



AUTHOR(S):

TITLE:

YEAR:

Publisher citation:

OpenAIR citation:

Publisher copyright statement:

This is the _____ version of an article originally published by _____
in _____
(ISSN _____; eISSN _____).

OpenAIR takedown statement:

Section 6 of the "Repository policy for OpenAIR @ RGU" (available from <http://www.rgu.ac.uk/staff-and-current-students/library/library-policies/repository-policies>) provides guidance on the criteria under which RGU will consider withdrawing material from OpenAIR. If you believe that this item is subject to any of these criteria, or for any other reason should not be held on OpenAIR, then please contact openair-help@rgu.ac.uk with the details of the item and the nature of your complaint.

This publication is distributed under a CC _____ license.

Discursive constructions of professional identity in policy and regulatory discourse

Authors

Gerard FEALY PhD MEd, RGN, Full Professor of Nursing, Dean of Nursing and Head of School, UCD School of Nursing, Midwifery & Health Systems, University College Dublin, Ireland

Josephine-Mary HEGARTY PhD, MSc, RGN, Professor, Catherine McAuley School of Nursing and Midwifery, University College Cork, Ireland

Martin MCNAMARA EdD, MA, RGN, UCD School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin, Ireland

Mary CASEY, PhD, MMedSc (Nurs), RGN, Associate Professor, UCD School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin, Ireland

Denise O'LEARY, PhD, PgDip, BSc Assistant Head of School, School of Hospitality Management and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland

Catriona KENNEDY, PhD, DN, RGN, Professor of Nursing, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, Scotland

Pauline O'REILLY PhD, MA RGN, Senior lecturer. Department of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Limerick, Ireland

Rhona O'CONNELL, PhD, MSc, RM, Lecturer, Catherine McAuley School of Nursing and Midwifery, University College Cork, Ireland

Anne-Marie BRADY MSc PHD RN, Associate Professor, Head of School, School of Nursing & Midwifery, Trinity College Dublin

Emma NICHOLSON, PhD, BSc (Psy.), Assistant Professor and Research Fellow, UCD School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems, University College Dublin, Ireland

Corresponding author

Gerard FEALY, Room B114, UCD School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health Systems,
University College Dublin, Ireland, E-mail: gerard.fealy@ucd.ie

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland and the Department of Health who providing documentary material that formed part of the data for this study.

Conflict of interest

No conflict of interest has been declared by the authors.

Funding statement

This study was funded by the Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland.

Discursive constructions of professional identity in policy and regulatory discourse

Abstract

Aim. To examine and describe disciplinary discourses conducted through professional policy and regulatory documents within nursing and midwifery in Ireland.

Background. A key tenet of discourse theory is that group identities are constructed in public discourses and these discursively-constructed identities become social realities. Professional identities can be extracted from both the explicit and latent content of discourse. Studies of nursing's disciplinary discourse have drawn attention to a dominant discourse that confers nursing with particular identities, which privilege the relational and affective aspects of nursing, and in the process, marginalise scientific knowledge and the technical and body work of nursing.

Design. We used critical discourse analysis to analyse a purposive sample of nursing and midwifery regulatory and policy documents.

Method. We applied a four-part, sequential approach to analysing the selected texts. This involved identifying key words, phrases and statements that indicated dominant discourses that, in turn, revealed latent beliefs and assumptions. The focus of our analysis was on how the discourses construct professional identities.

Findings. Our analysis indicated recurring narratives that appeared to confer nurses and midwives with three dominant identities: 'the knowledgeable practitioner', the 'interpersonal

practitioner' and the 'accountable practitioner'. The discourse also carried assumptions about the form and content of disciplinary knowledge.

Conclusions. Academic study of identity construction in discourse is important to disciplinary development by raising nurses' and midwives' consciousness, alerting them to the ways that their own discourse can shape their identities, influence public and political opinion and, in the process, shape public policy on their professions.

Key words: nursing, midwifery, identity, professional, discourse, policy, regulation

Why is this research or review needed?

- Professional identities are socially constructed through public discourse and, hence, it is important for nurses and midwives to be alert to both the form and content of discursively-constructed identity.
- While several studies have analysed discourse in professional debates and in media texts, few have examined the latent beliefs, assumptions and values in policy and regulatory documents.
- The study of identity construction is important scholarship in that it raises nurses' and midwives' consciousness, alerting them to how ideological positions can assign particular identities to them.

What are the key findings?

- Using a social constructionist approach, we uncovered recurring narratives in policy and regulatory documents that revealed latent beliefs, assumptions and values
- Three discursively-constructed identity types revealed themselves in the discourse: 'the knowledgeable practitioner', the 'interpersonal practitioner' and the 'accountable practitioner'.
- The discourse carried assumptions about the form and content of disciplinary knowledge.

How should the findings be used to influence policy/practice/research/education?

- Authors of professional policy and regulatory documents need to recognise that documents have significance beyond the texts themselves, since they constitute public discourse that has constitutive powers, capable of constructing professional identity.
- Discursively-constructed professional identity can influence public and political opinion and, in the process, shape professional policy.
- When incorporated into analytical frameworks, critical discourse analysis is an important tool in policy analysis and review.

Pre-publication copy

INTRODUCTION

The Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland (NMBI) is the professional regulatory authority for nursing and midwifery in Ireland. The Department of Health (DOH) is the Government department with overall responsibility for health policy in Ireland, including policy regarding the development of the nursing and midwifery resource. From time to time the NMBI publishes guidance documents for practitioners, in such areas as scope of practice and standards for professional education (NMBI, 2015; 2016). Similarly, the DOH publishes reports on nursing and midwifery, including evaluative reviews and future-oriented policy statements on the educational preparation, development and deployment of nurses and midwives (Government of Ireland, 1998; 2000; 2012).

Taken in their totality, these regulatory and policy documents constitute a professional discourse, which can be defined as debates about nursing and midwifery policy and practice, conducted by nurses and midwives; that is, the manner in which the professions discuss themselves with themselves. As professional discourse, the documents realise dominant and recurring narratives that represent nursing and midwifery in particular ways and carry both explicit and latent ideas, beliefs, assumptions and values. As an essentially *public* discourse, they also reveal how nursing and midwifery are talked about and, in this way, provide a basis for analysing discursive constructions of professional identities. Importantly, the discourse presents a window on how the disciplines of nursing and midwifery ‘talk’ about themselves to themselves.

Background

Several authors have examined nursing's disciplinary discourse using the method of critical discourse analysis, and have variously used the analytical methods described by Fairclough (2010) (Gillett, 2012, 2014; Kelly *et al.*, 2012; Fealy & McNamara, 2007; Middleton & Uys, 2009), Potter & Wetherell (1987) (Middleton and Uys, 2009), Wetherell *et al.* (2001) (Gillett, 2012; Fealy & McNamara, 2007), Gee (2005) (McNamara, 2010; Fealy & McNamara, 2007), and vanDijk TA and Kintsch (Gillett, 2012; McNamara *et al.* 2012). Some authors have also studied midwifery discourses using Potter and Wetherell's (1987) iterative analytic scheme (Lee & Kirkman, 2008) or using a metasynthesis of qualitative studies informed by Noblit and Hare's (1988) method (O'Connell & Downe, 2009).

The texts studied typically include documentary materials, media items, and interviews and focus groups. For example, authors have analysed existing published discourses (Gillett, 2012, 2014; Grealish & Trevitt, 2005; Fealy 2004), including newspaper texts (Gillett, 2012, 2014; Fealy *et al.* 2012), online texts (Kelly *et al.*, 2012; McNamara *et al.*, 2012), historical texts (Fealy & McNamara, 2007), or discourse conducted in everyday practice (Middleton & Uys 2008), while others have generated discourse as primary textual data through focus groups and interviews (McNamara, 2010; Grealish & Trevitt, 2005).

Recurring narratives and professional identities

Discourse is understood as language-in-use comprising words and phrases configured in ways that express certain ideas and assumptions. Within discourse, particular narratives can be identified that are realised by and through the content and forms of language that comprise a particular discourse. Narratives can become dominant, in that through repeated use, they come to instantiate commonly-held ideas. Authors have drawn attention to such dominant narratives, such as that which privileges the relational and affective aspects of nursing, and in

the process, marginalises the doing aspects and the scientific knowledge for the technical and body work of nursing (Nelson & Gordon, 2006). This narrative has been variously described as the ‘virtue script’ (Gordon & Nelson, 2005) and the ‘caring science’ narrative (Fealy & McNamara, 2015; Koch *et al.* 2016). A related narrative is one that discursively constructs contemporary university nursing education as imperfect in contrast to an idealised past of practical training (Fealy & McNamara, 2007; Gillett 2012, 2014).

A key tenet of discourse theory is that public discourses construct identities and that these discursively-constructed identities themselves become social realities (Fairclough, 2010; Gee 2014). By analysing both professional and popular nursing discourse, several authors have demonstrated how nursing identities are constructed (Gillett 2012; Fealy & McNamara 2007; Grealish & Trevitt, 2005; Fealy 2004), and how the discourse continues to position nurses and nursing in traditional stereotypical and gendered ways (Kelly *et al.*, 2012; Fealy & McNamara, 2007; Gordon & Nelson, 2005). Similarly, studies of midwifery discourse have shown how the midwife is constructed with the identity of woman’s advocate in the face of medical hegemony (Lee & Kirkman, 2008; O’Connell & Downe, 2009). Discourse associated with curriculum and pedagogy reveals nursing to be a relatively weakly-bounded discipline with a poorly defined and articulated body of knowledge (McNamara *et al.*, 2012; McNamara, 2010).

The study of professional identity, as constructed in and through public discourse, is important in illustrating how the nursing profession sees itself and its social mandate, as well as how the public views the profession (Kelly *et al.*, 2012; Gordon & Nelson, 2005). This paper reports on one element of a larger national study, reported elsewhere (authors 2017), aimed at developing a framework for policy formulation, analysis and evaluation. In

developing the framework, the project team aimed to demonstrate the utility of analysing both the *content* domain of regulatory statements and policy reports, and to that end, selected critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the means of doing so.

THE STUDY

Aims

We selected CDA as a distinct method of critically analysing the *content* of regulatory and policy documents in an Irish context, since it enabled us to investigate the constitutive effects of the documents by identifying recurring narratives that might reveal latent ideas, beliefs and assumptions. Informed by discourse theory and the literature on identity, we established the following study objectives:

1. Examine disciplinary discourses conducted through professional policy and regulatory documents within nursing and midwifery
2. Identify recurring narratives concerning (a) the nature of professional practice (b) the professional role and (c) education for the professional role
3. Identify and name the nursing and midwifery identities that are socially constructed in the discourses
4. Discuss the implications of these constructed identities for professional policy and regulation

STUDY DESIGN

Critical discourse analysis is a method of inquiry that takes language-in-use as its data; it analyses language for both explicit and latent meanings, i.e., going beyond what is overtly

stated in texts to reveal underlying ideas and assumptions that are realised by the ways in which the texts are composed. Concerned with language as naturally-occurring data and as social action (Fairclough 2010), CDA investigates how social actors use language to construct self-interested and persuasive versions of the world and uncovers the power relations at work in their accounts (Fealy *et al.*, 2012). The approach offers a rigorous method for analysing both popular and professional discourse and is particularly concerned with the ways that some discourses come to dominate under certain cultural and historical conditions and within broader socio-political contexts, including healthcare.

Sample: Texts

In selecting our texts to demonstrate how CDA can be applied to the analysis of texts within a wider policy analysis framework, we purposively selected three regulatory documents and one policy document. The rationale for selection was based on the specific requirements of a larger commissioned study on which this paper is based, and which involved the development of an analytical framework for policy analysis in professional regulation. Additionally, the sample represented exemplars of contemporary documents that described and discussed professional regulation and policy in nursing and midwifery. The sample included two professional regulatory documents published by the NMBI, namely the *Code of Conduct and Ethics for Nurses and Midwives* (NMBI, 2014) (hereinafter the Code) and the *Scope of Nursing and Midwifery Practice Framework* (NMBI, 2015) (hereinafter the Scope Framework). Since both documents constitute guidelines on professional practice, each registered practitioner is expected to be familiar with and, where appropriate, use them in their daily practice. We also analysed a precursor review document that gave rise to Scope Framework; this was the *National Review of the Scope of Professional Practice Framework Final Report* (Fealy *et al.*, 2014) (hereinafter Scope Review). In 2012 the Irish DOH

published the *Review of Nursing and Midwifery Undergraduate Programmes* (DOH, 2012) (hereinafter Undergraduate Review), the final report of a national review of all undergraduate preparatory training programmes in nursing and midwifery that were introduced in the early to mid-noughties in Ireland. The review was conducted on the basis that, since the programmes were in existence for over a decade and had not been evaluated at a national level, such a review was warranted. As a national policy review, the Undergraduate Review contained a synthesis and distillation of the thoughts and beliefs of nurses and midwives about professional preparatory education.

Insert Figure 1 here

Ethical considerations

The main data sources for this discourse analysis study were extant published policy and regulatory documents, and hence, under the criteria for ethical review of the lead author's institutional review board, ethical review was not warranted. Our study also involved analysis of some secondary data, specifically, anonymized interview transcripts of focus groups, interviews and written submission that were generated as part of the Undergraduate Review and the Scope Review. The results of the analysis of this secondary data, for which ethical approval was granted in the original studies, are reported elsewhere.

Data analysis

We treated all four documents as a single data set. Our analysis of the texts was informed by key authors in the theory and method of CDA, including Fairclough (2010), Wetherell (1998) and Gee (2014). For example, Gee (2005, 2014) proposes that there are several building tasks of language that include building identities. A key challenge in our analytic process was to

examine the discourses in a systematic and rigorous way, consistent with the epistemological and theoretical assumptions of CDA (Greckhamer & Cilesiz, 2014).

Rigour

Since discourse analysis relies on interpretation, it was important therefore to maintain transparency and assure rigour of our methodological processes, and to that end, we applied the following analytical steps: (i) read and become familiar with the texts; (ii) analyse the texts to identify prominent key words and statements; (iii) identify the dominant discourse to uncover unspoken and unstated assumptions; (iv) discuss the policy and practice implications of the dominant discourse. Three members of the research team analysed all of the documents and used this four-step process, initially acting independently when analysing the texts and then discussing the findings to arrive at a consensus as to the emerging discourse. The focus of analysis within this sensitising framework was to reveal discursive constructions of professional identities that the texts might reveal (Gee, 2005; Gee, 2014).

FINDINGS

Our analysis indicated recurring narratives that appeared to confer nurses and midwives with certain identities. Three identities emerged as dominant: ‘the knowledgeable practitioner’, the ‘interpersonal practitioner’ and the ‘accountable practitioner’. These identities were evident in all the texts.

The ‘knowledgeable practitioner’

The idea of the knowledgeable practitioner, often expressed as ‘the knowledgeable doer’ in early policy discourse proposing educational reform (UKCC 1986), has been prominent in professional discourse for several decades. The texts that we analysed suggest that this idea

remains enduring and dominant in professional discourse and continues to be deployed to justify the continuance and consolidation of the nursing and midwifery degree programmes in Ireland. For example, the Undergraduate Review declared that ‘nursing or midwifery school graduates will be knowledgeable practitioners’ and the Scope Review referred to ‘the development of a highly educated and skilled workforce of nurses and midwives’ (p. 44). The Code similarly entreats nurses and midwives to use evidence-based knowledge and to ‘value research ... [which is] central to the nursing and midwifery professions’ (p. 20).

Phrases associated with the ‘knowledgeable practitioner’ included ‘professional competence’, ‘knowledge and cognition’, the ‘sciences of nursing/midwifery’, ‘evidence-based scholarship’, ‘critical and analytical thinking’ and ‘professional scholarship’, defined as ‘disciplinary knowledge, behaviours, values and attitudes’ (Undergraduate Review, p. 46). The Scope Review referred to ‘professional competence’ as ‘the quantum of critical thinking, knowledge ... judgement, skill and practice, as well as metacognition’ (p. 49). Knowledge was viewed as a prerequisite for other competencies, such as clinical leadership, which demanded ‘clinical decision making ... informed by up-to-date knowledge and skills, intelligence, insight and understanding’ (Undergraduate Review, p. 32).

The Undergraduate Review also emphasised broad and generic areas of knowledge, such as knowledge about the *context* in which nurses and midwives practice; hence, the texts spoke of the need for learning about: ‘developments in health policy and service delivery’, ‘the quality and safety agenda’, ‘models of community support’ in chronic disease management, and ‘healthcare issues [among] ... diverse, multi-cultural, minority and ethnic groups’ (p. 38). Related to this was the requirement to prepare nurses and midwives with the knowledge to

practice 'now and into the future' (p. 51), which implied that the content of preparatory training was necessarily contingent and tentative:

It was acknowledged that there would always be cycles of change driven by research and development and the needs of patients, clients and their families. There was a limit, however, as to the amount of content that could be captured in an undergraduate curriculum (Undergraduate Review pp. 8–9).

Where knowledge for practice was discussed, generic competencies were emphasised, including: 'clinical judgement ... and decision-making', 'leadership'; 'general management and team working skills'; 'the ability to use evidence'; and 'cultural competence' (Undergraduate Review, p. 38). Essential clinical skills were similarly described in broad terms, such as 'health assessment skills and the use of early warning scores'; 'physical and psychosocial assessment'; 'pharmacology and medication management'; and 'end of life care' (Undergraduate Review, p. 38). In a similar way, rather than emphasising precise forms and types of knowledge, the Code entreated nurses and midwives to 'deliver safe and competent practice based on best available evidence' (p. 21) and to 'exercise professional judgment' (p. 23). The Scope Framework also declared that, in their practice, nurses and midwives possess and use 'various kinds of knowledge in a critical manner' (p. 15). Where the texts discussed knowledge for clinical practice, they were also not explicit, but instead, the form and substance of knowledge was implicit in statements like 'the [undergraduate] curriculum should reflect the ongoing developments in care and treatment ... [and] current best practice' (Undergraduate Review, pp. 8–9.).

The interpersonal practitioner

As researchers, we were already sensitised to an enduring professional discourse that tends to privilege the interpersonal and dispositional over the knowing and doing aspects of nursing practice (Fealy & McNamara, 2007; Nelson & Gordon, 2006), and in our analysis of the four documentary texts, our sensitising framework revealed several examples of this discourse. For example, the Code advised the nurse and midwife to be ‘kind and compassionate in your practice’ (p. 21) and to ‘develop relationships of trust with patients’ (p. 24). Similarly, the Undergraduate Review spoke of the need to develop ‘compassion and caring for others’ (p. 52) and ‘a person-centred philosophy of care’ (p. 57) through preparatory professional training. The Code (NMBI 2014) was foregrounded with definitions of ‘therapeutic relationship’ (p. 5) and ‘quality of practice’ (p. 20); the latter construct was defined, not with reference to either content or outcomes of care, but rather included reference to the transactional aspects of practice, thus:

[Quality of practice] focuses on safety, competence, kindness, compassion, caring and protection from harm (p. 20).

The Scope Framework spoke of nursing in terms of it being a ‘therapeutic relationship’, stressing the interpersonal and the dispositional:

Fundamental to nursing practice is the therapeutic relationship between the nurse and the patient that is based on open communication, trust, understanding, compassion and kindness, and serves to empower the patient to make life choices (p. 8).

The document similarly stressed the dispositional dimension of midwifery practice, declaring: ‘fundamental to midwifery practice is the provision of safe competent, kind and compassionate care’ (p. 13).

The Undergraduate Review described the required competencies for nursing practice; these included ‘interpersonal relationships’, ‘therapeutic relationships’ and ‘person-centred holistic care’ (p. 78). The competencies for midwives similarly included ‘holistic midwifery care’, whereby midwifery practice was concerned with providing ‘holistic support ... [including] emotional support’ (p. 77). The Scope Framework declared that ‘nursing care is holistic in nature, grounded in an understanding of the social, emotional, cultural, spiritual, psychological and physical experiences of patients’, and the document recycled the same definition for midwifery care by merely replacing the word ‘patient’ with ‘woman’ (pp. 8 and 14).

In the Undergraduate Review, higher education institutions and their associated training hospitals were entreated to ‘ensure that the values of treating people with care and compassion, with dignity and respect and with impartiality remain at the core of the student experience’ (p. 14) and the dispositions of ‘compassion and caring’ (p. 52) were declared as being an integral part of professional scholarship. The graduate nurse or midwife was expected to ‘practice from a holistic, caring framework’ (p. 48). Similarly, in making recommendations for the content of undergraduate instruction, the Undergraduate Review called for a ‘renewed emphasis on the core values of compassion, empathy and caring’ (p. 38). The Undergraduate Review also stated that preparatory professional education should support ‘the development of a therapeutic relationship between the nurse or midwife and the patient’ (p. 57) and declared: ‘nothing stands still, which requires all of us to have a more

open and engaged approach with patients' (p. 5). The Scope Review represented 'good nursing' as involving working in 'proximity to patients providing total patient care' and the Undergraduate Review spoke of nurses and midwives 'delivering care 24/7' (p. 5).

The accountable practitioner

In both the explicit and implicit content of the texts, the discourse carried the view that knowledge or interpersonal skills were not, in themselves, sufficient to practice nursing or midwifery safely and effectively; hence the discourse conveyed the notion that professional practice encompassed an ethical-professional dimension. The identity of 'accountable practitioner' was sustained in the idea that the nurse or midwife was governed by a professional regulatory framework and by the individual practitioner's own ethical sense; hence graduates were expected to 'adhere to the code of ethics and standards' (Undergraduate Review, p. 28).

The identity of accountable practitioner was especially evident in the Code, which declared: 'you must act within the law and follow the rules and regulations [of the Board]' (p. 17).

While the Code included frequent mention of 'professional responsibility' and 'professional accountability', the Scope Review also referred to practitioners as needing to be empowered, through professional knowledge and skills, in order 'to act autonomously'.

The Scope Framework stressed nurses' and midwives' accountability in decision making, including accountability for making decisions about their own scope of practice and accountability when delegating tasks to others. The Scope Review described the Scope Framework as follows: 'As an enabling framework, it ... emphasises nurses' and midwives' individual accountability in making decisions about their roles and responsibilities' and it

defined the scope of professional practice as being ‘closely associated with notions of professional conduct, accountability and self-governance and expanded practice’ (Scope Review, p. 2). The Code was more explicit in naming the sphere of professional responsibility and accountability as including ‘practice, attitudes and actions, including inactions and omissions’ (NMBI, 2014, p. 16). The Undergraduate Review exemplified the idea of the self-regulated, autonomous practitioner in the following:

Establishing a clear understanding of what it means to belong to the professions of nursing and midwifery ... [is] the foundation to establishing the values, attitudes and behaviours that underpin good professional practice (p. 10).

New graduates were required to practice within clear parameters of conduct that included ‘professional behaviours ... appropriate relationships with clients and colleagues, attitude and appearance [and] professional responsibilities and accountability’ (Undergraduate Review, p. 46).

DISCUSSION

Discourse has constitutive powers, constructing subjects, objects or abstract ideas. It shapes and is shaped by the context in which it is enacted. This paper presented an analysis of a disciplinary discourse conducted within Irish nursing and midwifery, revealing three discursive constructions of professional identity: the knowledgeable practitioner, the interpersonal practitioner, and the accountable practitioner. These discursive constructions are not unique to Ireland. While the documents that we analysed were prepared for specific purposes, i.e. to regulate professional practice or to communicate policy, they nonetheless represented naturally-occurring data and, as such, conveyed self-interested and persuasive

versions of nursing and midwifery. The analysis revealed how the texts are both structured by extant discourses and, at the same time, maintain these discourses.

The three professional identities that emerged as dominant within the discourse were evident in the range of texts that discussed aspects of the professional role of nurses and midwives, including the graduate attributes that professional preparatory training was expected to develop, the scope of professional practice, and legal and ethical aspects of the nursing and midwifery roles. The evidence from this analysis suggests that nursing and midwifery in Ireland continue to engage in a professional discourse that carries assumptions about the nature of the professional role (Nelson S. & Gordon S. 2006), the relationship of nursing and midwifery to society (Fealy, 2004; Koch *et al.*, 2016), and the form and content of professional knowledge (McNamara & Fealy, 2014).

The idea of ‘the knowledgeable doer’ has been prominent in discourse concerning the education of nurses over several decades, particularly in the UK and Ireland, and has been deployed in debates that seek to justify the move from hospital-based training to university-based education (Drennan and Hyde, 2009). The present discourse presented disciplinary knowledge as consisting of broad, undifferentiated forms, for the most part, and in the process, conveyed no real sense that knowledge could be constituted as distinct, with its own conceptual structure, form-specific concepts, or truth criteria (Hirst 1974). Nor was there any attempt to differentiate practical and theoretical knowledge, in terms of their forms or structures, or the relationships between them (McNamara & Fealy 2014). By emphasising generic forms of knowledge and competencies and knowledge about the *context* of practice, the texts were largely silent in naming forms of knowledge that might otherwise confer notions of *scientific* knowledge or, unthinkably, medical knowledge (McNamara & Fealy

2014; Nelson & Gordon 2006). For example, aside from generic competencies, the Undergraduate Review did not discuss specific the forms of scientific knowledge for the actual *clinical* work of nurses and midwives (McNamara & Fealy 2014), such as that required for care of the sick or injured body, or in the case of midwifery, for the management of labour and childbirth.

A specialised and distinctive form of disciplinary knowledge is a prerequisite for a stable epistemic community of practitioners (McNamara, 2010). In the discourses that we examined, the texts carried a dominant discourse of nursing and midwifery practice as an interpersonal process that worked to decentre the scientific and technical aspects of the disciplines (Gordon & Nelson, 2005). In this way, the texts tended to represent the disciplines through a 'lens of sentimentality' (Nelson and Gordon 2006) and, thereby, constituted a discourse that took the ubiquitous form of the 'virtue script' (Gordon & Nelson, 2005). By valorising those aspects of the professions that seem naturally appealing to the public, such as kindness, compassion and caring, the discourse may represent an appeal for social legitimacy and public validation of a distinct practice in healthcare. Moreover, by privileging kindness, compassion and caring as the essence of practice, the discourse carried both explicit and implicit claims that nursing and midwifery are 'holistic professions', whose 'caring science' practice is detached from biomedical practice (Koch *et al.*, 2012).

Being non-committal about disciplinary knowledge, the discourse was, as a consequence, non-committal about professional roles, suggesting instead that nursing roles were relatively weakly-bounded, being highly flexible and unspecialised, as well as merging with, and incorporating aspects of the roles of other professionals (McNamara *et al.* 2011). However, this was somewhat counterbalanced in those elements of the texts that demonstrated nurses'

and midwives' evident willingness to embrace new and expanded roles and to demonstrate accountability in professional practice and service. This suggests that nurses and midwives seek to realise their disciplinary autonomy by embracing role expansion. Moreover, the fact that nurses and midwives debate ontological, policy and professional matters is itself a testament to their disciplinary empowerment and a desire for professional autonomy (Drennan *et al.* 2009). Ironically, by constructing professional identity through a discourse that defines disciplinary knowledge in broad and generic terms, and which characterises professional practice as an interpersonal process, nurses' and midwives' agency in negotiating professional autonomy may be weakened.

A number of authors have highlighted how discourse functions to construct nursing or midwifery identities and have shown how these identities, in turn, serve self-interests, both internal and external to the professions (Fealy 2004; Fealy & McNamara 2007). Several authors point to a discourse that propagates public images of nursing, proffering a simplistic, stereotypical and inaccurate professional image, which is antithetical to disciplinary advancement, and call instead for a counter discourse that more realistically portrays the discipline (Gordon & Nelson, 2005; Fealy & McNamara, 2007; Gillett, 2012; Kelly *et al.*, 2012). Such a counter discourse should name the work that nurses and midwives do, including the physical body work (Nelson & Gordon, 2006), and should identify the precise forms of knowledge needed to inform clinical work, including medical knowledge (Nelson & Gordon, 2006; McNamara & Fealy 2014).

Evidence of popular discursive constructions of nursing identities indicate that nursing stereotypes persist in public media, including new social media (Kelly *et al.* 2011). These stereotypes incorporate taken-for-granted gender categories (Fealy 2004) and include both

favourable (e.g. ‘skilled knower and doer’, ‘self-confident professional’) and unfavourable (e.g. ‘sexual plaything’) identities (Kelly *et al.* 2011). Within professional discourse, constructing nursing and midwifery identities, primarily with reference to dispositions like compassion and empathy, implies that professional nursing and midwifery practice is merely concerned with relational and affective professional engagement, and that these are the exclusive concerns of nurses and midwives. This discourse has been widely propagated by early nursing theorists, such as Watson (2005) and Parse (1999), who sought to distance nursing from the natural sciences and instead locate it firmly within the human sciences. The textual construction of nursing and midwifery in the present analysis suggests that these ideas persist in contemporary professional discourse in Ireland, despite the introduction of graduate education and widespread exposure to the life sciences and empirical research. Along with phrases like ‘proximity to patients’, ‘24/7 [presence]’ and ‘therapeutic relationship’, this further suggests that the disciplines continue to seek to construct professional identity as distinct from medicine (McNamara & Fealy 2014).

Codes of professional conduct and frameworks for scope-of-practice decision making provide an explicit system of rules and principles for professional self-regulation and denote professional responsibility and accountability to society (Kennedy *et al.*, 2015). The texts that we examined included a professional code and a decision-making framework, so it is unsurprising that these texts should carry a discourse that speaks of the accountable practitioner. Nevertheless, this form of discourse highlights the always contingent, relative and bounded nature of professional autonomy in nursing and midwifery, and in so doing, further shapes professional identity.

Limitations

The textual examples selected for this study may not represent either the full extent of professional discourse or the discourse that nurses and midwives conduct in their everyday professional lives. Accordingly, we may only confidently summarise professional discourse among Irish nurses and midwives, with reference to the texts that we analysed and not to other texts, such as every day professional conversations. Given the substantial volume of textual data, it is possible that other recurring narratives resided in the discourse and did not reveal themselves. Additionally, treating all the documentary sources as a single data set may have resulted in a missed opportunity to observe nuances within and among the documents.

CONCLUSIONS

Policy and regulatory documents offer a window to the professions and to society on how nurses and midwives speak about their professions and, in the process, construct their identities. As such, they become important beyond their original function. The language used in regulatory and policy review documents is important, since it speaks directly to both the practitioner and the public; in the case of the former, successful implementation of policy is directly related to the messages delivered in policy documents (MacLachlan *et al.*, 2012). At a discursive level, authors of regulatory and policy documents need to recognise that everyday language-in-use can serve several unintended functions, which include constructing professional identities for those who are the subject of the document and propagating a self-interested version of the profession to the wider society. Additionally, for nursing and midwifery to truly engage in interdisciplinary education and research, then having a clearly-differentiated disciplinary identity with a distinct disciplinary discourse is a pre-requisite. Such a discourse should avoid representing disciplinary knowledge and practice as esoteric

and, consequently, inaccessible to other disciplines, and should instead speak of the real and distinct nursing and midwifery contribution.

This study's findings support previous studies on discursive constructions of professional identity by demonstrating that professional identities can be extracted from both the explicit and latent textual content of discourse, including that contained in documents on professional policy and regulation. Academic study of identity construction in discourse using social constructionist analysis is important to disciplinary development by serving to raise nurses' and midwives' consciousness, alerting them to the ways that their own discourse can shape their identities (Kelly *et al.*, 2012), influence public and political opinion and, in the process, shape public policy on their professions (Gillett, 2012).

REFERENCES

Department of Health (2012) *Report of the Review of Undergraduate Nursing and Midwifery Degree Programmes* The Stationery Office, Dublin.

Drennan J. & Hyde A. (2009) The fragmented discourse of the 'knowledgeable doer': Nursing academics' and nurse managers' perspectives on a master's education for nurses. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, **14**, 173–186, DOI: 10.1007/s10459-008-9102-x.

Fairclough N. (2010) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.) Harlow, Longman.

Fealy G. M. (2004) 'The good nurse': Visions and values in images of the nurse. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, **64**, 649–656.

Fealy G. M., Casey M., Brady A. M., Hegarty J., Kennedy C., McNamara M. S., O'Reilly P., Prizeman G., & Rohde D. (2014) *National Review of the Scope of Nursing and Midwifery Practice Framework: Final Report* Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland, Dublin.

Fealy G. M., McNamara M., Treacy P. & Lyons I. (2012) Constructing ageing and age identities: A case study of newspaper discourses. *Ageing & Society*, **32**(01), 85–102. .

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X11000092>.

Fealy G. M. & McNamara M. S. (2015) Transitions and tensions: The discipline of nursing in an interdisciplinary context (Guest editorial). *Journal of Nursing Management*, **23**, 1–3.
doi:10.1111/jonm.12282.

Fealy G.M. & McNamara M.S. (2007) A discourse analysis of debates surrounding the entry of nursing into higher education in Ireland. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, **44**, 1187–95, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2006.04.006>.

Gee J. P. (2014) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis, 4th Revised Edition*, Routledge, London

Gee J. P. (2005) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis, 2nd Edition*, Routledge, New York.

Gillett K. (2014) Nostalgic constructions of nurse education in British national newspapers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 70, 2495–2505 DOI: 10.1111/jan.12443.

Gillett K. (2012) Critical discourse analysis of British national newspaper representations of the academic level of nurse education: too clever for our own good? *Nursing Inquiry*, **19**(4), 297–307, DOI: 10.1111/j.1440-1800.2011.00564.x.

Gordon S. & Nelson S. (2005) An end to angels. *The American Journal of Nursing*, **105**(5), 62–66.

Government of Ireland (1998) *Report of the Commission on Nursing: A Blueprint for the Future*. The Stationery Office, Dublin.

Government of Ireland (2000) *Nursing Education Forum: A Strategy for a Pre-Registration Nursing Education Degree Programme*. Stationery Office, Dublin.

Grealish L. & Trevitt C. (2005) Developing a professional identity: Student nurses in the workplace. *Contemporary Nurse*, **19**, 137–150.

Greckhamer T. & Cilesiz S. (2014) Rigor, transparency, evidence, and representation in discourse analysis: Challenges and recommendations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, **13**, 422–433.

Hirst P.H. (1974) Liberal education and the nature of knowledge. In *Education and the Development of Reason* (Dearden R. F., Hirst P. H. & Peters R. S. eds), Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, pp. 391–414.

Kelly J., Fealy G. M., & Watson R. (2012) The image of you: Constructing nursing identities in YouTube. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 68 (8), 1804–1813.

Kennedy C., O'Reilly P., Fealy G. M., Casey M., Brady A. M., McNamara M., Prizeman G., Rohde D., & Hegarty J. (2015) Comparative analysis of nursing and midwifery regulatory and professional bodies' scope of practice and associated decision-making frameworks: A discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71(8), 1797–1811. DOI: 10.1111/jan.12660.

Koch T. F., Leal V. J., Ayala R. (2016) Let's talk about society: A critical discourse analysis of sociology courses in pre-registration nursing *Nurse Education Today* 36 139–144 DOI: 10.1016/j.nedt.2015.09.003

Lee A. M. S. & Kirkman M. (2008) Disciplinary discourses: Rates of caesarean section explained by medicine, midwifery, and feminism *Health Care for Women International*, 29 (5) DOI: 10.1080/07399330801949574

MacLachlan M., Amin M., Mannan H., El Tayeb S., Bedri N., Swartz L., & McVeigh J. (2012) Inclusion and human rights in health policies: Comparative and benchmarking analysis of 51 policies from Malawi, Sudan, South Africa and Namibia. *PLoS One*, 7(5), e35864.

McNamara M. S. (2010) Where is nursing in academic nursing? Disciplinary discourses, identities and clinical practice: A critical perspective from Ireland *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 19, 766–774 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2009.03079.x

McNamara M. S. & Fealy G. M. (2014) 'Knowledge matters in nursing', In M. Young & J. Muller (Eds.) *Knowledge, Expertise and the Professions*. (pp. 157–170) Routledge, Oxon and NY.

McNamara M. S., Fealy G. M., & Geraghty R. (2012) The visibility of the discipline on the websites of academic nursing schools. *Nursing Outlook*, **60**, 29–36, DOI: 10.1016/j.outlook.2011.05.008.

McNamara M. S., Fealy G. M., Casey M., Geraghty R., Butler M., Halligan P., Treacy P. & Johnson M. (2011) Boundary matters: Clinical leadership and the distinctive disciplinary contribution of nursing to multidisciplinary care. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* **20** (23–24): 3502–12.

Middleton L. & Uys L. (2009) A social constructionist analysis of talk in episodes of psychiatric student nurses' conversations with clients in community clinics. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, **65**, 576–586, DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04928.x

Nelson S. & Gordon S. (2006) *The Complexities of Care: Nursing Reconsidered* Cornell University Press, New York.

Noblit G. W. and Hare R. D. (1988) *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies* Sage, London.

Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland (2016) *Nurse Registration Programmes Standards and Commitments (Fourth Edition)* Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland, Dublin.

Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland (2014) *Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics for Registered Nurses and Registered Midwives* Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland, Dublin.

Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland (2011) *Review of the Code of Professional Conduct and Ethics for Registered Nurses and Registered Midwives* Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland, Dublin.

Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland (2015) *Scope of Nursing and Midwifery Practice Framework* Nursing and Midwifery Board of Ireland, Dublin.

O'Connell R. & Downe S. (2009) A metasynthesis of midwives' experience of hospital practice in publicly funded settings: Compliance, resistance and authenticity. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health, Illness and Medicine*, **13**, 589–609, DOI: 10.1177/1363459308341439.

Parse R. R. (1999) Nursing science: the transformation of practice. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* **30** (6), 1383–1387.

Potter J. & Wetherell M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour* Sage Publications, London.

United Kingdom Central Council for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting (1986) *Project 2000: A New Preparation for Practice* UKCC, London.

vanDijk T. A. and Kintsch W. (1983) *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension* Academic Press, New York.

Watson J. (2005) *Caring Science as Sacred Science*. F.A. Davis Co., Philadelphia.

Wetherell M. (1998) Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society* **9**, 387–412.

Wetherell M, Taylor S. & Yates S. J. (2001) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* Sage Publications, London.