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ABSTRACT
This chapter presents the results of a systematic review of the current scholarship into doctoral student agency from a global perspective. In past work, the authors with others have explored doctoral student and research supervisor agency from the perspective of scholar-practitioner agency within the doctoral learning community as well as the post-doctorate practice-based research agenda. This chapter focuses on an analysis of the current scholarship published since 2019 that has continued to examine the aspects of doctoral student voice, agency, and academic identity. Theoretical perspectives were drawn from the scholarship for the theoretical framework of situated learning theory to view how and why doctoral students specifically are able to move from the periphery of the doctoral learning community to center with agency.
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INTRODUCTION
The research into student agency has remained ongoing and many factors have been shown to influence the enhancement of doctoral student agency. Numerous past researchers, including the chapter authors, have noted the specific attributes, traits, characteristics, and qualities that comprise doctoral student agency as well as considerations for the agentive and agentic characteristics. An evolved doctoral student agency may aid persistence and completion of the doctoral program as well as engagement with the scholarly community and dissemination of graduate research. Other scholars have highlighted the role of doctoral student agency in the attainment of academic careers post-doctorate as well as the strategies and techniques for research supervisors to ensure quality development of agency for their dissertation candidates. In past work, the chapter authors have defined doctoral student agency as the belief in a student’s ability to initiate an active role in one’s own learning setting, content, process, and engagement (Sweat et al., 2021). In addition, they have conducted work into dissertation research supervisor agency (Rigler et al., 2017; Throne & Oddi, 2019; Throne & Walters, 2019).

Subsequently, LaFrance et al. (2020) recommended dissertation research supervisors should use their agency to ensure the doctoral program provides adequate student supports and feedback for dissertation completion. Yet, the authors also called for further research associated with doctoral students
such as the socioemotional factors addressed in doctoral education (LaFrance et al., 2020). Further, van der Laan et al. (2021) noted it as essential to support postgraduate student wellbeing. While the prior research has delved into dissertation research supervisor agency, less examination has been done on doctoral student agency. For purposes of this chapter, the authors have considered the various aspects of the student’s positionality and socioemotional well being as a part of that positionality and the academic self. The objective of this chapter is to consider findings from a systematic review of the current scholarship between 2019-2021 to ascertain new knowledge and perspectives on the various aspects of what may referred to as doctoral student agency. Findings are considered through the lens of situated learning theory and a situated dissertation advising framework, constructed previously by the chapter authors with others, used for doctoral scholars pursuing the doctorate primarily online.

BACKGROUND
The results of the systematic review extend the past work of the chapter authors with others who have highlighted the agentive and agentic characteristics of doctoral student agency (Sweat et al., 2021). Five agentive attributes were identified from the literature as (a) problem solving and critical thinking, (b) self-motivation and self-directedness, (c) confidence and self-awareness, (d) self-efficacy and identity development, and (e) independent scholar-practitioner. Four agentic attributes determined included (a) empowerment, (b) resilience amid inequities, (c) perseverance amid hierarchies, and (d) perseverance amid organizational and relational power dynamics. Müller (2019) defined the development of agency, from a poststructuralist and post-qualitative perspective, not as a product of will as much as a dormant agent residing in the arena of possibilities that may hold transformational power for education.

Other scholars have reported the attributes of agency also sustain the doctoral scholar post-doctorate throughout the academic career from career attainment and advancement (Campbell & O’Meara, 2014; Hayter & Parker, 2019; Jaeger et al., 2017). Still others linked doctoral student agency with academic identity, especially for the dissemination of graduate research, entrance to the scholarly publishing community, and the ongoing research agenda post-doctorate (Badenhorst, 2018; Leshem, 2020; Throne & Oddi, 2019). Further, Jaeger et al. (2017) pointed to the social capital necessary in this regard and Inouye and McAlpine (2017) noted scholar independence.

Scholar practitioner is a new concept in doctoral scholarship that has changed the traditional scholarly role to an experiential role taking shape and evolving program outcomes in many institutions and was thus included as a study construct (Anastasia & Burrington, 2020). While not a new concept, experiential research is directed towards identifying problems, creating solutions (Fortune, 2018), and putting those solutions into practice (Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2018). Agency specific to scholar practitioner/professional duality has also suggested today's doctoral programs are behind preparing students for careers in industry (Anastasia & Burrington, 2020). As doctoral colleges rethink the traditional scholar model and move forward to a scholar practitioner model, the focus on theory is changing to a focus on application (Anastasia & Burrington, 2020). As university programs are changed to reflect scholar/practitioner applications over theory building, and as a result, program realignments from theory to practice are becoming a practice in higher education and warranted inclusion (Anastasia & Burrington, 2020).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
Situated learning theory served as the theoretical framework for this systematic review. As first posited by Lave (1991, 1996), learning was characterized as situated as it occurs normally within and across any embedded learning activity, context, or culture. Thus, it is essential that the learning setting be situated so as to normally foster the construction of knowledge (Lave, 1991, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991). In past work, the chapter authors with others have noted
Socialization and collaboration are essential components of situated learning theory whereby the learner participates within a community of practice comprised of the established conventions, beliefs, and behaviors to be acquired. While initially, the learner may reside at the periphery of the respective learning community, over time the learner becomes more socialized, engaged, and active within the learning culture until assuming a pinnacle role as an expert (Throne et al., 2018).

Lave and Wenger (1991) coined the term communities of practice, which has evolved to be defined as any group who engage in collective learning within a particular domain (Wenger, 1998, 2011). As members of the doctoral learning community, doctoral faculty, doctoral research supervisors, and the ancillary members of the community such as library and information science (LIS) professionals, can support the doctoral scholar to move from the periphery to the center of the doctoral learning community (Throne, 2020). As the dissertation research supervisor acknowledges their role to foster enhanced student agency for the doctoral scholar, situated learning can evolve into situated dissertation advising (Throne et al., 2015). When a quality research supervisor-doctoral scholar relationship is established and the supervisor provides mentoring tailored to the student’s agency and research skillset, doctoral scholar agency may be enhanced (Rigler et al., 2017; Sweat et al., 2021; Throne, Shaw et al., 2015), which has been shown to improve doctoral student persistence and completion, scholar-practitioner-leader preparation, dissertation research completion, and graduate research dissemination (Prager et al., 2020). As such, the study employed the continued lens of situated learning theory to consider the four aspects of doctoral student agency.

**METHOD AND SOURCING**

A systematic review allows for the explicit and reproducible research methods to systematically source, critically assess, and synthesize research for a specific problem or construct, and the growing use of systematic review has been well documented in the health sciences (Gopalakrishnan & Ganeshkumar, 2013). Systematic review as research method has also increased in educational research parallel to the trends in evidence-based education and the need to review prior research to generate new knowledge (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). As the authors have previously conducted general literature and critical reviews to ascertain specific aspects of doctoral student agency from the recent research, the need to employ more systematic methods to further inform understanding gleaned from other researchers’ findings was necessary. Thus, generally, the systematic review procedures from Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) were used as study method. Research syntheses provide a rigorous and efficient systematic approach to generate new knowledge from cumulative research to identify trends and gaps within burgeoning scholarship surrounding a specific phenomenon of inquiry (Polanin et al., 2017). In addition, the digital technological advantages of electronic academic databases, scholarly crawler search engines, open access research, knowledge sharing, and other digital technologies have served to advance systematic research as a viable scientific method of research and supports the selection of the study method (Gopalakrishnan & Ganeshkumar, 2013; Machado et al., 2019).

The chapter authors specifically adapted the systematic review data analysis methods to address one research question: *How is doctoral student agency defined, expected, developed, and fostered within global doctoral education?* Four primary constructs were determined from the prior research into scholar agency (Anastasia & Burrington, 2020; Bowlin et al., 2016; Rigler et al., 2017; Sweat et al., 2021) and included (a) scholar independence, (b) social capital, (c) scholar voice and identity, and (d) scholar practitioner/professional duality.
Selection Criteria and Screening

Refereed journals serve as the gold standard for academic research in higher education (Kwieck, 2020) and commercial databases dominate based on analyses by Gusenbauer (2019), Kwieck (2020), and Gusenbauer and Haddaway (2019). Selection criteria began with the choice of three of the largest proprietary academic metadatabases (EBSCO, ProQuest, Web of Science), one journal platform that included an open access component (SAGE), and one other open access database (DOAJ) to systematically source higher education journal articles. The ERIC database was also included due to its carefully curated education search terms and recommendation for higher education research by LIS professionals at U.S. doctoral research institutions. Despite the claims of transparency and ease of use by many scholars, crawler search engines such as Google Scholar were excluded as potential search agents due to reported lack of precision for systematic reviews (Gusenbauer & Haddaway, 2019). Database selection also was determined to ensure inclusion of Kwieck’s (2020) identification of the top six elite journals in higher education globally, which include Higher Education, Studies in Higher Education, Higher Education Research and Development, the Journal of Higher Education, Research in Higher Education, and the Review of Higher Education with the latter three as the top three U.S. journals. Some overlap existed between academic databases, such as the SAGE journal platform and Web of Science, to ensure comprehensive inclusion; yet, discrete journal articles were only counted once.

Table 1. Academic database and platform results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic/Journal Database</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBSCO Education Research Complete</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIC (Education Resources Information Center)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProQuest Education Database</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE Open/Journals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web of Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=102.

Four primary constructs of doctoral student agency were previously identified within the chapter authors’ previous research were used to formulate keywords and key phrases for each defined area (Rigler et al., 2017; Sweat et al., 2021). Overarching keywords and key phrases used for all database and platform searches included doctoral student agency, agentive, and agentic. Specific keywords and key phrases were further refined for each of the four constructs. Potential peer-reviewed journal articles were first sourced using title, abstract, and keywords, and then full text pdfs were screened for alignment with doctoral agency (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2020). Scholar independence was sourced using doctoral student agency and scholar independence, doctoral agency and independence, independent scholar agency, independent researcher, PhD/doctoral wellbeing, doctoral scholar empowerment, doctoral scholar self-efficacy, and doctoral researcher capacity. Social capital was sourced using doctoral agency and relationship, PhD/doctoral socialization, doctoral change agent, doctoral social network, doctoral social justice, and
doctoral social equity. Scholar voice and identity was sourced using doctoral student agency and academic identity, doctoral agency and voice, and doctoral agency and communication. Scholar practitioner/professional duality was sourced using doctoral scholar practitioner and agency, doctoral leadership and agency, scholar professional duality, doctoral career development, doctoral leadership capacity, and doctoral practitioner self-efficacy. Of the 102 articles sourced using the search strategies (see Table 1), 72 met the study criteria, and 31 sources were excluded from the final sample due to non-specificity of agency or ill-defined aspects of agency (see Figure 1). The final sample included 19 sources aligned with agency as scholar independence, 15 sources for agency as social capital, another 23 sources for agency as scholar voice/identity, and 14 sources for agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality.

Figure 1. Systematic Review Schematic

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sources were selected for this systematic review were preselected, underwent an initial screening (see Figure 1) where 31 sources were deemed not aligned and eliminated, and the remaining 72 sources were assigned to individual chapter authors to reduce the potential for selection bias of the final sample. Chapter authors conducted a separate secondary screening to ascertain the final collection related to each construct for analysis and findings as discussed in the following sections.
Scholar Independence as Agency

Nineteen sources met the screening criteria for the construct of scholar independence as related to doctoral scholar agency and all 19 sources met secondary screening for article quality prior to inclusion for analysis. Six of the articles were conceptual or theoretical research, four were quantitative research, eight were qualitative research, and one was a mixed-methods study. Coding was conducted using systematic review. Thirteen codes identified included: change, creativity doctoral agency, professional development, supervision, mentoring, doctoral practitioner, self-efficacy, self-directed learner, doctoral scholar agency, doctoral student, scholar independence, situated learning theory, and transformation. The 13 codes were collapsed into four theme findings: (a) self-directed learning, (b) performance-oriented learning, (c) task significance, and (d) cognitive learning styles. Discussion and illustration of each theme finding follows.

Doctoral student agency is significant to doctoral studies. The importance of scholar independence as agency within doctoral education allows students to engage in ways that are affectual to their cognitive learning styles (Elliot et al., 2019; Murray & Vanassche, 2019). The main theme of the literature is related to doctoral student agency with themes of self-directed learning, performance, task significance, and cognitive learning styles. Self-directed learning (SDL) is typically linked with task-oriented roles, so the learner develops agency for a specific role (Angervall & Silver, 2019; Batty et al., 2020, Berry et al., 2020; Elliot et al., 2019; González et al., 2019; Lindsay & Floyd, 2019; LeBlanc et al., 2019; McAlpine et al., 2020; Morin et al., 2019; Pather & Remenyi, 2019; Vaughn et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2019). Performance oriented learning occurs when scholar independence is used to identify measurable performance goals and aligns individual needs and organizational goals to performance measures (Murray & Vanassche, 2019; Pather & Remenyi, 2019). Additionally, performance is aligned to the mission and vision of an educational curriculum. Task significance encourages learners to demonstrate skills with applicable exercises and measures based on performance (Angervall & Silver, 2019; Batty et al., 2019; Berry et al., 2020; Elliot et al., 2019; González-Ocampo & Castello, 2019; Lindsay & Floyd, 2019; McAlpine et al., 2020). Cognitive learning styles help learners to learn based on their cognitive learning styles, whereas learners are more engaged and benefit from doctoral studies Angervall & Silver, 2019; Batty et al., 2020, Berry et al., 2019; Elliot et al., 2019; González et al., 2019; Lindsay & Floyd, 2019; Morin et al., 2019; Vaughn et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2019).

Moreover, scholar independence as agency enhances academic programs as learners to remain self-motivated and enjoy individualized learning. As a result, doctoral supervisors must be mindful of the context which learning takes place (Batty et al., 2020; González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018). Moreover, doctoral student agency initiatives are typically linked with task-oriented activities which are experimental to prepare them for the (Chapman, 2019). In this light, there are key implications for individualized learning through doctoral student agency, doctoral program development, and doctoral instructor instruction programs. Linking performance measures to doctoral student agency provides a framework to ensure instruction is aligned to educational or organizational performance measures (González et al., 2019).

Self-Directed Learning

Batty et al. (2020) provided a multitude of examples of doctoral student agency, including its goals, process, and characteristics. Goals of doctoral students are defined by three main goals, which can be grouped as follows: the ability of doctoral students to be self-directed in their learning, fostering transformational learning as a central aspect to doctoral student agency to promote emancipatory learning, and social action as an integral part of doctoral student agency. Outlined are the tenants of these goals. The first goal of doctoral supervisors is to enhance scholar independence in their learning (Batty et al., 2020). This goal is based on humanistic philosophy, which suggests personal growth is the goal of adult
learning. The second goal is to foster transformational learning as central to doctoral student agency. Doctoral students thrive in educational environments where they can engage dialogues which connect to their interests and perspectives against those of others and apply them to learning goals (Angervall & Sifver, 2019). In perspective, doctoral students need to reflect critically and base understanding of historical, cultural, and biographical motives for their career objectives and interests (Chapman, 2019; McAlpine et al., 2020). The third goal aims to enhance the ability of individual learners to be more self-directed in their learning, whereby the focus of this goal focuses on instrumental learning to assist doctoral learners.

Further, early models of doctoral student agency were linear in nature (Pather & Remenyi, 2019). Doctoral students progress through various steps to achieve learning goals in a self-directed manner. As a result, the traditional teaching process was maintained and enhanced by this methodology. Several representations emerged to include interactive models, where there is an emphasis on several factors, such as environmental, personalities of learners, cognitive processes, and the contextual learning methods. When combined develop the doctoral student experience. For example, doctoral students analyze individuals find in their own environments, past or new knowledge, and theory. Doctoral student research is composed of sets or clusters of those elements and comprise both instructional method processes (doctoral student agency), research objectives, and personality characteristics of the individual learner (learner self-direction) (McAlpine et al., 2020; Pather & Remenyi, 2019).

Likewise, doctoral students assume primary responsibility for planning, implementing, and evaluating their learning experiences (LeBlanc et al., 2019). To facilitate this kind of learning, supervisors must possess skills to assist learners’ complete needs assessments, locate learning resources, and choose instructional methods and evaluation strategies (Batty et al., 2020). Additionally, a framework to help learners achieve specific learning objectives: inquiring, modeling, experimenting, theorizing, and actualizing indicates cognitive processes to enrich the doctoral learning experience (González-Ocampo & Castello, 2019, 2020; McAlpine et al., 2020). Indeed, Angervall and Silver (2019) provided instructional models to represent frameworks supervisors in formal settings could use to integrate self-directed methods of learning into their programs and activities, whereas there are distinct stages of learners (dependent, interested, involved, and self-directed). Dependent learners need an instructor to tell them what to do; Interested learner. Learners of moderate self-direction are motivated and confident but largely unfamiliar with the subject matter to be learned. Involved learners maintain intermediate self-direction who have both the skill and the basic knowledge and view themselves as being both ready and able to explore a specific subject area with a good guide. Self-directed learners are of high self-direction who are both willing and able to plan, execute, and evaluate their own learning with or without the help of an expert (Angervall & Silver 2019; González-Ocampo & Castello, 2019). Assessing doctoral student agency indicate that readiness of the learner is extremely important to indicate an internal state of psychological readiness to undertake doctoral studies. Thus, doctoral supervisors may want to focus some attention on the extent of how frameworks and theory impact learner autonomy and their professional objectives (LeBlanc et al., 2019; McAlpine et al., 2020).

**Performance-Oriented Learning**

A methodology of performance-oriented learning in the organizations is based upon the notion of educational and workplace learning as a goal-oriented multifaceted system of individual, collective, and organizational processes driven by the goals to improve both individual and organizational performance based on relevant performance measures (Murray & Vanassche, 2019). Doctoral student agency methodologies benefit from establishing academic and technological platforms to identify measurable performance goals, aligns individual needs, and organizational goals in setting the performance measures.
Moreover, Pather and Remenyi (2019) indicated measurable performance goals are based upon individual needs and organizational goals are used to facilitate doctoral student agency, develop learning community structures, and guide organizational instruction programs based on key performance indicators for sustainable performance.

Murray and Vanassche (2019) also presented an examination of how implementing educational and instruction programs are an approach to provide a framework to build research capacity and measure performance. Likewise, performance should be aligned to the mission and vision of an educational curriculum or organization instruction plan. Performance is defined as a set of key targets that drive learning toward the goal to improving individual and research performance (Murray & Vanassche, 2019). Performance metrics allow educational entities and organizations to focus on their instructional goals, help students to contextualize task significance and performance requirements, and assist learners to develop systematic learning goals, access applicable knowledge and skills, and communicate with colleagues and management to enrich individual and organizational learning processes.

**Task Significance**

Task significance increases skill performance (Lindsay & Floyd, 2019). For instance, task significance encourages learners to demonstrate skills with applicable exercises and measures performance based on research objectives (McAlpine et al., 2020). Self-directed learners are more apt to embrace this kind of instruction program because there is a logical link between skill set and performance based on educational or instruction goals (Angervall & Silver, 2019; Batty et al., 2019; Berry et al., 2020; González -Ocampo & Castello, 2019). Moreover, supervisors or management can make objective judgments based on individual performance. There is evidence that demonstrates doctoral student agency identity is an effective predictive performance indicator, which gives clarification to ongoing academic or instruction goals (González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018). Moreover, connections regarding identity and preferred learning styles are relevant criteria for enhanced performance for learners.

Likewise, relationships exist which indicated challenges exist to determine the underlying impact of task significance on job performance. To address this variance, Elliot et al. (2019) indicated performance effects of doctoral student agency, relational mechanisms, and boundary conditions of task significance. It was determined those who received a task significance intervention increased their levels of job performance relative to those who were not given the benefit of corelating task significance. Additionally, task significance increased the commitment of those who clearly understood stated goals and objectives of research goals (Elliot et al., 2019; McAlpine et al., 2020). Moreover, when learners understand task significance and its linked to research and career objectives, they are more likely to improve relational mechanisms and adhere to boundary conditions of task significance set forth by instruction or professional objectives (Lindsay & Floyd, 2019).

**Cognitive Learning Styles**

Cognitive styles are characterized as consistencies in information processing that develop in concert with underlying personality traits (Angervall & Silver, 2019; Batty et al., 2020; Berry et al., 2019; Elliot et al., 2019; González et al., 2019; Lindsay & Floyd, 2019; Morin et al., 2019; Vaughn et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2019). Some personality traits prefer doctoral student agency; thus, they are reflected in how individuals receive and process information and encompass the ways people see and make sense of their world and attend to different parts of their environment (Chapman, 2019). Likewise, learning style models are developed and used in various educational contexts to explain and accommodate individual differences in learning (Murray & Vanassache, 2019). Learning styles are generally defined as relatively stable and consistent. The characteristics of the learning environment and learning experiences influence a learner’s development (Williamson, 2019). There are various approaches to learning styles in the adult education
such as experience, social interaction, personality, multiple intelligences and emotional intelligence, perceptions, and conditions or needs (Batty et al., 2019; Oswald et al., 2020; Sm-Rahman & Jahan, 2020). When educators or trainers skillfully facilitate learners to learn based on their cognitive styles learning styles, learners are more engaged and get more from the instruction (Angervall & Silfver, 2019; Murray & Vanassche, 2019). Therefore, when learners are self-directed, they are more engaged in that they feel part of a learning community; therefore, deepening the connections of theory and personal relationships.

Professional development for educators encompasses consistent review and refinement skills, expanding knowledge, and enhancing existing knowledge. The increasing integration of technology into the educational arena requires supervisors to incorporate technology into education curriculum (Yang et al., 2020). The emphasis of technology skills for supervisors requires continuing professional development and an adaptation of a culture of constant change (Batty et al., 2020; Murray & Vanassche, 2019). Notwithstanding, the incorporation of technology into curriculum must be incorporated with doctoral students in mind. The incorporation of technology into learning management systems (LMSs) enhance the ability of supervisors to provide aural, vocal, and haptic conveyance of information, while also engaging doctoral students (Yang et al., 2020). The focus on communication skills, problem-solving ability, mental health, and learning motivation for self-directed learners must be a priority like that of other learning styles (Berry et al., 2020). Conversely, it can be said that other forms of learning such as experiential-based learning provides greater opportunity to increase communication skills, problem-solving ability, and learning motivation than other learning styles (Elliot et al., 2019). However, the reality is that each learner is different, and their learning preferences must be respected; therefore, it is incumbent on curriculum designers and supervisors to develop materials that engage all types of learners.

The significance of doctoral student agency allows a participant of an educational program understand and apply information based on cognitive learning styles (Elliot et al., 2019). Learning styles are conceptualized as cognitive, affective, social, and psychological behaviors the learner perceives in response to the learning environment (Murray & Vanassche, 2019). Interestingly the notion of cognitive style and cognitive ability are different from one another. Cognitive ability and capacity refer to the concept of that which one knows whereas cognitive ability can be associated with the level of intelligence the learner achieves for a given goal. The best instruction happens when doctoral supervisors create classroom environments in which there are measures of cognitive, affective, psychological, and interpersonal styles of learning, regardless of learner preference. In this way, learners can engage in meaningful ways that best impact their learning and research outcomes.

**Scholar Voice and Identity as Agency**

Twenty-three sources met the initial screening criteria for the construct of doctoral scholar agency as scholar voice and identity and 17 of the 23 sources met secondary screening for article quality prior to inclusion for analysis. Of the final 17 sources, all were qualitative in nature including six thematic analyses, four narrative inquiries, three autoethnographies, one case study, one image analysis, one longitudinal, one phenomenological, and one systematic review. The studies incorporated candidates from over 11 different geographic countries around the world. Martin and Gough’s procedures for coding and analysis were followed (as cited in Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Coding was conducted using systematic review utilizing MAXQDA, a qualitative data analysis application. Following coding, 27 codes were collapsed into six patterns with two major themes emergent from the recurrent patterns. Two thematic themes emerged throughout the literature in regard to doctoral candidates’ voice and identity in alignment with findings from Cowley et al. (2019): (a) identity transformation and (b) identity operationalization.
Voice and Identity Transformation

Though scholarly identity may be a key outcome for doctoral programs, the multifaceted nature of identity creates ambiguity and difficulty in articulating what it fully entails (Inouye & McAlpine, 2019). In the 17 articles analyzed for this construct, nine provided information relating to doctoral candidate identity with various definitions of identity provided, yet no definitions of scholarly or academic identity were clarified. Identity is a fluid aspect of an individual, influenced by social structures, and intertwined between various roles and functions (Creely & Laletas, 2020). For doctoral candidates, the transformation of identity from pre-graduate work to post is a critical aspect of development. Candidates entering doctoral programs start with an identity strongly influenced by the economic, social, and cultural aspects of their environment—a process of social reproduction with family and education as the two most significant influencers (Amundsen, 2019). For candidates studying abroad or from minority populations, the family cultural identity was key (Amundsen, 2019; Robertson & Nguyen, 2020). Further, as social reproduction is based on education, the attainment of a doctoral degree has the potential to not only elevate the opportunities for the candidate, but also generations thereafter.

One of the most consistent themes and highest coded area throughout the articles related to the transformational journey doctoral candidates navigate in developing the voice and identity as a scholar. Leshem (2020) emphasized the journey to identifying as an independent scholar was the most crucial aspect of the doctoral program—though also one of the most difficult as research identified significant barriers including under preparation for doctoral level research (Caskey et al., 2020), insecurities regarding ability to successfully complete autonomous research (Pappa et al., 2020; Hanson et al., 2020), overcoming the imposter syndrome with a sense of fake it till you make it (Wilkerson & Samuels, 2019), and valuing the rigorous process to achieve a scholarly identity instead of playing the game simply to earn the degree (Dann et al., 2019). The transformation of scholarly voice and identity is an incremental process occurring over a span of time and experiences (de Magalhaes et al., 2019). Though the attainment of a doctoral degree includes a defined end point, the journey to scholarly identity is ongoing and continues post-doctorate. Nonetheless, the sooner doctoral candidates begin identifying as a scholar, the more fulfilling and successful the journey may become (Caskey et al., 2020).

The literature analyzed identified multiple factors contributing to an early development of scholarly voice and identity in the doctoral program. Mantai (2019) found activities including collaboration with experienced researchers, supervisors, and research communities in projects, presentations, and publications as significant factors in scholarly identity development. The element of identity from doing emphasizes the need to incorporate positive activities leading to recognition and validation from the scholarly community (Pappa et al., 2020). These scholarly activities enable the exercise of agency leading to the development and solidification of voice and identity (de Magalhaes et al., 2019).

Voice and Identity Operationalization

The scholarly identity of the doctoral candidate is exemplified in how the candidate operationalizes the transformed identity through professional aspirations and applications (Guerin, 2019). This transition from an internal attribute to a substantive external attribute was an evident theme in nine of the 17 articles analyzed. The heart of agency is the ability to make personal changes which is reflected through individual goals (Amundsen, 2019). Candidates often enter doctoral programs with a goal in securing a career in higher education as a tenured faculty member (Mantai, 2019). Though the number of doctoral candidates enrolled in programs continues to increase, the number of traditional tenured faculty professor positions continues to decrease (Dann et al., 2019). Candidates who are unable to secure faculty positions may experience further identity transformation or a re-transformation as they enter non-academic
positions in the workforce. This process can be a significant struggle for some candidates as they forfeit prior goals and find realities in non-academic settings. Guerin (2019) synthesized literature around this phenomenon and described it as a cruel optimism for the ideal faculty life resulting in a form of hysteria when reconciling the two realities. Post-doctoral candidates entering or re-entering the non-academic professions may also face challenges as they seek to operationalize their new scholarly voice and identity in professional settings where application, efficiency, and pragmatic practices are valued over theory and research (Cowley et al., 2020).

Even for doctoral completers who do secure higher education faculty positions, operationalizing the scholarly voice and identity developed in the doctoral program will be essential (Frick & Brodin, 2020). Completers need to enlist agentic practices learned throughout the doctoral program in establishing a research agenda and applying scholarship to faculty teaching and service responsibilities—endeavors likely not addressed as part of the doctoral program (Mantai, 2019). As part of the transition from doctoral candidate to doctoral completer in an academic position such as a faculty member or researcher, the completer will need to initiate and apply their voice and identity without the supervision of a faculty advisor, dissertation chair, or dissertation committee (de Magalhaes, 2019).

One manifestation of the scholarly identity is reflected through voice in scholarly writing. Negretti and McGrath (2020) summarized writer’s agency as the ability to create identity through a given text and emphasized how the operationalization of a doctoral candidate’s voice and identity will be reflected through their agentive practices as a writer. This dynamic can create additional challenges for international doctoral candidates completing a degree and entering a professional career in a second or additional language environment (Thurlow et al., 2019). The language barrier may delay the identity transformation leading to further delays in how the individual operationalizes their voice and scholarly identity (Robertson & Nguyen, 2020).

Scholar Practitioner/Professional Duality as Agency

This systematic review was conducted with the intent of understanding doctoral student agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality. Fourteen articles met the initial selection screening criteria for agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality and were systematically reviewed using Distiller SR, a systematic review application developed by Evidence Partners. The software allowed for a full-text review of each article and provided an array of reporting and data extraction (see Figure 2). Distiller SR was used for the analysis of agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality because it eliminated duplications, and moved each article through a screening process, either retaining or eliminating items that were relevant or irrelevant. From the literature provided, each article was read and then entered into the Distiller program. Each source was perused for construct aligning with the scholar practitioner model and professional duality and doctoral student agency. The Distiller study characteristics form allowed full text screening of the articles and provided filters to the user to extract data applicable to student agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality.

Each article was documented in the Distiller program based on author, title, study purpose, problem, question, type of study/methodology, population, and findings. All fourteen articles had a stated purpose; however, only nine of the articles included a research question. Twelve of the articles included a theory. Of the fourteen articles reviewed, three were case studies, four were literature reviews, five were qualitative studies, quantitative study, and one was a mixed methodology. Two of the 14 articles were related to agency theory and 10 sought to understand other comparable theories. Two of the articles contained no mention of theory. Each of the fourteen articles stated a purpose; however, five of the articles did not state a research question, three of which were literature reviews, one qualitative study, and the only quantitative study in the group of articles reviewed. The articles' global perspectives covered
seven different countries, including the United States, United Kingdom, Norway, Canada, Australia, China, Germany, and Iceland. Two of the 14 articles reviewed had no alignment with agency and scholar practitioner/professional duality and were excluded. The remaining 12 articles ranged from minimal alignment to complete alignment and project workflow provided quality control allowing one individual to screen each article and extract data. Since each of the studies reviewed were peer reviewed, validation of the research increased the quality of the data extracted. Limitations existing in conducting this review include article selection and language. While keywords provided the foundation for initial screening, theoretical perspectives were reviewed as well because of the global nature of the sources. The logical progression of themes presented through the extraction of the data allowed for synthesis of common ideas. The results of the analysis are not intended to be a full review of student doctoral agency in scholar practitioner/professional duality as the sample was limited by the articles reviewed. Limitations may also exist in the cross-language presented by the researchers globally in the presentation of data while five of the articles were focused on U.S. practices limiting the global scope of the review. Upon completion of the second tier of screening, 12 articles were aligned with student agency through scholar practitioner/professional Duality. Of the resulting 12 articles, data were extracted and organized into four main themes: (a) professional preparation and career paths, (b) program realignment, (c) leadership preparedness, and (d) scholar training.

**Figure 2. Data Extraction**

With an emphasis on the chair/supervisor student relationship, traditional ideas of scholarship are changing from scholarly outcomes to a practitioner outcome. As such, this review sought out studies and literature that were in alignment with this idea. Of the 14 articles reviewed, only two had little to no relationship to scholar practitioner/professional duality. Bologna et al. (2020) proposed a psychological approach to agency, applying Bourdieu’s practice theory and Jung's theory of the unconscious. However, the literature presented does little to support the scholar Practitioner/Professional Duality models' concept as it is more applicable to parental influences on students during the formative years rather than the scholarly focus. Bragen et al. (2019) also focused on the formative years of students. While the research did approach scholarly practice through transformational leadership and design thinking, there was little to support the concept of agency at the doctoral level. Using a collaborative video-cued narrative (CVN)
approach, this research aimed to understand what learning must take place to prepare the students. While the 14 sources showed support for agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality, it was limited.

**Professional Preparation and Career Paths**

The traditional idea that a doctorate will result in teaching is no longer valid; rather, University programs are slowly recognizing the need for change to a scholar/practitioner model that prepares graduates for a career in their given industry (Anastasia & Burring, 2020). Ferguson et al. (2019) touch on scholar practitioner/professional duality through their research on doctoral programs in Australia to explore ethos in its application to program outcomes (Yoeli & Berkovich, 2010). The study was directed at work-based outcomes more so than program discipline or profession but did conclude that program or discipline application to increase student ethos is needed. Kaslow et al. (2018) supports the findings in the journals through prominent levels of mentoring and career path support.

Richards and Sinelnikov (2019) researched the need for student-to-student mentoring for socialization in higher education the alignment with agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality and agentive and agentic attributes through self-awareness and resilience (Sweat et al., 2021). Additionally, the research suggests that mentoring has a direct relationship to entering the professional environment post-graduation supporting a need for mentors/supervisors to possess the professional knowledge of an industry when working with doctoral students guided by occupational socialization theory (Richards & Ressler, 2016; Russell et al., 2016). Agentic and agentive attributes also are strongly aligned with Staub and Rafnsdottir (2019) and their research of doctoral graduates in Iceland to understand how students managed their time in career development with a specific emphasis on gender. Giddens’ (1984) structuration theory provides unique incorporation of feminist theory to understand student career timelines and processes. Straub found that gender differences were broad in managing time with female students experiencing the oppression of gender in making career decisions as doctoral graduates. Additionally, responsibilities in the home were more potent for the female participants over their male counterparts, increasing this oppression.

Schafer (2020) supported agency and scholar practitioner/professional duality using the theory of human agency (Ackers 2004) to explore careers for doctoral graduates in Germany. Schafer (2020) found a need for networking as more scholars complete their programs and seek to move into new or advanced careers supporting doctoral student agency of socialization and networking (Sweat et al., 2021; Frisby 2019; Jaeger et al., 2017; Perez et al. 2019). Lee et al. (2019) also researched doctoral students in Australia, emphasizing Chinese students in particular. However, the research explores the scholar practitioner path to create a prototype guide that students can follow in applying their learning to their careers. The process they suggest includes "conception, design, testing, and guided intervention" (p. 175) derived from the themes discovered in their research working with the Chinese students. Liao (2020) also explored the EdD process in preparing doctoral students for a career in education and the author sought to explain professional learning outcomes for doctoral students. Using the CVN model, Laio's focus was on the model over the actual outcomes to determine if CVN supporting the model's use for future research. The findings support the fundamental ideas associated with scholar practitioner/professional duality by suggesting that should align programs with career paths.

This research suggested "spatial mobility" plays a vital role in career outcomes in higher education due to increased pressures for change in the existing focus on teaching, discounting the increasing number of doctoral graduates that opt to work in an industry over academics. As such, agency is a part of the doctoral journey whether students opt to teach or opt to work in industry. Further, this systematic review answers the prior calls for more research into agency, agency as academic identity, and socialization of doctoral scholars (Perez et al., 2019) and the institutional or hierarchical constraints
across the doctoral learning community and other social structures that may impede agency (Shultz et al., 2019; Sobuwa & McKenna, 2019).

**Program Realignment**

Moghadam-Saman (2019) investigated doctoral researcher readiness for industry using the Explanatory Model of Social Science (Danermark et al., 2002). Researcher readiness for industry application in doctoral programs guided this study and supports Scholar Practitioner/Professional Duality by proposing a framework for eliminating homogenous doctoral programs that do not prepare students for industry. Lundgren-Resentenna and Kahn (2019) incorporated Archer's (1995) Morphogenetic Theory, Critical Realism Cultural Political Economy, and Grounded Theory (Belfrage & Hauf, 2017) to explore a Doctor of Education (EdD) programs in the United Kingdom. The research proposed doctoral programs are behind in their application to professional practice; however, there was little support in the findings that changing a doctoral program will result in preparedness for professional practice. The research does support the establishment of a strong mentor/student relationship. Wenger's (1998) communities of practice guided the research of Firestone et al. (2019) and highlighted a need for a redesign of doctoral programs focused on professional application of an EdD. Questioning the value of a traditional doctorate, their research found that doctoral degrees in education need revision to apply learning in professional environments supporting Scholar Practitioner/Professional Duality.

**Leadership Preparedness and Scholar Training**

For scholar practitioners, higher learning institutions encourage the doctoral researcher to advise and consult with government and business leaders and contribute to social and organizational change, all of which evinces both a scholarly and practical ethos (Anastasia & Berrington, 2020). Two of the articles reviewed reflect this (Buss, 2019; Honig, 2020). With the nature of change in doctoral programs focusing on the degree's experiential application, Buss (2019) provided dedicated support for scholar practitioner/professional duality models. These research questions as to how doctoral students grow into leaders were viewed through the lens of possible and provisional selves (Ibarra, 1999; Markus & Nurius, 1986; Oyserman & James, 2009, 2011). Honig (2020) incorporated socio-cultural learning theory (Honig, 2008) and critical race theory (Bell, 1995), supporting the idea that doctoral learning programs should prepare students for leadership in their disciplines. This research supports doctoral student agency attributes through a prominent level of support from doctoral supervisors in reinforcing student learning and leadership preparedness for the post-doctorate career (Sweat, et al., 2020).

Traditional scholarly outcomes typically lead to careers in education. However, practitioner outcomes may lead to careers in education even though a degree may be industry specific. Chen and Lalovic (2019) embrace the concept of scholar practitioner/professional duality through their research on social cognitive career theory (Lent et al., 1994, 2013). Specifically, their research supports the need to work with doctoral students in Canada to prepare them for life as scholars and contributors through narrative interventions supported by the SSCT. The relationship between mentor and study, while temporary, shapes the outcomes of the student learning and levels of student identity and self-efficacy (Sweat et al., 2021).

**Social Capital as Agency**

Fifteen sources met the initial screening criteria for the construct of doctoral scholar agency as social capital and 14 of the 15 sources met secondary screening for article quality prior to inclusion for analysis. Of the final 14 sources, 11 of the articles were qualitative research, two sources were conceptual papers, and one presented findings of mixed methods research. Martin and Gough's procedures for coding and analysis were followed (as cited in Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). One conceptual paper was excluded from the final analysis due to misalignment with article quality expectations. Following coding, 37 codes
were collapsed into five patterns with two major themes and three minor themes emergent from the recurrent patterns across three or more of the final 14 sources. Critical reflexivity was employed following this pattern identification to ensure patterns were substantive and it was further determined patterns across less than two sources were excluded from emergent theme determination. Two major themes included (a) social capital as agency benefits from the doctoral community and (b) social capital as agency is pronounced within social networks. Two minor themes included (a) social capital as agency is relational and (b) social capital as agency is socially constructed. Discussion and illustration of each theme finding follows.

**Social Capital Benefits from the Doctoral Community**

Five of the 14 sources reviewed reported some aspect, finding, or discussion of social capital as agency benefits from the doctoral community. In a qualitative study of students’ experiences in the doctoral community, Stoten (2019) found an effective doctoral community requires prominent levels of purposeful social interaction, identity as a community member, and a substantive sense of belonging. The author noted personal agency was essential to doctoral group participation; yet, constraints of participation can arise when members vary in experience or role. The author also stressed the need for the doctoral community to become more technology-mediated to expand membership across students of diverse experiences and disciplines rather than homogenous groups that may serve to transform and strengthen the community. Ramos et al. (2020) echoed the challenges of the doctoral community whereby women of color students reported they faced racism and sexism; yet, the asset of agency allowed them to successfully navigate these oppressive negative experiences. Agency was found to aid in the challenge of longstanding deficit perspectives for these doctoral scholars and led to empowerment (Ramos et al., 2020). Assets including agency and mentoring can allow doctoral scholars to use an anti-deficit approach in hostile academic environments to shape the doctoral community and the socialization process necessary for doctoral success (Ramos et al., 2020). Similarly, Davis et al. (2020) noted the traditional doctoral socialization process as meritocratic and based on a premise of social identity and positioning where student agency of those from non-dominant races and cultures may be subverted by systematic acculturation. The authors also called for examination of the doctoral community from anti-deficit ideologies to better understand interactions across the community as cohort agency may be a positive outcome in spite of social tensions or marginalized and isolated group experiences (Davis et al., 2020).

Villeneuve et al. (2020) and Mills and James (2019) highlighted the collaborative aspects of social capital that can enhance the doctoral experience. Villeneuve et al. (2020) noted the importance of doctoral scholars to identify the social organizations and institutions to gain a ladder to research collaborations across disciplines and research collaboration as intersubjectivity as necessary to interdisciplinary research. Likewise, Mills and James (2019) stressed organizational research collaboration should be integrated within doctoral education to enhance agency and academic spaces for critical reflection across the doctoral community. When the doctoral community expands to include the social capital from business, industry, or professional practice, the doctoral scholar may benefit and may reduce the traditional more isolated channels of the doctoral experience (Mills & James, 2019).

**Social Capital is Pronounced within Social Networks**

Seven of the 14 sources reviewed reported some aspect, finding, or discussion of social capital as agency was pronounced within and among social networks. Stoten (2019) likened doctoral scholar social networks to networks of practice. The author noted doctoral educational leaders should consider ties that support networks over traditional institutional linkages between students and the university. When doctoral scholars are members of a like-minded community and leadership may better serve them when these networks are better understood and may enhance the social resources necessary to enhance agency for doctoral scholars. Likewise, Todd and Louw (2019) specifically examined doctoral research process
socialization among the doctoral learning community and found peers and faculty are key social agents and subsequent networks enhanced a new professional status for doctoral scholars. Further, social agents beneficial to the doctoral scholar are gained from key agents beyond the research supervisor (Todd & Louw, 2019). Ramos et al. (2020) and Jimenez-Silva et al. (2020) related the influence and power that can be gained for agency as social capital when doctoral scholars draw from the social networks inherent within the doctoral community and those networks socially constructed for emotional and other support to persist through doctoral education. Social power was seen to influence agency post-doctorate and into the early academic career (Jimenez-Silva et al., 2020).

Hadizadeh and Vefal (2020) reported in a qualitative study of doctoral scholars in North Cyprus that agency was socially constructed and negotiated as well as co-constructed with identity as scholars challenged socialization experiences throughout the program. Further, through these socialization experiences within the doctoral community agency and identity were co-constructed and led to increased academic discourse competence (Hadizadeh & Vefal, 2020). Douglas (2020) reported collaboration among doctoral scholars can create networks to sustain and enhance relational agency and further higher-level competency. When this understanding is pedagogically employed, relational agency may be enhanced for doctoral scholars within the doctoral learning community thereby eliminating patterns of isolation traditionally found for these students. The author called for institutions to consider the contemporary doctoral experience and consciously support networks from the student rather than institutional perspective (Douglas, 2020) and Chimentao and Reis (2019) further called for these social considerations to be expanded to care for others including the doctoral scholar’s research participants. In contrast, English et al. (2019) reported on the social capital deficits and challenges to doctoral student agency well supported by the scholarship that poor social networks and poor relations with the research supervisor can lead to a new researcher’s demise or increased doctoral attrition. The authors called for specific attention to the need for consideration of spaces and social networks to support LGBTQ+ doctoral scholars to improve feelings of exclusion within the doctoral community and across other institutional networks.

**Social Capital is Relational and Socially Constructed**

Six of the 14 sources reviewed highlighted social capital as doctoral agency is relational (minor theme 1) and is socially constructed (minor theme 2). Sustainability doctoral researchers, Walsh et al. (2021) raised the notion that relational agency involves non-human forms as well as human beings whereby research can be expanded by relational ontologies that encompass non-human and human existence. Such consideration may enhance understanding of relational agency distribution across networks and unbounded disciplinary perspectives for interrelations among social and ecological realms (Walsh et al., 2021). Hadizadeh and Vefal (2020) noted a path to enhance agency and power relations may be through positionality as the non-static nature of identity evolves throughout the experiences within the doctoral community. Similar to the earlier theme of relational agency development via social networks, Douglas (2020) also found relational agency was enhanced by collaborative opportunities inside and outside of the doctoral learning community.

Mills and James (2019) explicated the expectations of policymakers who may demand doctoral education to offer socialized opportunities beyond the one-dimensional approach to the doctoral journey. The authors recommended the use of collaboration to disrupt traditional institutional dimensions and encourage socialization research process that engage others, which may reduce the pain points between policy, practice, and research institutions (Mills & James, 2020). Ideally, agency can be enhanced through socialized construction of identity and knowledge exchange among others from inside and outside the doctoral community across diverse settings. While social capital as agency can be socially constructed, Davis et al. (2020) reported the converse that covert acculturation hinders agency. The authors found
context was essential to reshape agency as when underrepresented doctoral scholars conducted applied research that impacted their communities, socialization was bidirectional and served to empower doctoral scholar identity as researcher (Davis et al., 2020).

**FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS**

Several authors of the sources in the review called for further research into the aspects of doctoral researcher agency. For example, Stoten (2019) called for future research to explore students at various phases of the doctoral journey across various disciplines to gain a deeper sense of the experience of the individual doctoral scholar. Inouye and McAlpine (2019) called for future research based on various theoretical frameworks to examine how identity is furthered developed or transformed in doctoral candidates with an emphasis on how candidates process feedback on writing and the impact on scholarly identity development and Creely and Laletas (2019) identified the need to investigate the early intrapersonal experiences of doctoral candidates and how agentic practices such as coping strategies lead to identity development. The researchers categorized the early-stage doctoral experience as either positive transformation or isolated dissatisfaction leading to reported drop-out rates ranging between 40 and 70%. A focus on the deep level experiences may create awareness to the challenges doctoral candidates face leading to the development of interventions and resources needed for success. Liao (2020) also explored the EdD process in preparing doctoral students for a career in education and the authors sought to explain professional learning outcomes for doctoral students and findings supported the model's use for future research. The findings support the fundamental ideas associated with Scholar Practitioner/Professional Duality by suggesting that should align programs with career paths. The chapter authors echo these calls for ongoing research into doctoral research agency and specifically further inquiry is needed to foster the means to advance agency within doctoral education.

**CONCLUSION**

Key findings were gleaned from a systematic review of the current scholarship into doctoral student agency from a global perspective. In past work, the authors with others have explored doctoral student and research supervisor agency from the perspective of scholar-practitioner agency within the doctoral learning community as well as the post-doctorate practice-based research agenda. Findings resulted from analysis of the current scholarship published since 2019 that has continued to examine the aspects of doctoral student voice, agency, and academic identity. Theoretical perspectives were drawn from the scholarship for the theoretical framework of situated learning theory to view how and why doctoral students specifically are able to move from the periphery of the doctoral learning community to center with agency. Four primary constructs of doctoral student agency were previously identified within the chapter authors’ previous research were used to formulate keywords and key phrases for each defined area: (a) scholar independence, (b) social capital, (c) scholar voice and identity, and (d) scholar practitioner/professional duality. Sources were selected for this systematic review were preselected, underwent an initial screening with 31 sources deemed not aligned and eliminated, and the remaining 72 sources were analyzed. Multiple findings were identified across the four constructs. Doctoral students with agency assumed primary responsibility for planning, implementing, and self-directed learning experiences. Agency was also prominent across performance-oriented learning, significant tasks, and cognitive learning styles. Agency as scholar identity was determined by voice and identity transformation as well as voice and identity operationalization. Agency as scholar practitioner/professional duality was characterized by professional preparation and career paths, program realignment, and leadership preparedness and scholar training. Social capital as scholar agency was found to benefit from the doctoral community and found to be pronounced within social networks. Finally, social capital was found to be relational and socially constructed to enhance agency. Evidence supported the need for ongoing research
into doctoral research agency and specifically further inquiry is needed to foster the means to advance scholar agency within doctoral education.
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**ADDITIONAL READING**


**KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS**

**Communities of Practice (CoP):** Lave and Wenger (1991) coined the term CoP to illustrate any group who engages in collective learning within a particular domain. As a CoP, the doctoral learning community provides a social network to allow for the doctoral scholar’s agency enhancement including development as an independent investigator.

**Doctoral Learning Community:** The doctoral learning community is typically a multi-faceted community of practice to support doctoral education and the research supports necessary for quality doctoral research as well as for new investigator agency and development.

**Doctoral Student Agency:** “A doctoral student’s agency is the belief in one’s ability to take the initiative necessary to assume an active role in one’s own learning setting, content, process, and engagement” (Sweat et al., 2021, p. 206).