

The Dispositions and Skills of a Ph.D. in Education: Perspectives of Faculty and Graduate Students in One College of Education

Susan K. Gardner · Michael T. Hayes ·
Xyanthe N. Neider

Published online: 17 November 2006
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2006

Abstract Twenty-two faculty and graduate students were interviewed in one college of education in order to understand what the college and its constituents view as the skills, habits of mind, and dispositions needed to obtain a Ph.D. in Education. Analysis of the data was conducted using professional socialization as a theoretical framework, allowing for an understanding of the different perspectives of this topic as viewed through a developmental lens. Implications for theory and practice are included.

Key words socialization · doctorate · education

Susan K. Gardner received her Ph.D. in Higher Education from Washington State University and is currently Assistant Professor of Higher Education at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. Her research interests include doctoral education, student development, and issues of social justice in higher education. She can be reached at gardners@lsu.edu.

Michael T. Hayes received his Ph.D. in the Cultural Foundations of Education from the University of Utah, and he is currently an Associate professor in the department of Teaching and Learning at Washington State University. His research interests include the cultural studies of education and issues of visual culture and globalization. He can be reached at mthayes@wsu.edu.

Xyanthe N. Neider received her M.A. degree in Higher Education Administration from Washington State University and is currently enrolled in the Ph.D. program at the same institution. Her research interests include identity development of non-European students in the current political and social environments, online teaching and learning, as well as graduate student education and development. She can be reached at xneider@wsu.edu.

S. K. Gardner (✉)
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA
e-mail: gardners@lsu.edu

M. T. Hayes · X. N. Neider
Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

M. T. Hayes
e-mail: mthayes@wsu.edu

X. N. Neider
e-mail: xneider@wsu.edu

The discussion of the purpose of doctoral education has persisted since the inception of graduate education in the United States. While many posit the purpose of doctoral education to be the preparation to conduct original research (e.g., Council of Graduate Schools, 1990), others contend that the purposes of doctoral education should be further reaching, including training to teach (Adams & Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002; Gaff, 2002) and skills necessary for the labor market outside of academia (Atwell, 1996; Golde & Walker, 2006; Jones, 2003). On one side of the discussion, scholars posit the market research argument: to prepare the product directly for its subsequent use (Berelson, 1960). As the doctoral student may become a faculty member, researcher, or something altogether different, this “use” may be completely dependent on the individual student’s career choice. When the purpose of doctoral education is viewed through this inconclusive understanding, one is not surprised to see the lack of literature addressing this very topic. This leads one to ask what it means to have a doctorate, and more specifically, what it means to have a Ph.D. Is it a set of skills that one possesses upon completion of the program of study, or is something altogether more intangible such as a disposition that one has after completing program requirements? Speaking to this lingering discussion in academia, Berelson (1960, p. 88) stated, “Whereas the lawyer is a lawyer, the physician a physician, the engineer an engineer, no one can predict what the Ph.D. knows or does: Is he (sic) a scholar? A teacher? An educated man?”

Within the field of education, this debate is no less prevalent. Indeed, the emergence of the Ed.D. degree in 1920 at Harvard University was one attempt to differentiate the purposes of the doctorate in education between the researcher and the practitioner (Toma, 2002), but the purpose of the doctorate in education has nevertheless remained a lingering issue (Baez, 2002; Carpenter, 1987; Dill & Morrison, 1985; Robertson & Sistler, 1971). Many scholars have suggested that the Ph.D. be designated for those choosing research or faculty careers and the Ed.D. for those pursuing practitioner-oriented careers (Nelson & Coorough, 1994; Osguthorpe & Wong, 1993; Toma, 2002), but new discussions surrounding the development of an entirely separate professional practice doctorate or a terminal master’s degree in educational administration further complicate the issue (Jacobson, 2005; Lester, 2004).

Further muddying the waters is the discussion of how education conceptualizes itself as an academic enterprise. Is it a discipline, an inter-discipline, a second level discipline, or an enterprise (Richardson, 2006)? No central canon exists within the field of education, much less a central understanding of whether it is a discipline or simply an amalgamation of other disciplines working toward the improvement of professional practice. Taken together, the purposes of the Ph.D. itself are unknown, much less the purposes of the Ph.D. in Education.

Attempts to better understand and subsequently to improve doctoral education are underway through efforts such as the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, recently completed in 2006. This Carnegie Initiative was a five-year project that “focused on aligning the purpose and practices of doctoral education in six disciplines” (Golde & Walker, 2006, p. 6), those of chemistry, education, English, history, mathematics, and neuroscience. The College of Education in this study had been a participating institution in the Carnegie Initiative. As part of its efforts to study and re-envision its own doctoral programs, the College conducted a qualitative study of its stakeholders in order to investigate what the constituencies in one college of education identified as the skills, dispositions, and habits of mind necessary to hold a Ph.D. in Education. As an exploratory study, the investigators sought to understand the perspectives of a sampling of faculty in this college, those who had completed the degree and served as the mentors to those

working to obtain it, as well as the perspectives of the doctoral students themselves as they underwent the training and experiences necessary to obtain the degree. Owing further to the exploratory nature of the study, the investigators sought to understand how the responses of the participants reflected the broader cultural frames of references within education as a field of study and the specific contextual influences within this college of education in particular. The conceptual framework of socialization was employed in this study in order to better understand how the acquisition of a set of skills, values, and habits of mind necessary to obtain the Ph.D. in Education was viewed through those progressing through the degree program as well as from those who grant it, therefore demonstrating the developmental nature of how individuals are socialized into the professional relationships and cultural values which mark the degree. The following section addresses the concept of socialization as well as the other relevant literature that lends to a better understanding of the context of the study as it is situated in the existing literature.

Background

We sought to understand the meaning attached to the Ph.D. in Education by the constituencies of one college of education. In many ways, this meaning is a shared one among those who hold the degree and those who seek to obtain it. This shared meaning inherently includes values, skills, attitudes, norms, and the knowledge base necessary to obtain the degree. Similarly, socialization, generally defined, is the process through which an individual learns to adopt the values, skills, attitudes, norms, and knowledge needed for membership in a given society, group, or organization (Merton, 1957; Tierney, 1997).

In this study, this given society, group, or organization is represented generally by the college of education and its accompanying cultural context, and more specifically by the department or program in which the degree specialization resides. Socialization in the particular organization is governed by its own set of rules and guidelines that are necessary for successful membership, resulting in the theoretical conceptualization of organizational socialization. Van Maanen and Schein (1979, p. 211) described organizational socialization as “the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role.” Socialization is generally transmitted through the existence of the organizational culture. Tierney (1997, p. 3) described organizational culture as “the sum of activities—symbolic and instrumental—that exist in the organization and create shared meaning. The definition of socialization pertains to the successful understanding and incorporation of those activities by the new members of the organization.” Borrowing from Merton, Tierney stated, “Culture is the sum of activities in the organization, and socialization is the process through which individuals acquire and incorporate an understanding of those activities” (p. 4). He continued, “An organization’s culture, then, teaches people how to behave, what to hope for, and what it means to succeed or fail. Some individuals become competent, and others do not. The new recruit’s task is to learn the cultural processes in the organization and figure out how to use them” (p. 4).

Organizational socialization typically has two major stages. The initial phase is generally referred to as anticipatory socialization and often begins before individuals make the decision to join the organization as they learn about the organization through the recruitment and selection process (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Anticipatory socialization is the period when individuals take “on the values of the non-membership group to which they aspire” (Merton, 1957, p. 319), aiding the individual in adjusting to the group and

becoming assimilated to its norms, values, and attitudes (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Anticipatory socialization, in the case of the pursuit of the Ph.D. for the future academic career, occurs in graduate school. Boyer (1990, p. 68) stated, “It is in graduate education where professional attitudes and values of the professoriate are most firmly shaped.”

After successfully gaining entrance to the organization, the individual enters the stage of socialization referred to as role continuance (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). This stage consists of the time when individuals experience the socialization processes that will ultimately influence their decision to remain in the organization and to adopt the values, attitudes, and beliefs of the culture (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). In this study, the two constituencies interviewed were faculty and doctoral students. This deliberate inclusion of both groups represents both stages of the socialization process. Therefore, the socialization process in this College is represented by those who are seeking admission to the group (i.e., those who desire to gain the Ph.D.) during the stage of anticipatory socialization and those who already hold the degree, representing the stage of role continuance.

The values, attitudes, and beliefs of the culture, in this case, the academic culture, are often dictated by the discipline itself. Disciplines have their own particular qualities, cultures, codes of conduct, values, and distinctive intellectual tasks (Becher, 1981), which ultimately influence the experiences of the faculty, staff, and students involved. Becher and Trowler (2001, p. 44) underscored this point: “We may appropriately conceive of disciplines as having recognizable identities and particular cultural attributes.” Within the context of this study, these cultural attributes are important in understanding how the socialization process as a whole works within the particular disciplinary setting.

In this study, the disciplinary setting or culture is that of education. While not universally acknowledged as a discipline in the strictest sense, education as a field of study nevertheless includes “its own set of problems, questions, knowledge bases, and approaches to inquiry” (Richardson, 2006, p. 253). With an overall dearth of scholarly literature surrounding the conceptualization of education as discipline, Richardson (2006) was one of the few to take it on. Her conceptualization of a discipline, owing to a set of questions, knowledge bases, and approaches to inquiry, allows for a better understanding of education and its associated organizational socialization. Furthermore, while there remains a lack of consensus regarding the status of education as a discipline, the predominant discipline typology literature, including that of Biglan (1973a; 1973b), Becher and Trowler (2001) and Clark (1987) all include education within their conceptualizations of discipline. In these theories, education is generally classified as “soft-applied,” owing to its generally non-science orientation in its research practices and its often direct relationship to practice (Biglan, 1973a).

Within education itself, there has been continuing debate about the purposes of the doctoral degree and what knowledge, skills, and understanding should be inherently included in a doctoral program of study. In many ways, this debate in and of itself can be used to explain the existence of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees in education. While the Ed.D. has been generally regarded as a practitioner-oriented degree and the Ph.D. as a research-oriented degree, the distinction between the two is nevertheless nebulous in most colleges of education (Carpenter, 1987; Dill & Morrison, 1985; Osguthorpe & Wong, 1993). For the purposes of the current study, the Ph.D. in Education was the focus of the research question. While the institution under consideration offers both degrees, it is the Ph.D. that is included in the work the faculty undertook with the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, with the understanding that the Ed.D. in and of itself would be later examined. Furthermore, while both degrees do exist within the college of education, only the Ph.D. is offered across all

program areas. It is hoped that a clearer understanding of the Ed.D. might also emerge through a better understanding of the meaning and significance attributed to the Ph.D.

Research Methods

Our study sought to answer this question: what do the stakeholders in one college of education perceive to be the dispositions and skills someone with a Ph.D. in Education should possess? We utilized a qualitative approach as it allowed for a broader understanding of the multiple perspectives and issues relevant to doctoral education as well as allowing for flexibility in conceptualizing doctoral education and its purposes in this exploratory study. Qualitative methodology is preferred when conducting exploratory studies, as it allows for the identification of unanticipated phenomena and influences (Maxwell, 1996).

Faculty and doctoral students were interviewed in order to answer the research question. A random cross-section of individuals from each constituency group, garnered from publicly available college rosters, was contacted for participation in the study in the spring of 2005. The College of Education at this institution is made up of two departments. One department is focused on teacher education with specialties in such areas as literacy education, mathematics education, and cultural studies; and the other department is a conglomeration of the specializations of educational administration, athletic administration, educational research, and counseling psychology. While several specializations exist in the college, only one Ph.D. degree exists, the Ph.D. in Education. The Ed.D. program in the college tends to be a part-time program for educational administrators across the state.

A total of 11 doctoral students and 11 faculty members were ultimately interviewed, representing several specialization areas. The 11 faculty members represented approximately one-third of the total faculty in the two departments studied, while the 11 doctoral students represented approximately one-tenth of all doctoral students in the college but were nevertheless representative of the departments studied. Further, we sought to obtain equal representation of doctoral students across program year, resulting in three students in the first, second, and third years of their degree program and two students in their fourth year. This purposeful representation across years in the program was intended to reflect the developmental nature apparent in organizational socialization. Further, the sampling reflected the diversity among student participants, as only half were planning to pursue careers in the professoriate. The others were planning to pursue administrative roles or professional practice after graduation.

After obtaining Human Subjects approval for the study and consent from each participant, we conducted the interviews. Interviews lasted from 30 to 90 minutes and were guided by a protocol (see [Appendix](#)) which was structured in nature but nevertheless allowed for flexibility in responses by the participants. We taped and transcribed the interviews for main ideas surrounding the research question itself. We then conducted an analysis of the data through the use of constant comparative method, “a research design for multi-data sources, which is like analytic induction in that the formal analysis begins early in the study and is nearly completed by the end of data collection” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p. 66). The steps of the constant comparative method, according to Glaser (1978) include (1) begin collecting data; (2) find key issues, events, or activities in the data that become main categories for focus; (3) collect data that provide many incidents of the categories of focus; (4) write about the categories explored, keeping in mind past incidents while searching for new; (5) work with the data and emerging model to discover

relationships; and (6) sample, code, and write with the core categories in mind. The steps of the constant comparative method occur simultaneously during data collection until categories are saturated and writing begins. This study utilized Glaser's steps in data analysis, which allowed for emergent themes to develop from the data and provided a means by which large amounts of data were compressed into meaningful units for analysis. We obtained trustworthiness of the data collected and its subsequent analysis through the ongoing discussions and comparisons of data by the three researchers conducting the study.

Findings

From the analysis of the interviews, the stakeholders in this college of education clearly attributed definite skills and habits of mind to the Ph.D. in Education. Several themes emerged from the interviews in each of the sets of findings, describing the skills and habits of mind as well as the modes through which a Ph.D. in Education should acquire them. In regard to the conceptual framework of socialization, the development of a particular set of characteristics and skills is an important part of the overall socialization process in any organization or group. Higher education exists as one such organization or group with its own socialization processes and goals, often leading to a particular professional identity. The development of relevant characteristics and skills in doctoral education is equally important to the individual pursuing the degree (Baird, 1972; Rosen & Bates, 1967; Soto Antony, 2002; Weidman & Stein, 2003). In this study we describe a clear delineation of these characteristics or habits of mind, and skills and knowledge in this College of Education in particular, relating to the particular socialization process that is expected in this disciplinary culture and setting. Therefore, while the participants did not necessarily discuss the process of socialization in itself, they all discussed what they felt to be the outcomes of the socialization, which occurs as a result of obtaining the Ph.D. Each set of findings is discussed in turn below.

Habits of Mind

Three themes regarding habits of mind emerged from the interviews. These habits of mind form a set of characteristics that typify what these stakeholders perceive to be the qualities that an individual holding a Ph.D. in Education should possess. In regard to socialization, this set of findings represents what Merton (1957) described as the values and attitudes needed for membership in an organization.

The first habit of mind discussed by the participants is the quest for knowledge. This habit of mind encompasses what the participants explained as the desire for knowledge, the willingness to learn, and the possession of a curious mind. The quest for knowledge also characterizes the research enterprise itself, an inherent part of doctoral education (Council of Graduate Schools, 1990).

The quest for knowledge, and its meaning for the Ph.D. in Education, was apparent in many of the participants' comments. An associate professor in the teacher education department commented on this habit of mind: "A Ph.D. in Education should have a sense of wonderment; a curious mind. He or she should prize the doubt that is inherent in the research enterprise." Similarly, a third-year doctoral student in counseling psychology, stated, "A Ph.D. in Education should be someone who is or can be vulnerable and comfortable with ambiguity. You need to be someone who questions." We discerned that

while faculty and more advanced graduate students discussed the quest for knowledge, there were not any first year students who discussed it. This may reflect the socialization process at work, which Bragg (1976) pointed out is transmitted through interactions between the faculty member and the student, a relationship that has not yet fully developed in the first year of graduate school.

The second habit of mind is independence, including other related themes such as autonomy, self-motivation, and self-direction. Both faculty and students used these terms throughout the interviews, testifying to the independent nature of the person holding or seeking the Ph.D. Independence in doctoral education has been commented upon by several scholars (Bargar & Duncan, 1982; Gardner, 2005; Lovitts, 2005). Indeed, the Council of Graduate Schools (2004, p. 4) clearly delineated the independent nature of doctoral education: “Beyond some beginning course work, the experience of each Ph.D. student is individualized and varied. Ph.D. students bear a greater responsibility for defining the scope of their educational experience than do other students. Further, the degree requires initiative and creativity, and the award of the degree depends upon the individual performance of a student in completing original research in the area of study.”

The characteristic of independence was mentioned quite often by faculty. One counseling psychology faculty member commented, “You need to be autonomous and independent as a Ph.D. in Education, including the motivation and drive to pursue learning.” Another faculty member from Teacher Education remarked, “A Ph.D. in Education is someone who is independent... someone who is self-directed in research and really who just needs some guidance from faculty, not someone who needs to be coddled.” Yet another stipulated, “This may sound crass, but just be hard working and self-directed.” A third year student mentioned independence, but it was in the context of being able to conduct “independent research,” whereas other students mentioned concepts of “learning by doing” and phrases like “you need to push yourself.” It was, however, the more advanced students who discussed the characteristic of independence, again showing the developmental nature of the socialization process and this culture in particular. It is probably not remarkable that faculty mention the concept of independence when they are those who must work with the students to transition to independence through the dissertation research and beyond.

The third and final habit of mind identified is humility, which includes openness to feedback, receptivity to new ideas, an ethical stance in ideas and research, and reflectivity. The Council of Graduate Schools (1990) alluded to an ethical stance in ideas inherent in the characteristic of humility, but beyond this very little scholarly literature addresses the concept of humility in the research and doctoral education process. Nevertheless, the faculty and students in this study commented upon humility frequently.

One faculty member in counseling psychology remarked thusly on humility: “Research involved in doctoral education shouldn’t be taken lightly. It should be hard, and it should be a struggle, but the willingness to learn and be humble in your findings is also important.” A counseling psychology student in the second year similarly stated, “A Ph.D. in Education is about critical thinking with humility and realizing how much you have left to learn.” Critique and openness to feedback was also often discussed by faculty members. One such individual in Teacher Education commented, “Students must be willing to take [critique] and use that critique to better themselves. A good student will take the critique provided on a paper and not get defensive, but use that feedback to improve their writing and to improve their analytical abilities.” Yet another faculty member in the same department remarked, “A Ph.D. in Education is humble. They understand that these are difficult ideas that will take

time and significant effort to grasp and to master.” Again, it is of note to see that first year doctoral students did not mention humility or other habits of mind, reflecting the developmental aspect of the socialization process. Further, as set forth by Bragg (1976), the first step of the socialization process, occurring early for first year doctoral students, is observation.

Skills and Abilities

The second set of findings, skills and abilities, stand in clear contrast to the habits of mind. Whereas habits of mind are intangible attitudes, values, and characteristics that cannot be seen or casually observed, skills and abilities are more tangible and observable qualities.

From the interviews two main themes emerged to describe the skills and abilities that a Ph.D. in Education should possess. Again, socialization theory (Merton, 1957) would reflect these findings as characterizing the skills and knowledge needed for membership in an organization. In its Policy Statement, the Council of Graduate Schools (1990, p. 1) also spoke to the purpose of the Ph.D. in regard to skills and abilities, “When all courses have been taken, the research finished, the dissertation written, and all examinations passed, the student should have acquired the knowledge and skills expected of a scholar who has made an original contribution to the field and has attained the necessary expertise to continue to do so.”

The two themes describe skills and abilities necessary for the research enterprise and for communication. These themes are synergistic in that the scholar’s research findings must be clearly communicated to external audiences. Assuming the requisite knowledge base, the first set of skills involved with the research enterprise include the ability to analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and conduct research in a variety of research traditions.

One doctoral student, in her second year in the educational research program, remarked upon the research enterprise and its associated skills, saying, “The basics should include reading, writing, statistics, and communication skills. If you are a qualitative person, you should learn those skills and follow the steps to approach the study. You need to understand research methods.” A doctoral candidate in his fourth year in the educational research program, also commented, “In research you need specific skills, like being able to critique and examine research as well as finding questions to research in the first place.” This student expounded upon the need to balance skills and knowledge of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. He said, “We are missing the big picture by only looking at one side.” Again, it is noteworthy to observe that students were those who most often discussed skills—observable abilities that can be imitated and learned. Faculty members certainly discussed skills such as “writing clearly” and “critical thinking,” but it was more often the students who discussed these skills. When viewed through the lens of socialization, Bragg (1976, p. 7) described this as the second part of the socialization process, imitation, or “trying on” of the faculty member’s behavior.

It was particularly interesting that of the 22 participants in the study, only two individuals suggested that a Ph.D. in Education should also possess the ability to teach, which is especially noteworthy when considered within the context of a college that emphasizes and conducts research on teaching. This finding would suggest that in this College of Education the Ph.D. degree remains distinctly tied to the research enterprise rather than the academic role as it relates to teaching, per se.

The second theme, the ability to communicate, encompasses the skills needed to communicate the information garnered from the research enterprise. This includes the

ability to communicate effectively through writing and interpersonal communication and the ability to understand and speak to a wide variety of audiences. The Council of Graduate Schools (1990, p. 1), in its Policy Statement, also echoed this skill: “The Doctor of Philosophy program is designed to prepare a student to become a scholar, that is, to discover, integrate, and apply knowledge, as well as communicate and disseminate it.” A counseling psychology student, in the third year of the program, commented on this ability, stating, “Students should be able to express themselves critically and to be critical thinkers and critical writers.” Another third year doctoral student in teacher education, remarked: “It doesn’t matter what you want to do with the degree, but you should be able to document that you can do in-depth research, that you can apply theory to practice, and your ability to communicate with people in your area, including knowing how to use the lingo and research in your area.” An educational administration student in his first year believed skills in communication, interpersonal skills, networking skills, and the ability to write are the most important. A first year doctoral student in the teacher education department posited, “You need to know when to speak a certain language, with whom, and where it is appropriate; not just the language of the academy, either, as some of the vernacular takes time to acquire and mimic—but rather to be able to translate differently. Communication with faculty is different from communicating with students. If you can’t communicate, you’ve exempted yourself from the Ph.D.” One faculty member from the teaching department commented, “People who graduate from our program should be able to make bridges between other people’s work and schools and the people it is really applied to. Some people graduate at such an academic level that they do not or cannot write in ways that teachers can understand it.” Other faculty members, discussing the need to communicate, often talked about communication with external constituencies in just this way. Another faculty member remarked, “It is important to listen to other people; a willingness to really listen to other people you’re engaging with who come from different walks of life.” Nevertheless few of the faculty interviewed discussed the observable skills or behaviors that a Ph.D. in Education should possess, whereas they discussed at length the less discernable habits of mind. As previously stated, the students’ comments demonstrate the socialization occurring in this college of education as students observe and imitate the behavior of their faculty, who represent the socializing agents in the college “through the structures they establish and through the courses they teach” (Bragg, 1976, pp. 19–20). In terms of socialization, then, students are observing effective communication and learning to imitate it (Bragg, 1976).

Finally of note is the fact that none of the participants discussed an important part of any socialization process, that of relationships with others (Van Maanen, 1978; Weidman & Stein, 2003). The concept of socialization inherently encompasses social interaction as a large part of the process; yet the only relationships and interaction discussed by these participants was that of the written and spoken communication detailing one’s research findings. It may be that the inherently independent nature of academic work and research precluded the participants’ discussion of the importance of relationships to others in the academic and research enterprise.

Discussion

Taken together, the habits of mind and skills discussed by the faculty and doctoral students in this College of Education reflect the Council of Graduate Schools’ (1990, p. 1)

conceptualization of a well-prepared doctoral student who “...will have developed the ability to understand and evaluate critically the literature of the field and to apply appropriate principles and procedures to the recognition, evaluation, interpretation, and understanding of issues and problems at the frontiers of knowledge.” Furthermore, the inclusion of both skills and habits of mind in the analysis of these findings demonstrates the holistic nature of graduate education. Bowen and Rudenstine (1992, p. 105) commented, “What graduate students learn is, of course, most important of all—with ‘learning’ understood to encompass not just the substance of particular fields or disciplines, but also ways of forming questions, thinking about issues, and communicating ideas.”

Socialization was the guiding framework for this study. Bragg (1976, p. 6) defined the socialization process as one “by which an individual achieves his identity within the group. The end product of the socialization process is the incorporation of group values and norms into the individual’s self image.” Altogether, the findings that emerged from the interviews conducted with these faculty and graduate students coalesced into two “domains” of the socialization process—“the affective and the cognitive” (Bragg, 1976, p. 3). Whereas the skills and abilities may reflect the cognitive or even behavioral part of the socialization process, the habits of mind can be said to represent the affective domain discussed by Bragg.

Several interesting aspects arose in the interviews in regard to the knowledge, skills, and characteristics involved in obtaining a Ph.D. in Education. While all students and faculty discussed both habits of mind and skills related to the Ph.D. in Education, it was clear that faculty and the more advanced doctoral students discussed habits of mind more often than first or second year students. When analyzed through the conceptual lens of socialization this finding is not surprising in that new graduate students have not yet been fully socialized to the culture and norms of the profession, or in this case, the degree (Van Maanen, 1977). It may also be that newer graduate students have a more simplistic view of the process and expectations of earning a doctorate, assuming that is merely a set of facts of a body of knowledge to be understood, rather than a new way of looking at the world (Lovitts, 2001).

The general coherence in responses from both faculty and doctoral students in the study was also a remarkable finding of the study. Is it that the socialization process in this college is so powerful that even its newest members (i.e., doctoral students) quickly adopt values similar to the veterans in this organization (i.e., faculty members)? Or, rather, is it that the recruitment process to attract these new members filters out those who do not share similar values? It may be that socialization to the norms, values, skills, and characteristics of this organization occurs in these individuals’ professional positions as many of them have worked or are currently working in professional positions, or it may be that this socialization occurred during their earlier educational experiences such as in related master’s programs in education or in other disciplines. Either way, this question remains unclear and more research is warranted in this area.

Expounding on this issue further, when one examines the shared meanings among those interviewed, the socialization that takes place in this college of education could be said to be particularly powerful. When considering change efforts, such as the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, how successful will these change efforts be when considered through the lens of these very strong socialization forces and shared conceptualizations among constituencies? Organizational change, particularly when the organization is higher education, is never easy. Indeed, many have commented on the difficulties inherent in real and lasting change in doctoral education and in the academy in general (Damrosch, 1995; Heiss, 1968; Siegfried, Getz, & Anderson, 1995; Weick, 1984). Therefore, when

considering changes to the culture of this College of Education, how effective will these changes be without closely examining the socialization that also exists and is shared among constituencies at even the earliest entrance to the culture? Again, further research is needed to understand these questions better.

Conclusion

We believe the findings from this study will assist in better understanding doctoral education and in determining the processes, structures, and experiences needed to attain these habits of mind and skills. Structuring programmatic components and experiences outside of the classroom to include particular skill development will ensure that this College's ideal is met in regard to skill acquisition. Equally, understanding the specific needs as they relate to the field or discipline of education is required as it is generally the disciplinary context and culture that most clearly dictate the graduate experience (Gardner, 2005; Golde, 2005) and adds to what we understand to be the skills and habits of mind required for those holding a Ph.D. in Education.

Appendix

Interview Protocol

- (1) What do you consider to be an ideal Ph.D. program in education?
 - a. How well does the Ph.D. program in the college of education match this ideal?
- (2) What effect, if any, has this college's participation in the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate had on the quality of Ph.D. education in the college?
- (3) What are the dispositions, habits of mind, attitudes, and skills a Ph.D. in education should have or exhibit?
 - a. What is your assessment of how these are being provided in the college?
- (4) What are the most valuable experiences in a Ph.D. program in education?
 - a. How well are these being provided in the college?
- (5) What do you consider to be an ideal Ph.D. student?
 - a. How well does the Ph.D. program in the college help students to meet this ideal?
- (6) What are your expectations for these constituencies in a Ph.D. program in education?
 - a. Students
 - b. Faculty
 - c. Advisors/mentors
 - d. Administrators

References

- Adams, K. A., & Association of American Colleges and Universities (2002). *What colleges and universities want in new faculty. Preparing future faculty occasional paper series*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Atwell, R. H. (1996). Doctoral education must match the nation's needs and the realities of the marketplace. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 43(14), B4–B6 (November 29).
- Baez, B. (2002). *Degree of distinction: The Ed.D. or the Ph.D. in education*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Sacramento, CA (November).
- Baird, L. L. (1972). The relation of graduate students' role relations to their stage of academic career, employment, and academic success. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 7, 428–441.
- Bargar, R. R., & Duncan, J. K. (1982). Cultivating creative endeavor in doctoral research. *Journal of Higher Education*, 53, 1–31.
- Becher, T. (1981). Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6, 109–122.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Berelson, B. (1960). *Graduate education in the United States*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Biglan, A. (1973a). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 195–203.
- Biglan, A. (1973b). Relationships between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 204–213.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L. (1992). *In pursuit of the Ph.D.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation.
- Bragg, A. K. (1976). *The socialization process in higher education*. Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Carpenter, D. S. (1987). On-going dialogue: Degrees of difference? *The Review of Higher Education*, 10, 281–286.
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation.
- Council of Graduate Schools (1990). *The doctor of philosophy degree: A policy statement*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.
- Council of Graduate Schools (2004). *Ph.D. completion and attrition: Policy, numbers, leadership, and next steps*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.
- Damrosch, D. (1995). *We scholars: Changing the culture of the university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). Ed.D and Ph.D research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. *The Review of Higher Education*, 8, 169–186.
- Gaff, J. G. (2002). The disconnect between graduate education and faculty realities. *Liberal Education*, 88(3), 6.
- Gardner, S. K. (2005). "If it were easy, everyone would have a Ph.D." *Doctoral student success: Socialization and disciplinary perspectives*. Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.
- Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology.
- Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76, 669–700.
- Golde, C. M., & Walker, G. E. (Eds.) (2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Heiss, A. M. (1968). Graduate education today: An instrument for change?: The answer seems to be no. *Journal of Higher Education*, 39, 1–10.
- Jacobson, J. (2005, March 25). Report calls for abolition of Ed.D. degree and overhaul of education schools. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(29), A24.
- Jones, E. (2003). Beyond supply and demand: Assessing the Ph.D. job market. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*, 46(4), 22–33.
- Lester, S. (2004). Conceptualizing the practitioner doctorate. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29, 757–770.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

- Lovitts, B. E. (2005). Being a good course-taker is not enough: A theoretical perspective on the transition to independent research. *Studies in Higher Education, 30*, 137–154.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York, NY: Free.
- Nelson, J. K., & Coorough, C. (1994). Content analysis of the PhD versus EdD dissertation. *Journal of Experimental Education, 62*, 158–168.
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Wong, M. J. (1993). The Ph.D. versus the Ed.D.: Time for a decision. *Innovative Higher Education, 18*, 47–63.
- Richardson, V. (2006). Stewards of a field, stewards of an enterprise: The doctorate in education. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline* (pp. 251–267). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Robertson, N., & Sistler, J. K. (1971). *The doctorate in education: An inquiry into conditions affecting pursuit of the doctoral degree in the field of education: The institutions*. Bloomington, IN: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Rosen, B. C., & Bates, A. P. (1967). The structure of socialization in graduate school. *Sociological Inquiry, 37*, 71–84.
- Siegfried, J. J., Getz, M., & Anderson, K. H. (1995, May 19). The snail's pace of innovation in higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 41*(36), A56.
- Soto Antony, J. (2002). Reexamining doctoral student socialization and professional development: Moving beyond the congruence and assimilation orientation. In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (vol. XVII, pp. 349–380). New York, NY: Agathon.
- Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*, 1–16.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1994). *Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process*. Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Toma, J. D. (2002, November). *Legitimacy, differentiation, and the promise of the Ed.D. in higher education*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Sacramento, CA.
- Van Maanen, J. (1977). Experiencing organization: Notes on the meaning of careers and socialization. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Organizational careers: Some new perspectives* (pp. 15–45). London, England: Wiley.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). People processing: Strategies of organizational socialization. *Organizational Dynamics, 7*(1), 19–36.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 1*, 209–264.
- Weick, K. E. (1984). Contradictions in a community of scholars: The cohesion-accuracy tradeoff. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), *College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences* (pp. 15–29). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to academic norms. *Research in Higher Education, 44*, 641–656.