). As a result the productivity of researchers, particularly with regard to their 'outputs', has become increasingly important. This has caused some academics to document the affective and political consequences of plugging in to the 'heaving, monstrous academicwritingmachine' (Henderson, Honan & Loch, 2016, p. 4).

At the same time as workloads have increased, working conditions for many academics have become more precarious, with increasing casualisation and a resulting decline in pay and conditions (Gill, 2010). While admittedly work intensification, insecurity, and poor remuneration are features not only of academia but many twenty-first century labour markets, this does not mean that their impacts on academics should be simply dismissed. While 'tenure…clarity, flexibility and autonomy' (Kinman, 2014, p. 219) have been identified as historically protective factors for occupational stress among academics, in the current higher education environment it appears:

> there is a particular *combination* [italics in original] of work pressures faced by academics: work intensification and role confusion combine with the longstanding conception of academic work as a vocation and the current difficulty of acquiring full-time academic work to

produce an especially potent recipe for professional disquiet and occupational distress (Barcan, 2013, p. 7).

Indeed, Barcan (2013) wonders if academics 'as flesh-and-blood people can actually *sustain* the role of holding onto the past while embodying the future' (p. 6), as it seems that to 'embody the multiple spirits of the contemporary university, one would have to be something of a monster: the scholar-bureaucrat-entrepreneur' (p. 91). Increasingly, we do hear stories of flesh-and-blood academics buckling under this strain, with public and research accounts of overworked, stressed-out academics, and grim stories of burnout and emotional distress (Cvetkovich, 2012; Gill, 2010; Petersen, 2011; Sparkes, 2007). For example, Cvetkovich (2012) offers an account of her own depression, which is set in the context of the academy. In her memoir, felt experiences of stuckness and disappointment coexist alongside a feeling that 'academia seemed to be killing me' (p. 18). Cvetkovich (2012) asks why 'a position of relative privilege, the pursuit of creative thinking and teaching, lived as though it were impossible?' (p. 18). Together, these statements support the vision sketched by Roger Burrows (2012) of academia in the midst of a 'deep, affective, somatic crisis that threatens to overwhelm us' (p. 355). While I suspect Burrows intends his 'us' to speak to academics, it is a key argument of this article that this 'us' can be extended to include doctoral students as well.

Although the affective-political situations experienced by academics and doctoral students are clearly not identical, I am suggesting that we can hear resonances. Today's doctoral students are also subject to increasing insecurity. For example, in Aotearoa New Zealand during the tenure of the current National-led government, there have been a series of policy reforms that have increased the conditions of vulnerability experienced by doctoral students. In 2013 the government ceased the payment of student allowances to postgraduate students. Before 2013 qualifying postgraduate students had been paid a living allowance, but following this reform even students part way through postgraduate study were forced to borrow for their living costs or take on part-time work. Unsurprisingly, reports have emerged of New Zealand postgraduate students 'working long, minimum-wage hours, selling their cars and moving in with their parents to complete degrees' (Mann, 2013). At the same time that they are being encouraged into more debt or squeezing in part time jobs, many doctoral students are already:

> making agonizing personal risk/benefit calculations about how long to chance it in a system in which they have already invested a large portion of their young adult life but whose promises of return in the form of full-time work are – at the moment – dubious (Barcan, 2013, p. 8).

Widespread uncertainty about the viability of academic careers, and intensified and diversified demands on doctoral writing, have all contributed to additional burdens shouldered by many of today's doctoral students. My argument is that many of the ingredients in the 'potent recipe for disquiet' (p. 240) that Barcan identified with regard to academic workers now apply to doctoral researchers as well.

AFFECTIVE-POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF DOCTORAL WRITING

Let's bring this discussion back to the question of doctoral writing. As I have argued, a majority of doctoral writing knowledge is underpinned by a general assumption that writing is a skill that can be learned straightforwardly by students. While it has become increasingly common to re-position doctoral writing as a social and embodied practice, literature about its emotional context remains limited. Researchers have explored recent transformations to the practice of writing (Aitchison & Mowbray, 2015; A. Lee & Aitchison, 2009), however, often this work has been motivated to develop pedagogies that support students to meet the new expectations that have arisen. Unlike the accounts of academic labour I introduced above, critical analyses of the affective-political dimensions of doctoral writing remain under-developed.

In concluding this article I wish to illustrate how an affective-political approach may be more nimble to the task of tracking change to the conditions of doctoral writing. This is a project I have been pursuing over recent years (Burford, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2015a, 2016a, 2016b) in a broader study conducted at a research-intensive university in New Zealand between February and June 2013. This study involved 10 participants who were doctoral researchers connected to Faculties of Arts and Education and at various stages of their enrolment. My broader study sought to understand the affective landscape of contemporary doctoral education in New Zealand. It drew on diary-interview methods (Spowart & Nairn, 2013) conducted over a period of several months, as well as a series of arts-based activities and discussions conducted at a three-day residential writing retreat inspired by Grant's *Women Writing Away* model (Grant, 2008; for further information on the methods of the study see Burford, 2016b).

However, up until now my reasons for framing doctoral writing as an affective-political practice have remained somewhat unarticulated. In earlier case studies, for example, I used an affective-political framework to analyse the subject position of the 'rational emotion manager' (Burford, 2014a, 2015b). I explored how this affective subject position was related to a troubling set of emotions that seemed to engulf one of the students participating in my study, and the ways these feelings connected to her heavy writing workload. Using an affective-political framework enabled me to attend to the bad feelings this student contained in order to 'keep calm and carry on' writing. It also allowed me to consider what this practice of responsible emotion 'management' might teach us about the role doctoral writing is playing in the neoliberal university more broadly. Another case study explored the subject position of the 'failed' doctoral writer (Burford, 2015c). Failure tends to be understood as something that doctoral students should avoid or learn from in order to find eventual 'success'. Exploring the affective-politics of failure enabled me to consider what it would mean if the failure to write could be viewed as a creative practice with political potential. Rather than inevitably discerning writing failure as bound up with feelings of shame, guilt, and inadequacy, linking emotion and politics together enabled me to think about what might *feel good* about not writing. It assisted me to track affective practices of relief, joy, and, satisfaction in opting out of arguably hollow notions of doctoral (writing) success in the neoliberal university.

CONCLUSION

The key findings of this conceptual review are as follows:
- Much doctoral writing knowledge is underwritten by an assumption that writing is a straightforward skill that can be learned by doctoral students;
- While some doctoral writing scholars have re-positioned doctoral writing as a social and embodied practice, questions about the emotional dynamics of doctoral writing remain underconsidered;
- While increasingly researchers have explored the changing nature of doctoral writing, unlike critical accounts of academic labour, there has been limited analysis of how these changes are related to political phenomena, or are experienced emotionally by doctoral students;
- Therefore, the conceptual framework of affective-politics is advanced as a new tool to understand the practice of doctoral writing.

In concluding this article I wish to reaffirm that an affective-political conceptual approach provides useful tools to examine doctoral writing in more complex ways. Rather than 'finding a solution' to what is described as the 'problem' of doctoral writing, it allows researchers to approach it as an interesting 'lifeworld'. Standing in this position allows departures from some of the most basic assumptions made by those who are working to improve doctoral writing pedagogy and practice. For example, it enables us to ask whether doctoral education researchers can take as given that writing is a good or unproblematic practice, that students should do more of, more quickly, and with higher measurable quality. It can also enable us to ask what the burdens of writing in the current context may be, both for the learning and development of students, and for their own wellbeing. These are

questions that tend to be considered beside the point in mainstream research accounts of doctoral writing, but I believe they are vital if researchers are to offer a fuller conceptualisation of the practice of doctoral writing today. The key contribution this article offers to this ongoing work is a frame that can link political changes to doctoral education and the practice of writing to the emotional experiences of doctoral subjects themselves.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, L., & Lutz, C. (1990). Introduction: Emotion, discourse, and the politics of everyday life. In C. Lutz & L. Abu-Lughod (Eds.), *Language and politics of emotion* (pp. 1-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text, 22(*2), 117-139.

Aitchison, C., Catterall, J., Ross, P., & Burgin, S. (2012). "Tough love and tears": Doctoral writing in the sciences. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *31*(4), 435-447. doi:10.1080/07294360.2011.559195

Aitchison, C., Kamler, B., & Lee, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Publishing pedagogies for the doctorate and beyond*. London: Routledge.

Aitchison, C., & Mowbray, S. (2013). Doctoral women: Managing emotions, managing doctoral studies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *18*(8), 859-870. doi:10.1080/13562517.2013.827642.

Aitchison, C., & Mowbray, S. (2015). Doctoral writing markets: Exploring the grey zone. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 287-301). Singapore: Springer.

Antoniou, M., & Moriarty, J. (2008). What can academic writers learn from creative writers? Developing guidance and support for lecturers in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 13*(2), 157-167.

Badenhorst, C., & Guerin C. (2016). Post/graduate research literacies and writing pedagogies. In C. Badenhorst & C. Guerin (Eds.) *Research literacies and writing pedagogies for masters and doctoral writers* (pp. 3-28). Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Badenhorst, C., Moloney, C., Rosales, J., Dyer, J., & Ru, L. (2015). Beyond deficit: Graduate student research-writing pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education, 20*(1), 1-11. doi:10.1080/13562517.2014.945160

Bair, C., & Haworth, J. (2005). Doctoral student attrition and persistence: A meta-synthesis of research. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XIX, pp. 481-533). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bansel, P. (2011). Becoming academic: A reflection on doctoral candidacy. *Studies in Higher Education*, *36*(5), 543-556. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.594592

Barcan, R. (2013). *Academic life and labour in the new university: Hope and other choices*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Barnacle, R., & Dall' Alba, G. (2014). Beyond skills: Embodying writerly practices through the doctorate. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(7), 1139-1139. doi:10.1080/03075079.2013.777405

Blackmore, J. (2009). Academic pedagogies, quality logics and performative universities: Evaluating teaching and what students want. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(8), 857-872. doi:10.1080/03075070902898664

Blass, E., Jasman, A. & Levy, R. (2012). Supervisor reflections on developing doctoralness in practice-based doctoral students. *Quality Assurance, 20*(1), 31-41.

Boud, D., & Lee, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Changing practices of doctoral education*. London: Routledge.

Bolker, J. (1998). *Writing your dissertation in fifteen minutes a day: A guide to starting, revising, and finishing your doctoral thesis.* New York: Owl Books.

Bosanquet, A., & Cahir, J. (2015). "What Feelings Didn't I Experience!" Affect and Identity in PhD Writing. In C. Badenhorst & C. Guerin (Eds.), *Research literacies and writing pedagogies for masters and doctoral writers.* (pp. 132-148). London: Brill.

Bryson, C. (2004). What about the workers? The expansion of higher education and the transformation of academic work. *Industrial Relations Journal, 35*(1), 38-57.

Burford, J. (2014a). Doctoral writing as an affective practice: Keep calm and carry on? In E. Bitzer, R. Albertyn, L. Frick, B. Grant, & F. Kelly (Eds.), *Pushing boundaries in postgraduate supervision* (pp. 69-84). Stellenbosch: Sun Press.

Burford, J. (2014b). A meditation on the poetics of doctoral writing. *Higher Education Research & Development, 33*(6), 1232-1235. doi:10.1080/07294360.2014.932040

Burford, J. (2014c). Writing affectively: Queering the doctoral writing journey. In J. Rath & C. Mutch (Eds.), *Emerging critical scholarship in education: Navigating the doctoral journey.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 226-239.

Burford, J. (2015a). 'Dear obese PhD applicants: Twitter, tumblr and the contested affective politics of fat doctoral embodiment. *M/C Journal, 18*(3).

Burford, J. (2015b). Queerying the affective politics of doctoral education: Toward complex visions of agency and affect. *Higher Education Research & Development, 34*(4), 776-787. doi:10.1080/07294360.2015.1051005

Burford, J. (2015c). Not writing, and giving 'zero-f**ks' about it: Queer(y)ing doctoral 'failure'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education.* doi:10.1080/01596306.2015.110578

Burford, J. (2016a). Doctoral induction day: An ethnographic fiction on doctoral emotions. In J. Smith, J. Rattray, T. Peseta, & D. Loads (Eds.), *Identity-work in the contemporary university: Exploring an uneasy profession* (pp. 117-128). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Burford, J. (2016b). Uneasy feelings: Queer(y)ing the affective-politics of doctoral education (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

Burrows, R. (2012). Living with the h-index? Metric assemblages in the contemporary academy. *The Sociological Review, 60*(2), 355-372. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2012.02077.x

Cameron, J., Nairn, K., & Higgins, J. (2009). Demystifying academic writing: Reflections on emotions, know-how and academic identity. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 33*(2), 269-284.

Carter, S. (2011). Doctorate as genre: Supporting thesis writing across campus. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(6), 725-736. doi:10.1080/07294360.2011.554388

Connell, R. (1985). How to supervise a PhD. *Vestes, 28*(2), 38-42.

Cotterall, S. (2013). More than just a brain: Emotions and the doctoral experience. *Higher Education Research & Development 32*(2), 174-187.

Court, S., & Kinman, G. (2008). *Tackling stress in higher education.* London: University and College Union.

Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2006). Doctoral student supervision in a managerial climate. *Sociology of Education, 16*(3), 223-236. doi:10.1080/09620210601037787

Cvetkovich, A. (2012). *Depression: A public feeling.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Davies, B. (2006). Women and transgression in the halls of academe. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(4), 497-509.

Davies, B., & Petersen, E. (2005). Intellectual workers (un)doing neoliberal discourse. *International Journal of Critical Psychology, 13*, 32-54.

Deuchar, R. (2008). Facilitator, director or critical friend? Contradiction and congruence in doctoral supervision styles. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *13*(4), 489-500.

Devine, K. & Hunter, K. (2016). Doctoral students' emotional exhaustion and intentions to leave academia. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, *11*, 35-61. Retrieved from https://www.informingscience.org/Publications/3396

Ditton, M. (2009). How social relationships influence academic health in the 'enterprise university': An insight into productivity of knowledge workers. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(2), 151-164. doi:10.1080/07294360902725033.

Divaris, K., Polychronopoulou, A., Taoufik, K., Katsaros, C., & Eliades, T. (2012). Stress and burnout in post-graduate dental education. *European Journal of Dental Education, 16*(1), 35-42.

Ehrenberg, R., Jakubson, G., Groen, J., So, E., & Price, J. (2007). Inside the black box of doctoral education: What program characteristics influence doctoral students' attrition and graduation probabilities? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 29*(2), 134-150.

Elizabeth, V., & Grant, B. (2013). 'The spirit of research has changed': Reverberations from researcher identities in managerial times. *Higher Education Research & Development, 32*(1), 122-135. doi:10.1080/07294360.2012.751362

Gill, R. (2010). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of the neoliberal university. In R. Ryan-Flood & R. Gill (Eds.), *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections* (pp. 228–244). Oxon: Routledge.

Grant, B. (2008). *Academic writing retreats: A facilitator's guide*. Milperra: HERDSA

Grant, B., & Elizabeth, V. (2014). Unpredictable feelings: Academic women under research audit. *British Educational Research Journal*, *41*(2), 287-302. doi:10.1002/berj.3145

Hartman, Y., & Darab, S. (2012). A call for slow scholarship: A case study on the intensification of academic life and its implications for pedagogy. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, *34*(1-2), 49-60. doi:10.1080/10714413.2012.643740

Henderson, L., Honan, E., & Loch, S. (2016). The production of the academicwritingmachine. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology, 7*(2), 4-18.

Herman, C. (2008). Negotiating the emotions of change: Research, restructuring and the doctoral student. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 22*(1), 100-115.

Hey, V. (2011). Affective asymmetries: Academics, austerity and the mis/recognition of emotion. *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences, 6*(2), 207-222. doi:10.1080/21582041.2011.583486

Hopwood, N., Alexander, P., Harris-Huemmert, S., McAlpine, L., & Wagstaff, S. (2011). The hidden realities of life as a doctoral student. In V. Kumar & A. Lee (Eds.), *Doctoral education in international context: Connecting local, regional and global perspectives*. Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.

Hopwood, N., & Paulson, J. (2012). Bodies in narratives of doctoral students' learning and experience. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*(6), 667-681. doi:10.1080/03075079.2010.537320

Kamler, B. (2008). Rethinking doctoral publication practices: Writing from and beyond the thesis. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(3), 283-294. doi:10.1080/03075070802049236

Kamler, B. & Thomson, P. (2004). Driven to abstraction: Doctoral supervision and writing pedagogies. *Teaching in Higher Education, 9*(2), 195-209. doi:10.1080/1356251042000195358

Kamler, B. & Thomson, P. (2006). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.

Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2008). The failure of dissertation advice books: Toward alternative pedagogies for doctoral writing. *Educational Researcher, 37*(8), 407-514. doi:10.3102/0013189X08327390

Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision* (2nd ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

Kenny, J. (2008). Efficiency and effectiveness in higher education: Who is accountable for what? *Australian Universities' Review*, *50*(1), 11-19.

Kinman, G. (2014). Doing more with less? Work and wellbeing in academics. *Somatechnics, 4*(2), 219-235. doi:10.3366/soma.2014.0129

Lao, R. (2015). *A critical study of Thailand's higher education reforms: The culture of borrowing*. Oxon, NY: Routledge.

Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 157-172.

Leathwood, C., & Hey, V. (2009). Gender/ed discourses and emotional sub-texts: Theorising emotion in UK higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(4), 429-440. doi:10.1080/13562510903050194

Lee, A., & Aitchison, C. (2009). Writing for the doctorate and beyond. In D. Boud & A. Lee (Eds.), *Changing practices of doctoral education* (pp. 87-99). Abingdon: Routledge.

Lee, A., Brennan, M., & Green, B. (2009). Re-imagining doctoral education: Professional doctorates and beyond. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(3), 275-287. doi:10.1080/07294360902839883

Lee, A., & Williams, C. (1999). "Forged in fire": Narratives of trauma in PhD supervision pedagogy. *Southern Review, 32*(1), 6-26.

Lee. K. (2005). Neuroticism: End of a doctoral dissertation. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *11*(6), 933-938.

Leys, R. (2011). The turn to affect: A critique. *Critical Inquiry*, *37*(3), 434-472

Lillis, T., & Curry, M. (2006). Reframing notions of competence in scholarly writing: From individual to networked activity. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 51, p. 63-78.

Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(1), 5-32. doi:10.1558/japl.v4i1.5

Lynch, K. (2010). Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 9*(1), 54-67. doi:10.1177/1474022209350104

Marchant, T., Anastasi, N., & Miller, P. (2011). Reflections on academic writing and publication for doctoral students and supervisors: Reconciling authorial voice and performativity. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 16*(12), 13-29.

Maher, D., Seaton, L., McMullen, C., Fitzgerald, T., Otsuji, E., & Lee, A. (2008). 'Becoming and being writers': The experiences of doctoral students in writing groups. *Studies in Continuing Education, 30*(3), 263-275. doi:10.1080/01580370802439870

Mann, C. (2013, May 19). Students left to learn the hard way, *Sunday Star Times*. Retrieved from http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/8690351/Students-left-to-learn-the-hard-way

McGrail, M., Rickard, C., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25*(1), 19-35. doi:10.1080/07294360500453053

McWilliam, E. & James, R. (2002). Doctoral education in a knowledge economy. *Higher Education Research & Development, 21*(2)*,* 117-117.

Mulya, T. (in press). Neoliberalism and psychology higher education in Indonesia. *Anima Indonesian Psychological Journal.*

Nerad, M. (2010). Globalization and the internationalization of graduate education: A macro and micro view. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *40*(1), 1-12.

Nutov, L., & Hassan, O. (2011). Feeling the doctorate: Is doctoral research that studies the emotional labor of doctoral students possible? *International Journal of Doctoral Education, 6*, 19-32.

Paré, A., Starke-Meyerring, D., & McAlpine, L. (2011). Knowledge and identity work in the supervision of doctoral student writing: Shaping rhetorical subjects. In D. Starke-Meyerring, A. Paré, N. Artemeva, M. Horne, & L. Yousoubova (Eds.) *Writing in knowledge societies* (pp. 215- 236). South Carolina: Parlor Press.

Pearson, M. (1999). The changing environment for doctoral education in Australia: Implications for quality management, improvement and innovation. *Higher Education Research & Development, 18*(3), 269-287.

Pearson, M., Evans, T., & Macauley, P. (2008). Growth and diversity in doctoral education: Assessing the Australian experience. *Higher Education*, *55*(3), 357-372.

Pelias, R. (2004). *A methodology of the heart: Evoking academic and daily life*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Peseta, T. (2001). Imagining a Ph.D. Writer's body: Grappling over pedagogy. In A. Bartlett & G. Mercer, *Postgraduate research supervision: Transforming (r)elations* (pp. 83-87). New York: Peter Lang.

Petersen, E. (2007). Negotiating academicity: Postgraduate research supervision as category boundary work. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(4), 475-487.

Prasad, A. (2013). Playing the game and trying not to lose myself: A doctoral student's perspective on the institutional pressures for research output. *Organization, 20*(6), 936-948. doi:10.1177/1350508413486274

Prasad, A. (2015). Liminal transgressions, or where should the critical academy go from here? Reimagining the future of doctoral education to engender research sustainability. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting, 26*, 108-116. doi:10.1016/j.cpa.2014.09.006

Rudestam, K., & Newton, R. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Saltmarsh, S., & Randell-Moon, H. (2014). Work, life, and im/balance: Policies, practices and performativities of academic well-being. *Somatechnics, 4*(2), 236-252. doi:10.3366/soma.2014.0130

Simpson, B., & Humphrey, R. (2010). Writing across boundaries: Reflections on the place of writing in doctoral training for social scientists *Learning and Teaching, 3*(1), 69-91. doi:10.3167/latiss.2010.030105

Sparkes, A. (2007). Embodiment, academics, and the audit culture: A story seeking consideration. *Qualitative Research, 7*(4), 521-550. doi:10.1177/1468794107082306

Spowart, L., & Nairn, K. (2013). (Re)performing emotions in diary-interviews. *Qualitative Research, 14*(3), 327–340.

Starke-Meyerring, D. (2011). The paradox of writing in doctoral education: Student experiences. In L. McAlpine & C. Amundsen (Eds.), *Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for doctoral students, supervisors and administrators*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Starke-Meyerring, D., Paré, A., Sun, K., & El-Bezre, N. (2014). Probing normalized institutional discourses about writing: The case of the doctoral thesis. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 8(2), 13-27.

Stubb, J., Pyhältö, K., & Lonka, K. (2011). Balancing between inspiration and exhaustion? Ph.D. students' experienced socio-psychological well-being. *Studies in Continuing Education, 33*(1), 33–50. doi:10.1080/0158037X.2010.515572

Styles, I., & Radloff, A. (2000). *Jabba the Hut: Research students' feelings about doing a thesis*. Paper presented at the Teaching and Learning Forum 2000, Perth.

Sullivan, N, & Simon, J. (2014). Academic work cultures: Somatic crisis in the enterprise university. *Somatechnics, 4*(2), 205-218. doi:10.3366/soma.2014.0128

Taylor, S., & Beasley, N. (2005). *A handbook for doctoral supervisors*. Oxon: Routledge.

Tennant, M. (2004). Doctoring the knowledge worker. *Studies in Continuing Education, 26*(3), 431-441. doi:10.1080/0158037042000265971

Tennant, M., McMullen, C., & Kaczynski, D. (Eds.). (2010). *Teaching, learning and research in higher education: A critical approach*. New York: Routledge.

van der Wende, M. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the OECD countries: Challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *Journal for Studies in International Education*, *11*(3-4), 274-289.

Wall, S. (2008). Of heads and hearts: Women in doctoral education at a Canadian university. *Women's Studies International Forum, 31*(3), 219-228. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2008.04.007

Wellington, J. (2010). More than a matter of cognition: An exploration of the affective writing problems of post-graduate students and their possible solutions. *Teaching in Higher Education, 15*(2), 135-150.

Wellington, J., Bathmaker, A., Hunt, C., McCulloch, G., & Sikes, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Succeeding with your doctorate*. London: Sage Publications.

Wetherell, M. (2012). *Affect and emotion: A new social science understanding*. London: Sage.

White, J. (2013). Doctoral education and new managerialism. In M. Vicars & T. McKenna (Eds.) *Discourse, power and resistance Down Under* (pp. 187-194). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

BIOGRAPHY

James Burford is a Lecturer in the Faculty of Learning Sciences and Education at Thammasat University. He teaches critical approaches to academic reading and writing, and comparative education courses at both the undergraduate and postgraduate level. His research interests include questions of identity, affect and agency in higher education, sexuality and gender studies, and qualitative research methodologies.