

Educational Perspectives

Journal of the College of Education / University of Hawai'i at Mānoa



The Doctorate in Education

Volume 37 ♦ Number 2 ♦ 2004

Educational Perspectives

Journal of the College of Education/University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

C O N T E N T S

Dean Randy Hitz
Editor Hunter McEwan
Managing Editor Lori Ward

College of Education Editorial Board
Linda Johnsrud, Professor
Kathryn Au, Professor
Curtis Ho, Associate Professor
Mary Jo Noonan, Professor
Robert Potter, Professor Emeritus
Jamie Simpson, Graduate Student Organization President

The Journal and the College of Education assume no responsibility for the opinion or facts in signed articles, except to the extent of expressing the view, by the fact of publication, that the subject matter is one which merits attention.

Published twice each year by the College of Education,
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Address all communications regarding subscriptions, manuscripts, and correspondence about editorial material to
Editor, Educational Perspectives, College of Education,
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Wist Hall
Room 113, 1776 University Avenue,
Honolulu HI 96822

Individual copies \$25.00
To purchase single copies of this issue
Phone 800-799-8111 (toll-free), 808-956-4969
Fax 808-956-6730
Email: crdg@hawaii.edu

Copyright 2004 by the College of Education,
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

This publication is available in microform from
Bell & Howell, 300 N. Zeeb Road,
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

International Standard Serial Number
(ISSN) 0013-1849

- 3 A Brief History of the College of Education's Doctoral Degrees**
— Hunter McEwan and Helen Slaughter
- 10 Reforming the Doctorate in Education: Three Conceptions**
— Luise Prior McCarty and Debora Hinderliter Ortloff
- 20 Doctoral Education: National Issues with "Local" Relevance**
— Linda K. Johnsrud and Jocelyn Surla Banaria
- 28 The Socialization and Mentoring of Doctoral Students: A Faculty's Imperative**
— Vicki J. Rosser
- 34 Reflections on the Dissertation Process and the Use of Secondary Data**
— Rochelle Mahoe
- 38 Confessions of a Qualitative Researcher: Reflexive Photography and the Exhibition of Culture in Schools**
— Michael J. Zambon
- 46 The College of Education Doctoral Student Association at the University of Hawai'i: Providing Peer Support and Community to Doctoral Students**
— Lynn Tabata and Jamie Simpson

The Doctorate in Education

Volume 37 ❖ Number 2 ❖ 2004

Cover layout by Mike Tamaru
Cover photo by Hunter McEwan

A Brief History of the College of Education's Doctoral Degrees

Hunter McEwan and Helen Slaughter¹

The College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa has two doctoral degrees: the PhD in educational psychology and the PhD in education. Both degrees have been in existence for over 30 years. The PhD in education, however, began its life as the EdD and was renamed the PhD in 1999.

As two of the articles in this issue make clear (Johnsrud and Banaria, McCarty and Orloff), doctoral degrees have come under increasing scrutiny at the national level. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, for example, has recently initiated a program to study doctoral degrees with the aim of helping university departments restructure their programs in six different fields of study: chemistry, education, English, history, mathematics, and neuroscience. Thus, the moment is an opportune one to invite a closer look at our own doctoral programs in education. This article describes the events and conditions that have given shape to these two degrees from the period of their inception to the present date.

The PhD in Educational Psychology

The story of the PhD in educational psychology begins in a college environment quite different from today. The 1960s were a period of expansion in education and of strong federal and state support for educational research. In 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with funds to support research in education, which grew from \$2 million in 1962 to \$100 million in 1966. The climate of the mid-sixties in Hawai'i was also very conducive to an advanced research degree in education. In 1963 the college had established an Educational Research Center or EDRAD, as it came to be known, with funds from the legislature. David Ryans was appointed as director of the Center in 1964. Ryans, a former President of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), helped EDRAD attract a number of talented researchers to the college, especially in the field of psychometrics. Dorothy Adkins, for example, who joined the faculty in 1964, was a past editor of *Psychometrika*. In addition to their role in EDRAD, these newcomers negotiated with the college to have their tenure located in the Department of Educational Psychology. A consequence of this infusion of talented researchers from the mainland was that it created a

pool of experienced researchers in educational psychology who possessed a strong incentive to create a doctoral degree that would prepare graduate students to become educational researchers.

The department was also quite different in composition from its present state. It was created in 1962 in a major restructuring of the college, which helped to transform it from its early, normal school origins. Six new departments were created—Health and Physical Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Educational Foundations, Educational Administration, and Educational Psychology. The Department of Educational Psychology was an unusual assortment or loose amalgamation of several distinct disciplines and professional interests. It combined, in one academic department, courses in educational psychology, counseling and guidance, special education, and communications and technology. It also housed a reading clinic.

The arrival of a group of respected psychometricians and researchers into EDRAD lent a new weight to the department's research mission and helped to establish conditions favorable to the development of the new PhD. On May 6, 1965, the department submitted a proposal to establish a PhD in educational psychology to the dean of the graduate school. The proposal was approved by the BOR in 1966 and the first students were admitted to the program in fall 1967.

The proclaimed purpose of the doctorate was "to prepare individuals to conduct original research in psychological problems"—in effect, to prepare educational psychologists for research positions in universities and other educational organizations. The proposal pointed to the pressing demand at the national level for trained educational psychologists.

The PhD in educational psychology would demand less than three years of full-time graduate work. Students would be expected to demonstrate competency in two languages other than English—namely, French and German. All candidates would be expected to complete graduate level course work in measurement, statistics, research design, and learning theory. Advanced courses would be comprised

¹ The authors wish to thank Ralph Stueber, Gil Sax, Royal Fruehling, Anne Bayer, and John Dolly for providing their valuable perspective and feedback in the composition of this article.

of seminars and directed research. Candidates would also be expected to identify a related field of study outside the College of Education, such as psychology, sociology, mathematics, linguistics, philosophy, or some other field. Finally, the doctoral dissertation would represent a “scholarly presentation of an original contribution to knowledge.” Generally, dissertations would be empirically based and quantitative in method, though theoretical contributions would also be considered. The proposal also identified three distinct groups of instructional faculty: Group A were made up of major advisors and committee members in the fields of learning, measurement, and guidance; Group B were major advisors and committee members in the fields of reading and mental retardation; and Group C were composed of adjunct personnel.

The multiple missions of educational psychology were, however, too diverse for unity to be sustained and soon forced a series of rifts which, in a matter of eight years, completely transformed the department. In 1964 the educational communications faculty broke away to form their own department. In 1967 the reading clinic separated from educational psychology. And in 1969, Special Education formed its own department. Finally, in 1972 the legislature suddenly withdrew its funding of EDRAD and the faculty who had worked there were absorbed into the educational psychology department.

These series of comings and goings left the department a good deal smaller than it had been, but no more settled. A new rift soon emerged in spite of efforts to forge a working alliance between faculty in the field of educational psychology and those in counseling and guidance. The alliance was destined to fail. As one report admits: “the philosophical and personnel interests of the department became increasingly divisive.” As a result, the department split into two groups. One group remained in a much-reduced Department of Educational Psychology; the others left to form, in 1976, the Department of Counseling and Guidance.

Making a case to the vice president for academic affairs for a new Department of Counseling and Guidance, the vice-chancellor, Geoffrey Ashton, pointed to the distinct missions of both groups: “counseling and guidance is interested in producing effective professionals...while educational psychology is interested in producing researchers and theorists.” Faculty in counseling and guidance tried to retain their own version of the PhD but their request was denied. Thus, the move cost counseling and guidance faculty a role in doctoral

education. However, the strain of the division and the events leading up to it also raised issues about the capacity of the educational psychology department to offer the PhD. In 1974 the dean of Graduate Division declared a moratorium on admissions. On June 25, 1975, Howard McKaughan, commenting on this situation from his perspective as dean of Graduate Division, referred to the creative role of educational psychology as a “spawning ground” for other programs. Nevertheless, he was concerned that there were adequate resources in the department, and he questioned its capacity to maintain a research-oriented doctoral degree. He wanted to be sure that “what remains is not merely viable but retains real strength.” His review of the department left him in no doubt that it should continue to offer MEd and PhD degrees if they concentrated on learning, measurement, and research. He recommended restoration of the program and in fall 1976 the PhD in educational psychology was back in business.

By 1982 things had improved considerably. The 5-year report of the Ad Hoc Review Committee of Graduate Division found that educational psychology, “with a small faculty and staff, maintains a high standard of academic excellence in teaching and research within the limits of its specialization.”

Most of the graduates of the PhD in educational psychology—there are now 80 graduates—are employed as university teachers, several of them at UH. Others work in related fields in such roles as program evaluators, research analysts, and administrators.

In its present form, the PhD program in educational psychology focuses on competence in educational inquiry in human learning and development, which it views through the lenses of cultural psychology and cognitive psychology. Students are prepared in research methodology and statistics; measurement; and assessment and evaluation. They are also expected to develop competence in both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies.

Educational psychology doctoral students come from many diverse disciplines. For example, one student is a computer science engineer who is interested in the application of human learning theories, especially distributed cognition, in designing online performance assessment; another student, from public health, is interested in human development to inform her work with young children. Students participate in a research practicum, learn to use technology for research and teaching, and gain experience in college-level teaching and teacher preparation.

There are ongoing efforts to update the graduate seminars so that they address current educational issues and a current initiative aims to strengthen the assessment and evaluation area of study.

The PhD in Education

The present PhD in education began its life thirty years ago as the doctor of education degree (EdD). It was conceived as a college-wide, interdisciplinary degree with specializations in curriculum and instruction, educational administration, and educational foundations. The program was approved by the Board of Regents on February 15, 1974 at the recommendation of University President Harland Cleveland and began accepting students for fall semester 1974. The aim of this new advanced degree was to provide doctoral level studies to prepare qualified students for leadership positions in Hawai'i. In contrast to the PhD in psychology, which was regarded strictly as a research degree, the EdD was viewed from its inception as an advanced degree for professionals in the field of education—a vehicle that would offer, in the words of its advocates, “advanced study appropriate for the training of educational leaders and specialists.”

Preparation for the launch of the new degree lasted over a decade. Fred Braun of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Ralph Stueber of the Department of Educational Foundations stated in a memo to the chancellor on June 5 1972 that work to gain approval of the EdD had been the result of 8 years of effort. Over this period the college had worked to develop the appropriate level of coursework and to hire qualified staff. Four of these years had been required to develop the proposal “as it stands today.” The first proposal was produced by a nine-member committee composed of faculty from across the college: Shiro Amioka and Ralph K. Stueber of educational foundations, Frederick G. Braun of curriculum and instruction, Edward F. Chui of health and physical education, John B. Crossley of educational administration, Donald Leton and Ian E. Reid of educational psychology, Gerry B. Mendelson of educational communications, and Associate Dean Andrew W.S. In. The proposal did not have an easy ride and had to go through several revisions before it was acceptable to Graduate Division. Initially, the degree was expected to begin in the fall of 1971, but several obstacles had to be overcome before full approval was granted—especially in meeting standards and requirements set by Graduate Division. The final version, *Proposal for the Degree of Doctor of Education (EdD) with Areas of Specialization*

in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Foundations, was submitted by Dean Hubert Everly to the Board of Regents on December 28, 1973 and obtained their approval on February 15, 1974.

Opinion on the desirability of a second doctoral degree in education sorted itself into two opposing groups. On the one hand stood the promoters, college faculty and their supporters who upheld the value of service to the community; on the other hand stood the doubters, who upheld the ideals of high standards of program quality and faculty scholarship. The promoters pointed to the demand for an advanced degree among educators in the DOE and other local educational establishments. The doubters were less swayed by these claims and more inclined to worry that the college lacked the resources, standards of rigor in research, and scholarly ability that would be needed to build a high quality advanced degree.

Supporters of the proposal pointed to the existence of more than 90 colleges and universities that were, at that time, offering doctor of education degrees on the mainland, including Harvard, Cornell, Stanford, Columbia, and Northwestern. They pointed out that a sufficiently high demand existed in the state to warrant the development of a doctoral degree, especially among DOE personnel, who had long expressed the desire to pursue doctoral studies without having to travel to the mainland. In order to ram this message home, the original proposal was submitted with strong letters of support from provosts of the five community colleges, as well as the heads of 'Iolani, Kamehameha, and Punahou schools. The Executive Director of Hawaii State Teachers Association, Albert T. Hamai wrote that Hawai'i has “long needed a doctoral program in education,” and David K. Trask, Executive Director of the Hawai'i Government Employees Association, tendered his support with “a categorical ‘yes’.” Shiro Amioka, a past chair of educational foundations who was now serving as the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, summed up the opinion of the supporters of the degree when he wrote that it was “heartening” that the Board of Regents might soon approve a doctorate in education, as it would offer “educators in the public school system an opportunity to pursue a doctoral program locally.”

The authors of the proposal also pointed out that the idea of a doctorate in education had been raised in the 1964 Academic Development Plan, and in the so-called “Stiles Report” of 1966. Indeed, this latter report, authorized by

the Third Legislature of the State of Hawai'i and chaired by Lindley Stiles, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin, had commented favorably on the quality of the college's graduate degree programs noting that in general, "the committee is sympathetic to the development of doctoral programs for high level specialists in education at the University of Hawai'i" (Stiles, p. 47).

In spite of these favorable endorsements, critics of the proposal took aim at a perceived lack of resources and raised questions about whether faculty were sufficiently well-prepared as researchers to staff a quality doctoral program. Gradually, however, these doubts were dispelled as advocates of the new degree built their case. Evidence for this change of opinion is revealed, tellingly, in a letter of support written by Robert W. Clopton in 1972. Clopton had been Chair of the Department of Educational Foundations from 1962 to 1965, and although he had been in the ranks of the doubters for some time, he gradually came over to the side of the promoters. He expressed his initial opposition thus:

When I was chairman of the Department of Educational Foundations, I stated my opposition to a proposed doctoral degree in Educational Foundations. When a majority of the members of the Department voted to request approval for such a degree, I forwarded the Department's request with recommendations so lukewarm in tone as to be negative in effect. My opposition to, and later lack of support for such recommendations at that time, stemmed from my conviction that the Department was not, at the time, sufficiently strong to offer a doctoral degree with which I would wish my name to be associated. (I was well aware, of course, that cognate departments in other universities which I regarded as less strong than our own were offering doctorates; but I did not regard the fact that other institutions were awarding second- and third-rate degrees as justification for our doing the same thing (Memorandum dated February 4, 1971).

Later, Clopton was able to make a fresh appraisal of the proposal from his position as a faculty member in the Liberal Studies Program:

I am now convinced, however, that the Department of Educational Foundations has grown sufficiently in strength—both personnel and facilities—to warrant offering a doctorate.

The Regents approved the EdD on February 15, 1974. President Cleveland reported that the necessary faculty positions were in place and that the instructional load would require no more than two full-time positions. Four provisions were attached to their recommendation:

- ❖ Priority should be given to Hawai'i residents who held positions in the Hawai'i state educational system.
- ❖ The program should be carried out with existing resources.
- ❖ No more than 15 students a year should be admitted.
- ❖ An evaluation would be conducted during the third year.

A number of factors probably influenced the regents in making these provisions: the fragile state of the university budget, the challenge of recruiting research-oriented faculty, a decreasing student enrollment in teacher education, and the difficulty of retaining experienced faculty.

Applications into the new EdD program were accepted in spring semester 1974, and the first students admitted for fall 1974. Applicants, then as now, were to be admitted only for the fall semester. In addition, they had to meet the requirements of Graduate Division as well as others established by the college. A Miller Analogies Test score at the 60th percentile or above was required, and applicants had to show evidence of three years of successful teaching and proof of competency in writing. The program of study required a core of four seminar courses to be selected from the graduate fields of study other than the student's own specialization area: EDCI 688, Issues and Trends in Curriculum; EDEA 685, Educational Administration: Theory and Principles; EDEC 604, Survey of Educational Communications; EDEF 725, Education and Social Change; and EDEP 768, Seminar in Educational Psychology. In addition to the common core, students were required to declare an area of specialization and a cognate field. Only two specializations were available in 1974—curriculum and instruction and educational foundations. These were soon followed by the educational administration specialization, which was approved in 1975. The EdD now had three areas of specialization and would remain restricted to these three until the program was restructured in 1993.

Gradually, despite some college-wide course requirements, the program came more and more under the purview of the departments and began to lose its college-wide focus. Students were required to take only one class in research methods. (When the doctorate came to be restructured, this "weak" research requirement was

identified as a problem for dissertation level students, and more research courses added). An internship of “appropriate duration” was also required to “demonstrate capability and competence in applying leadership and theoretical knowledge to the solution of a significant educational problem in (the) area of specialization” (Proposal, p. 14). Finally, each doctoral candidate would be required to produce a dissertation that would demonstrate competence “to apply research findings to the solution of significant educational problems encountered in (their) professional career” (p.14). Thus, the degree took shape from the start as a degree designed so that educational leaders could pursue advanced study in education, as opposed to one designed specifically to prepare researchers. Margaret Y. Oda, who later served for a period as a DOE district superintendent, was the first to obtain the EdD, which she accomplished in May 1977 in the area of curriculum and instruction.

In accordance with regents’ policies, the first program review was conducted in 1978. Between 1974 and 1978, the college had admitted 86 students to the EdD program—30 were DOE personnel, 19 were faculty at the community colleges, and 12 were UH Mānoa personnel. On October 20, 1978, taking his cue from the program evaluation, President Matsuda recommended continuation of the EdD in a memorandum to the Board of Regents. An evaluation made by the Doctoral Program Admissions and Standards Council found that the program had pursued its goals appropriately and that “it is serving an important need in the state.” The report also identified a number of strengths and weaknesses. The strengths included the “opportunity to gain a broad background through the college common core and an in-depth study of a career goal through the area of specialization.” The weaknesses were identified as a certain amount of rigidity in the core requirements, repetitive aspects of the qualifying exam that over-lapped with the comprehensive exam, and inadequate research holdings in the library. The council made two recommendations—to expand the core to include a course in counseling and guidance, and the elimination of the qualifying examination. In his report to the Board (September 8, 1978), the Vice President for Academic Affairs Durward Long, summed things up as follows: “from a service point of view, from an educational consideration, and in the context of effective use of current resources...the program should be continued and strengthened.”

Given the emphasis placed on service in articulating a rationale for the EdD, and given the extent to which this

reasoning was embraced by the university administration, a question naturally arises: To what extent was research regarded as a program goal? The documentary evidence would certainly indicate that research played a purely instrumental role; that is, research courses played second fiddle to the common college core, which emphasized breadth of knowledge across the disciplines as opposed to familiarity with research methods. But it would be misleading simply to conclude that research methods were unimportant. In the first place, the EdD offered opportunities for research that were unavailable at that time to students in the PhD in educational psychology, where the emphasis was placed on quantitative methods of research. The EdD opened the door to students to conduct research in a wider variety of disciplinary methods such as philosophy of education, history of education, and anthropology. In the second place, many doctoral students enrolled in the program were pursuing careers as college faculty (13 of the first 30 graduates held university teaching positions). Thus, in spite of the emphasis placed on service as the *raison d’être* of the EdD, faculty saw their role in much broader terms that included research as an important goal.

By 1988, however, serious questions were being raised about the quality of the EdD. At the time, the college was undergoing a period of transition. There was a heightened awareness of the importance of having professors actively engaged in research work. The college had begun to recruit new, research-minded faculty fresh from mainland universities. The college had a new dean, John Dolly, an educational psychologist by training, who questioned the emphasis placed on service among established faculty who were the mainstays of the EdD. In the wider context of university work, Mānoa was beginning to emerge as a major research university, and the new administration under President Albert Simone was beginning to measure faculty productivity in terms of scholarly output. A new post-tenure review process was established and higher demands placed on graduate faculty membership. Graduate Division also voiced concerns about the EdD, particularly in questioning the standards of scholarly output of those directing students in dissertation work. In 1987, a negative UH Mānoa program review brought things to a head, and Dean Dolly peremptorily ordered a “stop out” on admissions to the program until agreement could be reached on what to do with the degree. This action created a crisis for students and faculty alike and the order was quickly withdrawn after faculty protests. How-

ever, it was clear that the program had problems and they needed to be addressed.

These developments brought about a change in what was being demanded of the faculty—a shift of emphasis that that might be summed up as a move from a practitioner orientation to a researcher orientation. The college faculty was conflicted about whether the EdD should be a departmental degree or remain college wide. The dean commissioned two papers to present the merits of each position “to provide some stimulus for thought, discussion, and decision making.” In his article, John Thomson of educational administration argued for departmentalization and increased specialization; Ralph Stueber of educational foundations warned against the trend towards increasing specialization and fragmentation and made the case for maintaining the EdD as a college-wide degree.

In 1988 two major reviews of the EdD were conducted. Dean Dolly created a college wide committee led by Leon Burton of the Curriculum Research and Development Group to conduct an internal review. At the same time, the dean of Graduate Division, David W. Greenfield appointed a group of five prestigious educational researchers and deans of mainland colleges of education to conduct an external review: Alphonse Buccino of the University of Georgia, William F. Grady from the University of Colorado at Denver, Thomas J. LaBelle of San Francisco State University, Louise C. Wilkinson of Rutgers, and Donald J. Willower of Pennsylvania State University. Their report expressed particular concern about the heavy teaching load of college faculty and the absence of conditions necessary to nurture a climate of research and scholarship. It pointed out that “in major research universities, graduate faculty do not teach 3 courses a semester, they have adequate salaries, and they have graduate assistants available to work with them on various scholarly projects.” Furthermore, they noted, “All too often, in the College of Education at the UHM, these circumstances are not met.” It is clear from its comments and tone that the review was not critical of the EdD and the graduate faculty as such, but was more concerned with establishing a clear set of guidelines for the reconstitution of the EdD as a research degree. The report urged the Graduate Chairs’ Council to strengthen the research component of the EdD with a “range of methodologies, both quantitative and qualitative.” Both the internal and external reviews led eventually to the restructuring of the program. Dean Dolly appointed a task force, chaired by Peter Dunn-Rankin, to identify individuals within the college who

were qualified to chair EdD dissertations committees, and to identify the core courses for the EdD.

This was a period of intense and painful self-analysis for college faculty. But it did help to bring about needed changes that resulted in a doctoral program that was strengthened and transformed. The college-wide faculty governance and multidisciplinary nature of the program was reemphasized and a strong inquiry core in a variety of disciplinary research methods was developed for all students in the program. While the specialization areas and their related departments retained some autonomy and control, program governance was placed at the college level with a chair elected by a faculty administrative committee. This new graduate faculty in education was established with strict requirements for membership—a reform that created a two-tier graduate faculty system in the college. This ensured that only faculty with an ongoing research agenda would be able to supervise dissertation work. In addition, the common core of courses drawn from each department in the college was completely revised to create a new core of courses emphasizing different research methodologies as recommended in the external review.

These changes occurred during a period when the faculty was in a state of transition. Senior faculty members were moving closer to retirement age and a new cadre of junior faculty, many with a strong background in research, were being hired to replace them. One consequence of this trend was that in 1993 a new doctoral specialization in exceptionalities was created to complement the strengthening of research-oriented faculty in the special education department.

By 1994, the transition from practitioner degree to research degree was complete; at least in the proclaimed mission of the EdD. A review of the doctorate, conducted in 1994 by a group of research faculty from Mānoa described the EdD in terms strikingly different from earlier reviews: “a research degree, stressing theory and research for all students, regardless of their career path.” However, this transformation was not without its growing pains. In 1994, 99 students were enrolled in the college doctoral programs (72 in the EdD and 26 in the PhD in educational psychology). In addition, there were 543 master’s level students—a total of 14.7% of the graduate students at Mānoa. In spite of these numbers, only 3.5 of the 231 FTE general fund graduate assistantships were available to COE graduate students. As the report made clear, 3.5 GA positions available for more than 600 graduate students “is a serious concern affecting not only the quality of the program, but its viability.” As the report observed, this

high graduate faculty load was increasingly the responsibility of mid-level faculty who carried a relatively high teaching load as well as being involved in research and service. In spite of these demands, the report noted positively that faculty research productivity had “noticeably increased over the past 7 years.”

Prompted by the greater emphasis placed on research in the doctorate, faculty and students began to press for a change in the name of the degree from an EdD to a PhD. This move was regarded as especially important to the students because of “an unfortunate perception that the EdD degree is not designed to prepare candidates for academic research”—a common misapprehension as many prestigious research institutions still award EdD degrees, notably Harvard, Stanford, and Columbia Teachers College. However misconceived, the argument carried weight. The proposal was regarded by many as recognizing in name what had already taken place in fact—that the doctorate in education had transformed itself from a practitioner degree into a research degree.

The idea for a name change was originally proposed by Tom Speitel, who was chair of the EdD Program, in a 1992 memo to Graduate Division. The idea quickly became a popular one for faculty and students. In a vote, over two-thirds of the faculty and all of the doctoral students supported the change. The College of Education Doctoral Student Association played an important role in this change. In 1996, students wanted to know why, after 4 years, no action had been taken. They made a case for change based on the argument that “the EdD is considered more a professional degree than a full-fledged research degree,” and that in many cases our graduates were seeking employment as educational researchers. Linda Johnsrud, who was at that time the associate dean for graduate programs and research, pushed the request forward. In January 1999, the Board of Regents approved the proposal and the EdD was renamed the college-wide PhD.

Currently, the PhD in Education at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, provides students with a strong interdisciplinary program emphasizing a college-wide inquiry core that includes qualitative and quantitative research methods,

a course in multiple perspectives on research, and at least one advanced research course in the student’s dissertation research area. Students are able to select from among several course options within each inquiry area. Ultimately, students select an approach to research that best addresses the problem area and research questions addressed in their dissertation. All students are required to do either a field study, or an internship in college teaching.

There are presently 154 students in the PhD program. They come from diverse teaching, academic, geographical, and socio-cultural backgrounds. Eighty-two doctoral faculty members parallel this student diversity both in their socio-cultural backgrounds, and in the variety of their research interests. The program promotes a strong multicultural and global perspective, while emphasizing connections among theory, research, and practice.

References

- Ralph Stueber, (1988). *Some Retrospection, Moods, Visions, and Modest Proposals on the Idea of an All-College EdD*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawai‘i College of Education, Honolulu.
- The Stiles Report. (1966). Preparation of teachers and other educational personnel in Hawai‘i. A study authorized by the third legislature of the state of Hawai‘i. January 17, 1966.
- Proposal for a program of graduate studies for the degree of doctor of education (EdD) with areas of specialization in curriculum and instruction and educational foundations. College of Education, University of Hawai‘i, March 8, 1971.

Hunter McEwan is a professor of education and chair of the Department of Educational Foundations in the College of Education at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. He is editor of *Educational Perspectives*. He is interested in research on teacher education and theories of teaching.

Helen Slaughter is professor of education in the Department of Curriculum Studies at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, and graduate chair of the College of Education PhD in education. Her research interests are literacy, qualitative research, and evaluation.

Reforming the Doctorate in Education: Three Conceptions

Luise Prior McCarty and Debora Hinderliter Ortloff

Introduction

Major foundations active in higher education, such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The Pew Charitable Trust, The Spencer Foundation, and the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, have recently funded landmark conferences, established roundtable discussions, and supported wide-ranging collaborative inquiry on the doctorate. Concerns over doctoral education are raised in the halls of government, both federal and state. As Wulff and Austin (2004) note in "Paths to the Professoriate," there is a new and growing interest, reflected in a legion of conferences, funded research, and publications, in the doctoral degree and students' experiences while attaining it. This interest seems justified. Doctoral preparation now faces new challenges and demands in a variety of institutional settings. First, doctoral students often struggle with inadequate financial support, and carry relatively heavy teaching loads in their capacity as course assistants and teachers of undergraduates. Fellowships that would lighten their instructional responsibilities and allow them time to focus on study seem to be in short supply. Second, opportunities to be involved in serious research projects are limited, especially in course-driven doctoral programs devoted to generating revenue for the institution. Third, many doctoral programs struggle to recruit and retain students from underrepresented groups. Fourth, in many cases, major universities have large international student populations with special needs. Fifth, faculty retirements and hiring stops have led to significant reductions in the number of those qualified to supervise doctoral students. Junior faculty members, often viewed as more in tune with current intellectual trends, are pressed to serve as dissertation chairs, even though junior faculty are usually less experienced in directing doctoral work, and have less time to advise doctoral students. Finally, real discrepancies exist among career opportunities for newly minted PhDs. In the field of education, for example, science and mathematics educators have excellent job placement records and boast plenty of open positions, while historians and philosophers of education often face great difficulty finding appropriate employment in their own academic areas.

Recent literature on doctoral education has tended to focus on traditional, relatively administrative measures of quality, such as persistence, attrition, time-to-degree, and job placement (Gardner, 2004). Attention is also paid to the preparation that doctoral students receive as future faculty members (Gaff, 2002; Geiger, 1997; Hinchey & Kimmel, 2000). Nyquist et. al. (1999) report that graduate students are not prepared by their programs to assume the duties of faculty members. Golde and Dore's (2001) survey of over 4,000 doctoral students in the United States reveals a lack of connection between students' goals, doctoral degree preparation, and the careers they intend to pursue. The review by Wulff and Austin (2004) of recent action projects funded by foundations and professional organizations highlights a number of issues, some specific to individual disciplines. The laboratory sciences feature models of doctoral preparation markedly different from those at work in mathematics and theoretical physics where individual research may be more common than laboratory teamwork. In mathematics and physics, as in the humanities, doctoral education is likely to be course-driven and may require doctoral students to work as teachers to support their studies (Golde & Bueschel, 2004).

The field of education, often associated with the training of teachers, faces problems that come into clearer focus when viewed from the perspective of doctoral education. The challenges for education include a relative lack of unifying conception and of core or shared knowledge. Disciplines within education often have their own distinct notions of a canon; they retain commitments to divergent and competing epistemologies; they apply varying methods and norms that generate tensions between theoretical and practical education. At the same time, they maintain passionate interests in the competing demands of research and teaching; they debate the relations between educational practice and pure research; and they theorize endlessly about the supposed social and moral commitments of educators.

During the past two decades, no in-depth, comprehensive, large-scale study of doctoral preparation in education has been undertaken, despite the fact that education is, in comparison with other fields of inquiry, the largest producer of doctorates. Education awards two distinct doctoral

degrees: the doctor of philosophy (PhD) and the doctor of education (EdD). In the period since 1970, approximately 7,000 education doctoral degrees have been granted per annum. According to the National Research Council (1996) the number of doctoral degrees awarded to women has increased significantly; women now make up the majority of those who receive the degree. Minority students are also drawn to the field of education: sixty percent of all PhD degrees awarded to African-Americans in the last two decades have been in the field of education (Hoffer, Dugoni et. al, 2002). The enrollment of international students in doctoral programs in education is small, and only 2.8 percent of the international students studying in the United States are in the field of education at any level of study (Open Doors, 2004). However many of the larger Schools of Education, including the authors' own, have an international doctoral student enrollment exceeding thirty percent. Given the close ties to the profession of teaching, it is not surprising that many doctoral students in education have worked as teachers and are, on average, older than their counterparts in the arts and sciences. Hoffer, Dugoni et al. (2002) report the median age at degree completion to be 43.8 years. Also, doctoral students in education tend to pursue their studies part-time more often than full-time.

A number of factors have added a new sense of urgency to rethinking or re-envisioning the education doctorate. These include changes in doctoral student populations, new demographic trends, the manifold impact of technology, and political and financial pressures. These raise a number of questions that need to be addressed. "What purpose does the doctorate in education serve?" "How far are the old aims of doctoral education still relevant?" "What programmatic changes ought to be made to improve the preparation of future academics and professionals?" In 2001, these and other questions were posed by the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID) when educationists—together with representatives of five other disciplines—were invited to participate in a multi-year project to research and reconceptualize the goal of "making doctoral education more purposeful, and adapted to the demands and needs of the new century" (CID, 2001a, p. 2).

When CID researchers Chris Golde and Andrea Bueschel reviewed the applications to participate in CID from all six disciplines—mathematics, chemistry, history, neuroscience, English and education—they concluded that "Education as a field of study appears to be chaotic and unclear, and this chaos is reflected in the state of doctoral education." They

explained that, compared with the applications from the other disciplines, "Education applications seem fragmented and uncertain of how to proceed. Everything is in question, from the core to [the] interdisciplinary, from program purpose to connections with practice, from the quality of research to all six consensus issues. As the only profession in the six disciplines, education is trying to serve many roles and goals simultaneously. ... but there is little agreement about methods, questions, or purpose of research" (Golde and Bueschel, 2004, p. 19).

One could view this seemingly chaotic state of affairs in purely negative terms, and come to think that, not only is education as a field in crisis, but the preparation of its future scholars, researchers, and practitioners is also unfocused and fragmented. However, as Catharine Simpson's (2003, p. 1) analysis of the humanities and its graduate education shows, this apparently fragmented condition can be taken as a sign of "healthy complexity" and an indication that the humanities, as well as the field of education, still matter. Perhaps education matters more than ever in the reigning American climate of anti-intellectualism and anti-educational sentiment. It is in this spirit of optimism that we here focus on three relatively concrete reform efforts now being implemented in a number of schools of education that took part in the CID study: the establishment of a core of educational courses, significant changes in the preparation of educational researchers, and new initiatives for developing educational professionals, only some of whom will eventually work in the academy. We award so much attention to these three because we conjecture that three different—and mutually exclusive—conceptions of the doctorate underlie the various reforms. Each conception entails a different curriculum; each suggests its own characteristic set of recommendations for change. These conceptions call into serious question the meaning of faculty mentoring, the role of preliminary or qualifying examination, and the place within doctoral programs of traditional course work. While these topics are germane to every doctoral program, regardless of discipline, we believe that the field of education addresses them in more fundamental and urgent ways. We believe that the discussions that have emerged through the CID project and the reform efforts being conceived by our colleagues in participating departments and schools of education are much more fundamental in nature than the general doctoral reform literature might suggest. As we intend to show, these discussions reflect a deeply rooted

commitment to the types of reform characteristic of maturity in the field of education.

The Doctorate and Core Knowledge

What topics or courses properly belong in an educational core? Is there educational knowledge that every PhD or EdD in education should possess? What can all doctoral students in the field reasonably be expected to know or be able to do? According to Alan Schoenfeld (1999, p. 167), there is no agreed-upon core knowledge for education: "The problem of the core manifests itself in two ways. On the one hand, the intersection of various perspectives represented in education is nearly null. On the other hand, the union [across all educational subfields] is immense—far larger than can be dealt with in a short time in a meaningful way." In education, students are required to become sub-disciplinary specialists as well as generalists, at least in some measure. They are supposed to gain a broad understanding of educational practice and sophisticated skills in research while becoming accomplished teachers, scholars, professionals, and citizens. In addition to the demand for general and specialized knowledge and skill in research design, doctoral students in education are asked to master critical thinking and analysis. They are invited to develop such habits of mind as seeking criticism and showing cultural sensitivity. The character traits of intellectual honesty, integrity, and respect are also required. They must acquire good communication skills, professional curiosity, prudence, savvy, and an awareness of their social and moral commitments. Finally, doctoral students in education need to be prepared for the prospect of multiple roles, not just those of academics and researchers but also those of teachers, administrators and educational specialists in public and private institutions outside academia.

Most disciplines recruit students into their doctoral programs who already hold undergraduate degrees in that or a related discipline and can thus be assumed to have substantial background knowledge. This cannot be said for education. Not only do students with considerable variation in demographic and academic backgrounds become doctoral students in education, but requirements are seldom stipulated regarding prerequisite knowledge or methodological training. Students who are recruited into doctoral education programs can be divided into three groups: those with degrees from outside of education, former teachers, and educational administrators. It cannot be assumed that students from the latter two categories share relevant knowledge or experience.

The fact is that education is a collection of distinct disciplines (e.g., educational psychology, educational philosophy, educational history), sub-disciplines (e.g., mathematics, music, English), special interest fields (e.g., special education and higher education), and cross-disciplinary programs (e.g., instructional systems technology). If the goal of a common core is to be pursued, the challenge for doctoral programs will be to integrate groups of students with diverse disciplinary backgrounds. But this seems an impossible task. One fears that what will appear in the curricular place of a real core will be an indigestible concoction of theories drawn from educational sociology, history, psychology, and philosophy, garnished with ideas from curriculum theory, policy analysis, and teacher education served up in an assortment of helpings from various and divergent methodologies. All doctoral programs exhibit a tension between breadth and depth of knowledge. Many academics debate over core knowledge in their respective fields. But education seems to represent an extreme case. It is no wonder that the National Research Council's recent report concluded that, in doctoral preparation in education, "The breadth and depth of topical areas as well as multiple epistemological and methodological frameworks are nearly impossible to cover adequately in a single degree program" (Shavelson & Towne, 2002, p. 93).

So what is to be gained for education? It is not at all obvious that a common core will enhance knowledge production, quality of scholarship, and the academic status of education as a field of study. Indeed, graduate students may well be prevented from attaining the needed depth in their specializations if their time is devoted to the study of a broad, common curriculum. This is not to say that an introductory course or seminar for all new doctoral students would not be desirable or worthwhile. Such an introduction to graduate work could serve many purposes beyond providing an overview. But, if the goal is to produce better scholars and researchers through doctoral education, it would behoove educationalists to consider strengthening the various disciplines, such as history or science education, and to encourage faculty and doctoral students to contribute to and expand the body of knowledge in those component disciplines. Emerging disciplines, such as instructional systems technology and the learning sciences, which are considered interdisciplinary fields of study, are particularly striving to develop a sense of disciplinary distinctness and identity by defining their own endeavors in terms of a core of knowledge and distinctive methods. Interdisciplinarity may

be fashionable in administrative circles but, as educators, we need to guard against misleading students into thinking that interdisciplinary work is a good starting point for doctoral education. We should heed Catherine Simpson's (2003, p. 15) warning: "Interdisciplinarity has become a fetish and a touchstone, but no one can do interdisciplinary work well unless they have a home plate of knowledge from which they can run and to which they can return. A little learning is a dangerous thing. . . . Graduate education should not be a smattering of this and that."

Doctoral Students as Educational Researchers

The very heterogeneity of education as a field invites the introduction of different, even incompatible, research methods and rules to govern them. Labaree (2003, p.14), referring to the National Research Council's report (Shavelson & Towne, 2002), identifies the following special features of educational research.

This [educational] knowledge is thoroughly soft because it is an effort to make sense of the collective consequences of actions of large numbers of willful individuals who are making decisions about teaching and learning within a complex and overlapping array of social systems in response to multiple and conflicting purposes. . . . Under such circumstances of great complexity, vast scale, uncertain purpose, and open choice, researchers are unlikely to establish valid and reliable causal claims that can be extended beyond the particulars of time, place, and person. As a result, research claims in education tend to be mushy, highly contingent, and heavily qualified, and the focus is frequently more on description and interpretation than on causation. . . . Educational knowledge is also thoroughly applied because it arises in response to the needs defined by an institutional arena rather than emerging from a particular theoretical problem.

Preparing future researchers is therefore a topic that looms large and often dominates discussion of reforming the doctorate in education. The accountability movement, the federal government, and various professional associations such as the National Research Council (NRC) have put pressure on educationists to conduct research that is, by their lights, systematic, rigorous and scientific (Shavelson & Towne, 2002). They challenge educationists to answer the

question, "How do we prepare good researchers that are well-trained in scientifically respectable methods and are capable of revealing causal relationships among educational phenomena." Building a community of researchers and enforcing a scientific culture in education are widely deemed essential tasks. "Nurturing and reinforcing a scientific culture of educational research is a critical task for promoting better research. Scientific culture is a set of norms and practices and an ethos of honesty, openness, and continuous reflection, including how research quality is judged" (Feuer et al., 2002, p. 4). Schools of education as well as such professional associations as AERA are called upon to sponsor research-training and professional development programs to socialize future academics into an imagined research community that will eventually become self-regulating. As a glimpse at the history reveals, this remains a goal yet to be achieved in education (Lagemann, 2000).

Since the 1920s, when teacher-training colleges and normal schools became colleges of education in universities, the production of good research has been front-and-center in the field's self-image. Concerted efforts to establish a legitimate educational science did not always bear fruit or the right brand of fruit. In the early days, educational researchers borrowed liberally from the prevailing store of behaviorism and behavioral psychology, adopting a relatively narrow view of scientific method, and a reductionist conception of scholarly problems as technical problems (Lagemann, 2000). This gave rise to a monolithic model of graduate education on which educational researchers saw themselves, one and all, as applied behavioral scientists. Thus did educational psychology first appear on the map of scientifically respectable educational sub-disciplines.

Despite the relative success of educational psychology, it has not escaped criticism from within. According to Berliner (2003), the discipline is still haunted by the applicability of its research results. He demands that educational psychology be relevant, appropriate, generalizable, and usable. He rejects the dichotomy between hard and soft science. He concludes that educational research is the "hardest-to-do science of them all. We do our science under conditions that physical scientists find intolerable. We face particular problems and must deal with local conditions that limit generalizations and theory-building" (Berliner, 2002, p. 18). His insistence that research be usable places an extra burden on educationists. On the one hand, if it means that educational research ought to serve good decision-making in schools (much as medical

research supports decisions in hospitals) the demand seems *prima facie* reasonable. On the other hand, if it means that research problems are to be chosen strictly on the basis of future applicability, then the demand would stifle research creativity and freedom, if not productivity. Even top scientists have been markedly poor predictors of what the future, even the scientific and technological aspects of it, will require. One must also ask, "For whom is the research to be usable?" There is overwhelming diversity among consumers of educational research, nationally and internationally. The sort of educational research that works, say, in Vietnam may not please the folks in Peoria.

Recent studies emphasize the special difficulties in preparing educational researchers and make it plain that the problems of future educational researchers and of core knowledge are closely connected (Lagemann & Shulman, 1999). When Alan Schoenfeld, for example, was asked to write on the preparation of educational researchers, he replied, "[T]his charge is impossible. There is good reason to believe there is no straightforward solution to either of what I consider to be the two main problems of research preparation in education: the definition of core knowledge (the 'canon') and the development of research competency in beginning researchers" (Schoenfeld, 1999, p. 166). He argued that the latter issue in education is not much different from the correlative problem facing other social sciences, although the problems educators wish to solve may be more complex. He concluded, "The underlying constant for doing good work is, and will continue to be, having a coherent intellectual frame for exploring the issues of interest – a frame in which to identify important phenomena, formulate central questions about them, decide what appropriate evidence is, and provide defensible rationales for the claims one makes using that evidence appropriately" (Schoenfeld, 1999, p. 171).

Labaree's perspective on preparing researchers is informed by what he describes as a clash of cultures: that of the schoolroom versus that of the university research laboratory. The K–12 teacher first encounters the university researcher when he or she becomes a student in a research-oriented doctoral program. While such students often bring with them a degree of maturity, dedication, and professional experience, their preparation for research can challenge their deeply-held educational values and practical knowledge of teaching. Hence, as doctoral students, they may resist the legitimacy of an outlook based on research and reject crucial aspects of training. Labaree argues that,

[T]he shift from K–12 teaching to educational research often asks students to transform their cultural orientation from normative to analytical, from personal to intellectual, from the particular to the universal, and from the experiential to the theoretical. Embedded in these potential pressures to change is a struggle over the relationship between teaching and research in education and an emergent struggle over the moral responsibility of both kinds of practitioners for education's social outcomes. (Labaree, 2002, p. 16)

The path to preparing competent researchers may have been blocked by internal disputes over research methods, and in particular the debate over quantitative and qualitative methods. Generally, a spirit of methodological pluralism is settling on the field, with educators pursuing a variety of quantitative, qualitative, and other approaches such as action research and evaluation studies. To quote Feuer et al. (2002, p. 9), "No method is good, bad, scientific, or unscientific in itself. Rather, it is the appropriate application of method to a particular problem that enables judgment about scientific quality."

The preparation of educational researchers is often considered the principal goal of the PhD degree, as opposed to the EdD. The latter is usually treated as a practitioner's degree, devoted to the training of education students for managerial and administrative leadership. The PhD in education is thought to be a more theoretical degree, more geared to the preparation of future academics and researchers. However, studies reveal that distinctions between the two degrees remain fuzzy in many doctoral programs; often, the requirements for the EdD are virtually identical to those of the PhD. Sharp disagreements exist over the relative scopes of the two degrees, especially in view of the fact that conventional distinctions between applied and pure research do not function well in education (Dill & Morrison, 1985). A number of CID education schools have reformed their doctoral programs so that there are distinct and clearly demarcated paths to the two doctoral degrees, with only the PhD as the research degree. These institutions have tightened application procedures, reduced the number of doctoral students admitted per year, and revamped the curriculum around research requirements. In one case, they restrict supervision of dissertations exclusively to faculty who are active in research and able to attract funding (CID, 2004).

The desire to give graduate students a significant experience in research before the dissertation stage inspires a number of reform proposals that recommend *inter alia* an in-depth study of research methods in the first year of doctoral study coupled with a requirement to complete an honest-to-goodness research project. Other recommendations include opportunities for students to serve as research assistants and to work closely with a single professor or a research team. An apprenticeship model may be more effective in teaching aspiring researchers how to design research, collect data and analyze it, draw conclusions, and publish results than the traditional model, which has them learn about these topics in the classroom. Grant writing is another research-related skill that students could pick up in this fashion. The apprenticeship idea underlies a proposal under development at Indiana University to have groups of students sharing a theoretical interest work together with one or more professors over a number of semesters to learn research techniques while conducting research.

Even if reforms like these are enacted, serious concerns persist. First, EdD students ought to be, if nothing else, informed and critical consumers of educational research. This will require some measure of serious research training. Conducting action research or analyzing large numerical data sets are essential skills for educational administrators. Therefore, it becomes clear that high quality EdD programs face issues not wholly dissimilar to those of PhD programs. Were the PhD denominated the sole, or even the premier path to a research career in education, there would be an overnight devaluation of the importance of research to EdD candidates.

Secondly, research training with an exclusive emphasis on research methods may lead to a counterproductive narrowness in educational research. Research is always conducted on some specific, well-defined topic. Researchers need to maintain a good understanding of the broader context in which the educational processes he or she wants to study are embedded. A host of interactions have to be considered, and attention must also be paid to local conditions and traditions. If not, educational research will continue to appear poor in quality, inconsequential, fuzzy, and lacking in generalizability.

Thirdly, a real need exists in education for scholars who are educated broadly in the field and enjoy the kind of intellectual work that enlarges the scope of the discipline and provides for the life of the mind. Shulman (1999, p. 160), for example, argues that scholarship involves, “acts of the

mind or spirit that are undertaken in disciplined ways and subsequently made public so that members of one’s intellectual community can judge their worth and then use them to support the more general program of the community.” Scholarship requires intellectual curiosity, life-long learning, moral imagination, refined judgment, social sensitivity, and a passion for the subject. One must ask how effective doctoral programs are in promoting the virtues essential to a thriving intellectual community.

Fourthly, educational researchers need to be aware that not all research and scholarship are scientific in the narrow sense. Humanistic studies, such as history and philosophy of education, have made significant and lasting contributions that are now in real danger of disappearing from the academy, given the current obsession with empirical research.

Doctorate as Professional Development

Typically, large schools of education offer a variety of doctoral programs for professionals—instructional design, school leadership, educational psychology, policy studies, teacher education, and higher education are but a few of them. This variety of offerings reflects the reality that many doctoral students in education will take up careers other than that of university professor. Nevertheless, the practice of doctoral preparation in education, as in many academic disciplines, often presupposes that the student will become a full-fledged member of the academy with responsibilities for research, teaching, and service. Thus, most doctoral programs in education, excluding those devoted exclusively to credentialing, are geared to the future researcher and scholar.

On the basis of their survey of more than 4000 doctoral students in the arts and sciences, Golde and Dore (2001, p. 3) conclude, “The training doctoral students receive is not what they want, nor does it prepare them for the jobs they may take.” Aptly entitled “At Cross Purposes,” the survey reveals a three-way mismatch: often career preparation in a doctoral program matches neither the careers that students adopt after graduation nor the careers they would choose. Due to the contingencies of the academic job market, many doctoral students leave the academy before attaining their degrees; Lovitts (2001) cites research claiming a 50% drop-out rate across all disciplines. Sometimes, students become uninterested in faculty careers, particularly at research institutions, and seek careers outside the academy. Putting aside questions about the prospects for and the desirability of academic careers, one needs to acknowledge that the roles of faculty have changed.

Increases in the number of adjunct positions have brought about a corresponding reduction in the numbers of tenure-track faculty. For those who are on that track, pressures to publish and to engage in funded projects are constantly increasing. In addition to these demands, schools of education place high importance on the quality of teaching and on serving the institution, the community, or nation, not to mention professional organizations. Pressures such as these add to the stress of a career in higher education and may discourage doctoral students from entering the field.

According to Austin (2002, p. 7), when the model of future faculty preparation is appropriate, doctoral students do not seem to receive sufficient information early in their programs about faculty responsibilities. Austin makes it clear that “[D]octoral students must develop as researchers, as teachers, as engaged scholars, and as institutional/organizational citizens.” She also recommends that PhD institutions assess doctoral students’ progress in fulfilling these responsibilities and in acquiring a complex of professional identities. She believes that doctoral preparation demands, “being a faculty member, being a professional, being a member of the discipline, and being a balanced person. These responsibilities and identities may each require particular knowledge, abilities and competencies that have to be learned” (p. 9). Each of these roles carries with it a set of norms and ethical considerations that a doctoral student, in so far as he or she is learning to become a professional, must master. In addition, other requirements afford a measure of professional development in education: presenting at a conference, submitting a paper for publication, participating actively in professional organizations, and composing curriculum vitae. Experience in such activities can be encouraged and guided by a faculty mentor.

Many schools of education rely on doctoral students to serve as teaching assistants in undergraduate courses. Thus, the institution itself has an interest in offering professional guidance in teaching. Crucial to becoming a professional teacher is receiving good advice from experienced mentors, regular supervision and feedback, and opportunities for reflection directed to improving one’s teaching. Unfortunately, it is often the case that doctoral students are neglected and may jeopardize their own intellectual progress in the face of demanding teaching assignments.

The Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) initiative, funded by the National Science Foundation, has endeavored to address all these issues. Haviland et al. (2004) studied

and recommended ways in which members of the future professoriate can best be socialized into their future roles. They criticize doctoral preparation for academic careers on the grounds that it “promotes the replication of graduate faculty themselves (their goals, practices, and values) rather than . . . prepar[ing] graduate students to become faculty members who fulfill a range of duties in a variety of institutions” (p. 5). Further, the “PFF premise was that, if graduate preparation was improved with enhanced mentoring and professional development opportunities in a variety of settings, graduate students would have a better sense of faculty roles at different types of postsecondary institutions, make more informed career decisions, and be prepared to succeed in the careers they chose” (p. 7). The PFF initiative has been successful in disseminating knowledge about varieties of institutions. It encouraged contact and teaching opportunities outside home institutions and allowed students to conduct more successful job searches. Researchers cite evidence that professional development approaches, such as the one offered by PFF, adds value to the doctoral experience. It does not replace the traditional model but “meets graduate student needs by augmenting that model, providing participants professional development experiences in teaching and service, and sometimes in research” (p. 26).

In emphasizing professional development, however, PhD programs risk placing too little weight on the acquisition of the subject knowledge required for students to become disciplinary experts. Without a solid disciplinary foundation, a student’s future as researcher, specialist, teacher and professional will not stand up to the challenges of an academic job market that has become highly competitive. Another consideration is that the availability of academic jobs cannot be ascertained five to ten years ahead. Therefore, it is hard to foresee what the ideal professional development should be for current candidates. Given these considerations, an ideal professional development program would have to be highly individualized and guided by a clear set of goals. Even were it known that a doctoral student would obtain a faculty position (something that is, in practice, never known with reasonable certainty), the variety of educational institutions in existence virtually guarantees that it would be impossible to tailor each candidate’s degree preparation to his or her future position. Doctoral programs in education are organized largely by courses that are already highly structured and resist expansion by the addition of separate professional development requirements.

Doctoral education cannot be directed exclusively by the demands of the job market. There are too many unknowns, too many things to learn, too much that is of intrinsic value as opposed to merely utilitarian considerations. A PhD, even in education, is not like an MBA. A PhD represents a particular kind of learning, attitude, and mindset. It stands for a set of academic values that need protection, appreciation, and transformation. George Walker, the Director of CID, called for the preparation of a disciplinary steward who has a capacity to generate new knowledge, and the know-how required to conserve traditional knowledge of the discipline while transforming the knowledge to the benefit of others. "Disciplinary stewards are those responsible for preserving the essence of their fields while simultaneously directing a critical eye to the future, those to whom we entrust the vigor, quality, and integrity of the individual disciplines" (Walker, 2004, p. 239). Professional development, doubtless valuable for the preparation of future academics and professionals, seems to serve best as a process ancillary to the acquisition of knowledge.

Conceptions of Doctoral Education

Underlying and informing these various reform proposals are quite different conceptions of the doctorate—conceptions that are mutually exclusive and represent markedly different goals, curricula, and career paths for doctoral students. It is important, therefore, to give a clear account of each of these conceptions so that we can better understand and evaluate the various proposals for reforming the doctorate.

An epistemic core is often considered a sign of a mature discipline with an identity established through epistemological accomplishments that form a tradition of scholarly activity by those who have contributed to that core. Reform efforts that dramatize a need for a subject matter core in education view the doctorate primarily as a transaction with knowledge—a matter of knowledge acquisition. The (largely unjustified) conviction that there really is a core that unifies education, if one could only find it, is used to justify the imposition of a curriculum constructed around such a center, a curriculum intended to transmit knowledge sorted into 'core' versus 'peripheral' subjects. On this conception, the inner nature of the PhD is about establishing and preserving knowledge, especially knowledge in the core.

A second and distinct conception of PhD reform is allied with the idea that existing doctoral programs should be reconfigured to prepare students to conduct research. That conception places the acquisition of skill in research methods, skill in generating new knowledge, onto center stage and relegates the preservation and transmission of existing knowledge to the sidelines. In this scenario, doctoral study is about expanding the field or discipline through the discovery of new knowledge validated by scientific methods. The future researcher is to be equipped with a tool kit consisting of such skills as hypothesis formulation, data analysis, and experimental design. Intellectual curiosity, honesty, and the ethical treatment of research subjects are among the character traits to be instilled. Knowledge here serves an instrumental role, that of effective means to gaining new knowledge. This vision of the intellectual world is not that of a storehouse of knowledge, but of a maze of problems and puzzles that with energy, money, method, and luck can be solved. The doctoral program then becomes a form of apprenticeship, the first phase in the career of a scientist.

The third conception is associated with and helps to justify the reform idea that the PhD is a gateway to a professional career. This conception is not primarily about old or new knowledge, nor is it about knowledge preservation or acquisition. It is about the multiplicity of future responsibilities and tasks awaiting the doctoral student and for which, in this conception, he or she should be prepared. Here, doctoral preparation is about gaining competency in different areas of possible activity, those areas that will prove useful in the future career of the doctoral candidate. This conception hopes to foster in the student an entrepreneurial spirit and places great importance on learning that is valued only according to its utility in bringing about certain preconceived career goals. Thus, the doctoral program becomes a means to a professional end, a route to obtaining the PhD as a credential, as passport to a job.

The literature on school reform suggests that it is much easier to tinker on the perimeter of structures, rules and practices—what Tyack and Cuban (1995) called 'the grammar of schooling'—than to bring about fundamental change. Naturally, it is also easier for doctoral programs to make relatively minor administrative and organizational changes than to rethink or re-envision entire programs, as some reformers demand. In this article, we have articulated the three competing conceptions of the doctorate to underscore the fact that the reforms under discussion are not superficial but deep,

rooted in difficult questions about what a doctoral education should be. These issues lie close to such perennial questions as “What is learning?” and “What is education?” In thinking of doctoral reform in this way, as premised on philosophical pictures of or assertions about education, one gains new insights into its important features. For example, the passing of qualifying or preliminary examinations represents a significant milestone in many doctoral programs. Once students pass their qualifying examinations, they are allowed to move into candidacy and dissertation research. Each of the three conceptions invites a distinctively different approach to reforming the qualifying examination. A program determined to establish and maintain a strong core will set an examination that assesses core knowledge. Traditionally, this would be a timed, sit-down examination. The ability to conduct independent research, however, could not reasonably be gauged in such a traditional examination format. In the second conception of the doctorate, that in which doctoral education is preparation for research, a qualifying examination that consists of one or two published or publishable research papers seems more appropriate. In the third model, which emphasizes professional development, an appropriate qualifying assignment might be the creation by the student of a comprehensive portfolio.

It goes without saying that mentoring is essential to the successful completion of a doctoral program. The relation of mentor to protégé is a multifaceted and complex one. Each of the three conceptions brings out and displays a different aspect of the mentoring role for a faculty member. In the epistemic core conception, good mentoring means the provision of enhanced opportunities for individual study with a professor or in a study group that goes beyond required courses to gain further knowledge. Mentoring a budding researcher, on the other hand, may require offering a research assistantship to the student or co-authoring an article. In the third conception, mentoring for professional development may include supervising students in teaching, shepherding them at a conference, and introducing them to prominent scholars in the field.

In reflecting upon the literature on doctoral education reform and the specific plans that universities are developing or implementing, we have to ask ourselves whether, as prospective reformers, we are putting the cart before the horse. We engage in many reform-directed activities without a prior and clear awareness of the direction in which those activities will take us. The present effort to spell out three dif-

ferent conceptions of the doctorate and the reform proposals allied to them is intended to inform those activities by giving expression to the underlying philosophical and conceptual issues. In short, each reform project presupposes a picture of what ought to be reformed and what a reformed doctoral program should be. To ask after the purpose of doctoral education is already to presume that we know what that education is. One cannot improve a table or decorate a cake apart from the knowledge of what a table is and is supposed to be, or what a cake is and is supposed to be. This simple point is even more telling when it comes to a complicated phenomenon like doctoral education. We need a clear and widely agreed-upon vision of what the doctorate is in itself, before we can sensibly propose to improve it. If we start only with practical questions about the purposes that doctoral education is intended to fulfill, we have skipped over the essential questions about what it is supposed to be, and what it now is. The question of the doctorate is therefore a philosophical question about that vast and mysterious undertaking we call ‘education.’

References

- Austin, A. E. (2002). Assessing doctoral students’ progress along developmental dimensions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Sacramento, CA., November 21–24, 2002. Retrieved from www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid
- Berliner, D. C. (2002). Educational research: The hardest science of all. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8).
- Berliner, D.C. (2003). Toward a future as rich as our past. Carnegie Essays on the Doctorate. Menlo Park: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2003. Retrieved from www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid
- Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (2001). Invitation for participation. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid
- Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (2002). Overview of doctoral education literature in education. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid
- Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (2004). Documents for the Summer 2004 Convenings. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. To be retrieved from www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid
- Feuer, M. J., Towne L. & Shavelson R. J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 31 (8).
- Gaff, J. G. (2002). The disconnect between graduate education and faculty realities. *Liberal Education*, 88(3), 6.
- Gardner, S. (2004). Unpublished manuscripts: Doctoral education in the United States: A Synthesis of the Literature. Washington State University, Washington.
- Geiger, R. (1997). Doctoral education: The short-term crisis vs. long-term challenge. *The Review of Higher Education*, 20(3), 239–251.
-

- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). At cross purposes: What the experiences of doctoral students reveal about doctoral education. Philadelphia: A Report for The Pew Charitable Trusts. Retrieved from <http://www.phd-survey.org>
- Golde, C. M. & Bueschel, C. M. (2004). Knowledge practices and disciplinary reproduction in doctoral education. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, San Diego, CA., April 2004. Retrieved from <www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid>
- Haviland, D. Goldsmith, S. S., & Dailey, K. D. (2004). Socializing tomorrow's professors: The value-added of PFF programs. Draft paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, San Diego, CA., April 2004. <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/>
- Hinchey, P., & Kimmel, I. (2000). *The graduate grind: A critical look at graduate education*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Hoffer, T. & Dugoni, B. et.al. (2002). *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2001*. Chicago, National Opinion Research Center: 144.
- Labaree, D. F. (2003). The peculiar problems of preparing educational researchers. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 32, No. 4.
- Lagemann, E. C. (2000). *An elusive science. The troubling history of education research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lagemann, E. C. & Shulman, L. S. (Eds.). (1999). *Issues in education research*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Neumann, A., Pallas, A. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1999). Preparing education practitioners to practice education research. In Lagemann & Shulman, *Issues in education research*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- National Research Council. (1996). Summary Report 1995. Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities. Washington, DC, National Academy Press.
- Nyquist, J., Manning, L., Wulff, D. H., Austin, A. E., Sprague, J., Fraser, P. K., et al. (1999). On the road to becoming a professor: The graduate student experience. *Change*, 18–27.
- Open Doors. (2004). *Report on International Educational Exchange*. Institute of International Education. Accessed through the world wide web: opendoors.iie.network/org.
- Shavelson, R. J. & Towne, L. (Eds.). (2002). *Scientific research in education*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, available at <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10236.html>
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1999). The core, the cannon, and the development of research skills: issues in the preparation of education researchers. In Lagemann & Shulman, *Issues in education research*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Shulman, L. S. (1999). Professing Educational Scholarship. In Lagemann & Shulman, *Issues in Education Research*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Simpson, C. R. (2003). *Words and Responsibilities: Graduate Education and the Humanities*. Carnegie Essays on the Doctorate. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Retrieved from <www.carnegiefoundation.org/cid>
- Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, G. E. (2004). The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate: Creating stewards of the discipline. In Wulff, D. H. & A. E. Austin, *Paths to the Professoriate. Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wulff, D. H. & Austin, A. E. (Eds.). (2004) *Paths to the Professoriate. Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Luise Prior McCarty** is an associate professor in philosophy of education in the School of Education at Indiana University where she directs the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate. She served as associate dean for graduate studies from 2000 to 2003. Her areas of research include metaphysical and epistemological issues in the philosophy of Wittgenstein and contemporary continental philosophy, with application to multiculturalism, feminism, and aesthetics.
- Debora Hinderliter Ortloff** is a PhD student in educational policy and a Chancellor's Fellow in the School of Education at Indiana University. She is pursuing minor areas in european studies and educational inquiry. She is the research coordinator of the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate project in the School of Education. Her research interests are in comparative multicultural policy, citizenship education, and comparative higher education policy.

Doctoral Education: National Issues with “Local” Relevance

Linda K. Johnsrud and Jocelyn Surla Banaria

Although doctoral education in the United States is highly regarded and commands international respect, it is now under close scrutiny from a number of perspectives. Those who aspire to the doctorate (the students) and those who prepare doctorates (the faculty) have often offered their opinion on the quality of their experience and suggested changes to the process. Other interested parties are now weighing in as well, such as those who fund doctoral programs, those who hire doctoral graduates, and those who seek to influence the quality of higher education (Nyquist, 2002). The purpose of this article is to examine the national trends and the issues that have emerged, to review the research on doctoral education with an emphasis on doctoral preparation in the field of education, and to consider the implications of the recent work for the doctoral program in the College of Education, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

National Trends in Higher Education

It is probably the case that higher education has been under scrutiny more often than not during its history, but the current situation does seem to hold greater consequence for doctoral education. Three general issues permeate the academic literature as well as the popular press: the increased cost of higher education (Trombley, 2003), the decreased contributions of states to their public institutions (Hovey, July 1999), and the increased entrepreneurial activity on the part of both institutions and individual faculty (Slaughter & Leslie, 1998).

Increased cost and decreased state subsidy have resulted in substantial increases in tuition and fees charged to students (Farrell, 2003). The trend of passing the cost on to the students is also evident as the federal government has shifted from grant-based aid to loan-based aid (Hearn, 2001). As tuition has increased and students have had to incur greater debt for their education, many doctoral programs have cut enrollments (Magner, 1999). Many departments are enrolling fewer students and attempting to give them full or substantial support. The rationale is that fewer, better funded, students means more competitive students and a better chance of job placement. Although this strategy has long been the case at prestigious private institutions,

it seems to be gravitating to more public institutions as they grapple with budget shortfalls. The strategy has also been a reality in science and engineering programs where funding has always been more plentiful, but programs in the humanities and social sciences are now moving to the “smaller but better-funded approach” (Magner, 1999, p. 1). It is a commendable goal to have graduates with less debt and higher job prospects, but clearly the cuts to enrollment mean greater competition for fewer slots and less access in general for those who aspire to doctoral education.

The third, and related, issue, increased entrepreneurial activity, also has implications for doctoral education. As traditional funding sources are constrained, research universities and their graduate faculties are pressed to engage in efforts to increase their extramural funding, and such efforts carry both advantages and disadvantages for doctoral students (Gumport, 1999). Increased funding for research and training often means increased funding for graduate assistantships and stipends, but the pressure on graduate faculty to produce quick results can also mean that these positions are more like employment and less like the mentoring relationships desired in graduate education. The increased efforts of graduate assistants to engage in collective bargaining suggests that they view their situations less as part of their education and more as potentially exploitive (Smallwood, 2003).

Clearly these general higher education issues are relevant to the current climate for doctoral education, but direct scrutiny of doctoral education is also on the rise. One list of criticisms includes the overproduction of PhDs; the narrowness of the training provided; the emphasis on research over teaching; the use of students to meet institutional needs at the expense of sound education; and the insufficient mentoring, career advising, and job placement assistance reported by numerous students (Association of American Universities [AAU], 1998). Even more recently, various national studies indicate that doctoral study

- ❖ is intensive, rather than rich training;
 - ❖ is too long, too narrow, and too campus-based;
-

- ❖ does not attract underrepresented minorities and, in some fields, women;
- ❖ is a disconnected specialization;
- ❖ does not encourage interdisciplinarity;
- ❖ has attrition rates that are too high;
- ❖ does not produce the competence needed in all positions of leadership throughout society;
- ❖ does not appeal to the best and brightest. (Nyquist, 2002, p. 14–15)

Such criticisms have come from a variety of sources: those who hire PhDs including universities and colleges, business and industry, non-profit organizations and government; those who fund programs, such as government agencies, business and industry, foundations, and universities; and those who monitor and influence higher education, such as accrediting associations, educational and professional associations, and governance boards. These stakeholders have much to offer to discussions on the reform of doctoral education, and their views deserve to be taken seriously by the academic community.

Another group with much at stake includes those preparing for the PhD. Students have probably been surveyed more often than other groups regarding their satisfaction with their programs, but typically these surveys are institutionally-based. In 2001, the National Association of Graduate-Professional Students solicited on-line feedback from 32,000 graduate students and recent PhDs representing 1300 doctoral programs. Despite specific criticisms, an overwhelming majority of respondents reported positive doctoral experiences:

- ❖ 81 percent are satisfied with doctoral programs.
- ❖ 86 percent are satisfied with their advisors.
- ❖ 80 percent would recommend their programs to prospective students.

The criticisms, on the other hand, have much to do with career concerns. For example,

- ❖ 45 percent are satisfied with their preparation for teaching.
- ❖ 38 percent are satisfied with career services.
- ❖ 30 percent reported receiving graduation rates as part of the application process.
- ❖ 35 percent received information on job placements of recent graduates.

Other concerns were expressed by women and underrepresented minority students who were less satisfied with their overall experience than their white male counterparts. Twenty-eight percent of the women and 40 percent of the minority students reported that the environments of their programs were not supportive.

The study concluded that the following factors increased student satisfaction overall: involving graduate students in the policy and program decisions that affect them, providing them with more information about program outcomes, and providing greater breadth in graduate training. Certainly such concerns reflect not only the level of support provided to students by programs, but also the uncertainty of the job market in tough economic times. Nonetheless, these concerns need to be addressed by those who prepare PhDs: the graduate faculty who are not without their own criticisms. Much of the research and writing on doctoral education has been conducted by graduate faculty, and they have emphasized a number of inherent tensions.

National Tensions—Preparing Scholars vs. Preparing Employees

There is an underlying tension within doctoral programs about the essential purpose of doctoral preparation. Preparing doctoral graduates for a range of employment opportunities is not always congruent with upholding the rigor of research in academe. Although doctoral students are usually trained to work at a research university, the employment trend shows that doctoral graduates are increasingly seeking employment outside of the academy, such as in business and industry (Fechter & Gaddy, 1998). After World War II, more opportunities outside of the academy became available for doctoral graduates in the fields of business, industry, and the government (LaPidus, 1995). The percentages of doctoral scientists and engineers in business and industry have been increasing from 1973 through 1989, and the trend seems to continue in the 1990s. Overall, however, the data indicate little change in the proportion of PhDs who are employed in academe (58 percent of the 1979 graduates compared to 57 percent in 1995) (AAU, 1998). LaPidus (1995) argues that the role of doctoral education is not to prepare people for any specific job or career, but is an opportunity to extend and deepen their education. The challenge for doctoral graduates may be to capitalize upon the intellectual richness of their doctoral experience and translate that experience into marketable skills. Since there has been an increase in the employ-

ment of PhDs in the business and industry sector, programs that consider the implications of this fact in the education and training they provide will be serving doctoral students better than those that ignore it.

Ironically, Austin (2002) found that the doctoral socialization process does not prepare graduate students for faculty employment either. This is critical since new faculty members are performing with tighter budgetary constraints, meeting the expectations of more constituents, and facing higher research productivity requirements. In a qualitative study interviewing 79 doctoral students at two doctoral-granting institutions, Austin reported that students lack systematic professional development opportunities, receive minimal feedback and mentoring from faculty, and have few opportunities for guided reflection to discuss their goals, careers, and development with their own faculty members. They also receive little guidance about academic careers in different types of institutions or outside of academe. Collectively, these results suggest that doctoral students are not engaged in experiences that enable them to seriously consider and explore their career aspirations.

National Tensions—Preparing Researchers vs. Preparing Generalists

The quality of research training is frequently addressed in the doctoral education literature. Johnson, Lee, and Green (2000) explore the changing trends of how people approach research. They explore ideas of autonomy and the independent scholar that underpin traditional practices of post-graduate pedagogy. For example, the traditional approach promotes the role of an independent researcher, who is rarely socialized to meet the demands and rigors of an academic scholar engaged in the full range of faculty responsibilities. Some argue that the new scholars need to shift from the emphasis on independent thinking to collaborative work between institutions and agencies (Johnson et al., 2000). Caffarella and Barnett (2000) suggest that graduate students usually do not write like scholars, and that this is especially true of students in professional programs who work full-time. They recommend a doctoral writing program that prepares students for academic publication. In a similar vein, Duke and Beck (1999) argue that traditional dissertations do not serve future researchers well in preparing them for academic research nor in making contributions to knowledge. They suggest that dissertations are not widely read by scholars in the field, and that the format does not conform to the type

of writing needed for an academic career. They recommend that alternatives to the traditional dissertation be considered, such as generating papers ready for submission to scholarly publications.

In addition to Duke and Beck's (1999) argument on the inappropriateness of the format of dissertations, research training also affects the time to completion for a PhD degree. Leatherman (2000) and de Valero (2001) explain that the lack of completion of the dissertation is the primary reason for the lack of completion of doctoral degrees (the so-called ABD or "all-but dissertation" predicament). De Valero (2001) examined departmental factors that may have implications for the completion of dissertations and graduation rates for doctoral students. These factors include departmental practices, advising practices, and climate. Many students engaged in writing their dissertation work entirely in isolation: they are not enrolled in classes or seminars, nor are there mandatory or formal meetings with advisors or committee members. If the student doesn't initiate contact with their advisor, there may be no contact. If students at this level are struggling with their work, they may not know when or whether it is appropriate to ask for help. Leatherman (2000) reviewed a variety of strategies to help students with their dissertations. These efforts included a weeklong writing boot camp, dissertation fellowships provided by the campus, and personal writing coaches. The quality of research training affects doctoral students in terms of their ability to conduct their own research, the timely completion of their dissertation, and their preparation for the rigors of faculty research and productivity. The literature critiquing the quality and nature of research training is extensive, and some institutions have addressed this area by offering strategies to help their students finish their dissertation.

National Tension: The Responsibility for Attrition in Doctoral Education

Golde (2000) eloquently describes the problem: "Paradoxically, the most academically capable, and most carefully selected students in the entire higher education system—doctoral students—are the least likely to complete their chosen academic goals" (p. 199). The overall rate of doctoral student attrition is around 50 percent—a figure that has been fairly consistent since the 1960's (Lovitts, 2001). Faculty have mixed reactions to such a figure; some express disbelief that attrition could be that high (Golde, 2000), and others speculate that given the concern about over-production of PhDs in some

fields, perhaps that level of attrition serves an appropriate function (Lovitts, 2001).

There is no doubt, however, that attrition rates do contribute to the cost of education. When departments and colleges recruit, select, admit, and enroll students into a program, they have already expended resources on those students. If they have provided financial assistance, the commitment is even greater. Doctoral education is the most expensive education provided in system of higher education. To have students begin programs, proceed through to the dissertation stage, and then leave the program, is an enormous waste of resources. The personal toll the process may take on the individual who doesn't finish the degree may be even greater; non-completers have described the experience of deciding to leave as "gut-wrenching," an experience that left them "shell-shocked, disappointed, and depressed" (Lovitts, 2001, p. 6).

Those who leave doctoral programs may be largely invisible to the program faculty, and exit interviews are rarely conducted. The limited research conducted in this area does suggest, however, that while students leave for a wide variety of reasons, the extent to which the organizational culture and structure of the academic program fostered integration plays a significant role in retention (Lovitts, 2001). This is consistent with work at the undergraduate level, which contends that academic and social integration are key factors in students' willingness to persevere and complete their degree (Tinto, 1993). Apparently, graduate students respond to similar conditions and opportunities. Golde's study (2000) also emphasized the importance of academic integration, particularly the power of a supportive advising relationship. The quality of the relationship between a doctoral student and his or her advisor can be the make-or-break factor for many students. Lovitts (2001) argues that it is the single most critical factor in determining who stays and who leaves. Many faculty advisors relate to their students much in the same way their advisors related to them—which may or may not be a good thing. Many of these advisors may have no idea the impact their advising and mentoring—or lack thereof—has on the students who are working with them.

The most obvious means for an academic program to ascertain the culture or climate experienced by their students (current and former) is to ask them. Determining what experiences are important and available to students is a first step in addressing those issues that matter. Surveys,

interviews, focus groups, and exit interviews can all be used to assess the institutional climate; the national findings discussed in this chapter provide a basis from which to begin such an assessment. Faculty members represent those who persisted to the degree; while they may have their own horror stories about the experience, they did finish. They need to hear from those whose experiences were not worth continuing.

Doctoral Preparation in the Field of Education

The tensions described as "national" in this article are certainly relevant to most doctoral programs in the field of education, but education colleges have challenges that are unique to their professional school status. Colleges and schools of education are perennially under pressure to "prove themselves." Academic critics question if educational research holds the same status as research-based disciplines, such as the social or natural sciences. The relatively high proportion of part-time students in education is often seen as evidence that the students are not as committed to their studies and that the traditional academic norm of 'immersion in the discipline' is less honored. Since schools and colleges of education are professional schools, they come under close scrutiny as the primary source for preparing educators; such close scrutiny undermines the perception of education scholars as autonomous thinkers and contributors to their discipline. Tierney (2001) suggests that the low status of the professionals that are produced in education contributes to the lack of status of those who prepare them. The public disaffection with the performance of educators in general has escalated to calls for reform or even the elimination of schools and colleges of education. Levine (2001) recommends that schools and colleges of education reform themselves before the government intervenes in response to the public outcry. Such an intervention would further contribute to the perception that education scholars are less respected and are not to be accorded the same degree of autonomy as their peers in the academic disciplines. These ongoing critiques of the field of education may be directed primarily at teacher preparation, but ultimately the criticism may well affect the regard in which the doctorate in education (whether it is labeled the EdD or the PhD) is held. The name and nature of the degree has long been an issue, and will continue to haunt educators as long as both are awarded and distinctions are made.

Tension over the Nature of the PhD and the EdD

In 1893, the first formal Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree in the field of education was instituted at Teachers College at Columbia University (Dill & Morrison, 1985). Twenty-seven years later, the first formal Doctor of Education (EdD) degree was established at the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University. Osguthorpe & Wong (1993) described the EdD as a degree for students who were preparing to serve as educational practitioners, while the PhD was for those planning to emphasize research and become faculty members. Carpenter (1987) examined the differences between the EdD and PhD programs in higher education, and found minor differences, including (1) slightly more credits required for the EdD; (2) slightly more work outside the education field for the PhD; (3) more problem-centered research for the Ed D dissertation; and (4) more employment in post-secondary settings for PhD recipients, and more employment in K–12 public education for those with an EdD. Although scholars (Carpenter, 1987; Courtenay, 1988; Dill & Morrison, 1985; Osguthorpe & Wong, 1993) disagree about the future of the different types doctoral degrees in education, many argue that the field needs two types of doctoral preparation (and two degrees): one to meet the need for better prepared administrators, and the other to prepare educational researchers. Others (Deering, 1998) argue that in order to eliminate the confusion and misperceptions surrounding the two degrees, the field would be better served if it eliminated the EdD, and reallocated scarce resources to strengthening the PhD programs.

Tension regarding Research in the Field of Education

The debate over the quality of research produced in professional schools is a long-standing source of irritation to many graduate faculty members in the field of education, even though they themselves often criticize the work produced. In January of 2004, *Education Week* published an article entitled “The Skills Gap” (Viadero, 2004), which questioned whether education schools are up to the task of preparing capable researchers. The diversity of approaches to research, the multiple missions of education schools, and the wide variation in curricular and programmatic requirements are cited as evidence of the lack of consensus regarding the optimum training of first-rate education researchers.

In fact, graduate faculties in education have been developing a number of strategies aimed at enhancing the

research training of their doctoral students. For example, Metz (2001) describes her experience in an interdisciplinary seminar that teaches students to seek a clear research question. The purpose of the seminar is to explore underlying research processes common to different kinds of educational research. Page (2001) describes the challenge in determining which type of research method is appropriate for what research question. The process and circumstances in which the faculty grappled with this issue while redesigning their doctoral curriculum is detailed. Page recommends a set of introductory, core courses of research methods to be implemented in the doctoral curriculum. Similarly, Young (2001) argues that researchers should be trained to use a variety of perspectives and methods. While education is a field that is influenced by everyday experience and politics, she suggests that educational scholars’ epistemologies are integrally linked to how to best serve children and students. Thus, Young argues that schools of education should prepare students to employ epistemological diversity. More specifically, Engstrom (1999) examines the influence of the doctoral experiences on the research productivity and writing of women faculty members in higher education and student affairs programs. She found that mentors, student peers, and structured opportunities in research, writing, and publishing were positive influences on the subsequent productivity and writing of faculty members. Similarly, Anderson (1996) found that the more collaborative the faculty members are among themselves within the department, the more likely the student is to have the short term benefit of a better work environment as well as the long term advantage of better preparation to conduct research. A similar finding underscored the importance of the general climate of an academic department on the socialization of doctoral students to the scholarly role (Weidman & Stein, 2003). Weidman and Stein suggest that the optimal climate is characterized by “a faculty who are accessible to students, who are actively engaged in scholarly activities themselves, and who clearly convey expectations and encouragement for students engaging in such activities” (p. 653).

Summary

It is clear that the inherent tensions within doctoral education are national in scope; but nonetheless, the proposals for change are often specific to a particular discipline. Just as doctoral programs in engineering and philosophy demand distinct kinds of changes, so do doctorates in education. The

challenge for those of us in schools and colleges of education is to take the criticisms to heart and make changes that are appropriate to the particular demands of our field.

Implications for Doctoral Education, College of Education, UHM

The issue of centralization versus decentralization is a particular concern for the way the doctoral degree in education is organized at UH Mānoa. Though there is one degree, one set of core requirements, and one elected council which screens and selects faculty for membership to the Graduate Faculty in Education, there is a great deal of autonomy inherent in individual specializations: Administration, Curriculum Studies, Foundations, Exceptionalities, and Policy Studies. As a result of this autonomy, doctoral students may experience different norms and practices depending on their area of specialization. While differences are not in and of themselves a problem, it is difficult to determine whether there is a common experience or sense of community among doctoral students, or whether there are common or idiosyncratic issues to be addressed. One source of community building for the doctoral program is the College of Education Doctoral Student Association (COEDSA), described in an article by Lynn Tabata and Jamie Simpson in this issue. COEDSA sponsors a number of workshops and seminars that bring students and faculty members together around student-generated topics. Although this is a highly effective venue for addressing common issues, there is still much the faculty could do to attend to the issues raised in this article. The following recommendations emerge from the literature reviewed here.

Examine the rate and causes of attrition. It would be instructive to know how the attrition rate in the doctoral program in education compares to that in other doctoral programs, but it would be even more important to learn why those students who leave elect to do so. The rate of attrition may be a direct reflection of the effectiveness of the admissions screening and selection process. Faculty members devote considerable time and attention to admissions. Information regarding the relationship between student attrition and selection criteria would be of great value in informing the admissions process. In addition to admissions procedures, the reasons that students give for leaving the program will also provide important information about the doctoral experience. But data is important only to the extent that it is used to improve the quality of their programs.

Provide continuing orientation for the graduate fac-

ulty. Every faculty member brings the benefit of his or her own experience to their work with doctoral students. Rarely do faculty members gather to discuss how they view the purpose of doctoral education or to share their perceptions of what a quality doctoral experience looks like. Faculty members may also benefit from hearing about different advising, mentoring, or committee models. It would be beneficial for all faculty members to give thought to their role as advisors—especially with regard to the ethics of their relationship with doctoral students, and their academic duty to doctoral training. The likelihood of achieving consensus on a shared purpose and process may be slight, but the discussion is likely to foster increased attention to such matters and could be helpful to new members of the faculty who are searching for the norms of their programs.

Evaluate the quality of the research training in the program. It has been several years since the inquiry core was established—sufficient time has passed to enable us to evaluate how well candidates are prepared to conduct research. How well prepared are they to analyze data, evaluate the quality of research conceptualizations, and choose appropriate methods for their line of inquiry? Many students complain that they do not know how to obtain research experience prior to working on their dissertation. The best way for students to learn to do research is to do it with a faculty member. Then, faculty members need to make these experiences available to students. Clearly, the ideal is to find a means to make such partnerships mutually beneficial. Students should gain adequate preparation in their coursework to enable them to apply their skills to actual research projects; faculty should be willing to commit their time to helping students develop their skills and expertise.

Identify ways to sustain student work on the dissertation. Formal seminars or writing groups may help students to maintain a connection to the faculty and their peers during the writing stage. It may be possible to offer such coursework across the specializations, thereby lessening the load on specializations with small numbers of faculty and students. Students should be encouraged to form support groups during the dissertation writing stage. Even when students have very diverse topical interests, they can encourage one another and provide the emotional support needed to get through what can otherwise be a lonely endeavor.

Reconsider the role of the required internship or practicum in the doctoral program. It would be helpful to learn how students perceive the internship requirement. If

they see it as helpful to sorting or achieving their career goals, there may be no problem. If they see it simply as another hurdle on the way to the degree, the problem may be in the way it is presented or framed within the program or the specializations. The requirement could be a holdover from the days that the degree granted was the EdD, thus, it is important for graduate faculty to have a shared understanding of the purpose and worth of this experience.

Actively support the efforts of COEDSA. Although it may be wisest not to mess with a good thing, the student leadership for COEDSA has continuously been challenged to find ways to involve the faculty in their activities. Doctoral students find it especially difficult to meet faculty members outside of their specializations and to learn about the research conducted in other specializations. Some specializations have very few faculty members associated with them, thus, it is critical for students to establish relationships with other faculty members as well as those in their specialization.

Track the career choices of past recipients of the PhD degree in education. Current students are intrigued with the career outcomes of those who have preceded them in the program. The information provided in this special issue is invaluable to those who are considering the career options available to doctoral degree holders. Maintaining a data base on graduates would not only be useful to current students, but would also provide the kind of data needed for program review and accreditation purposes.

Make good use of the data in hand. Surveys of doctoral student satisfaction have been conducted for the College as part of the accreditation process. The findings of these surveys can be useful to the graduate faculty as a whole as well as to the faculty members within specializations. The data have been disaggregated in a number of ways including differences by gender, race and ethnicity, age, and specialization. If there are differences in the experiences of graduate students based on such variables, efforts should be made to address disparities in the doctoral experience.

Final Comment

The doctoral experience is not supposed to be a cakewalk; it is supposed to be a rigorous intellectual experience that results in a contribution to knowledge in the doctoral candidate's field of inquiry. The aim of this article is not to suggest that attrition rates and the level of student complaints should be addressed by lowering standards or reducing the quality of the training provided. It is to suggest, however,

that doctoral education deserves the critical attention of the faculty. No matter how extensive the concerns or the scrutiny from various stakeholders, doctoral preparation is the responsibility of the faculty. They have earned the international respect afforded US doctoral education, and they bear the responsibility for its shortcomings. Faculty members hold the key to the improvement of doctoral preparation; only members of the graduate faculty are in the position to model the highest of academic standards, to inspire and nurture the skills necessary to conduct first rate research, and to advise and mentor the next generation of scholars. Faculty members who respect their students demand the highest level of performance and provide the support students need to achieve the quality demanded.

References

- Anderson, M. S. (1996). Collaboration, the doctoral experience, and the departmental environment. *Review of Higher Education, 19*(3), 305–336.
- Association of American Universities. (1998, October). *Committee on graduate education report and recommendations*. Retrieved June 15, 1999, from <http://www.tulane.edu/~aau/GradEdRpt.html>
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94–122.
- Caffarella, R. S., & Barnett, B. G. (2000). Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques. *Studies in Higher Education, 25*(1), 39–52.
- Carpenter, D. S. (1987). On-going dialogue: Degrees or differences? *The Review of Higher Education, 10*(3), 281–286.
- Courtenay, B. C. (1988). Eliminating the confusion over the EdD and PhD in colleges and schools of education. *Innovative Higher Education, 13*(1), 11–20.
- de Valero, Y. F. (2001). Departmental factors affecting time-to-degree and completion rates of doctoral students at one land-grant research institution. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(3), 341–367.
- Deering, T. E. (1998). Eliminating the doctor of education degree: It's the right thing to do. *The Educational Forum, 62*, 243–248.
- Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). EdD and PhD research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. *The Review of Higher Education, 8*(2), 169–186.
- Duke, N. K., & Beck, S. W. (1999). Education should consider alternative formats for the dissertation. *Educational Researcher, 28*(3), 31–36.
- Engstrom, C. M. (1999). Promoting the scholarly writing of female doctoral students in higher education and student affairs graduate programs. *NASPA Journal, 36*(4), 264–277.
- Farrell, E. F. (2003, October 21). Public-college tuition rise is largest in 3 decades. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 10, 2004, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i10/10a00101.htm>
- Golde, C. M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attrition process. *The Review of Higher Education, 23*(2), 199–227.
- Fechter, A. E., & Gaddy, C. D. (1998). Trends in doctoral education and employment. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 13, (pp. 353–377). New York: Agathon Press.

- Gumport, P. J. (1999). Graduate education and research: Interdependence and strain. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 396–426). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hearn, J. C. (2001). The paradox of growth in federal aid for college students, 1960–1990. In M. B. Paulsen & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The finance of higher education: Theory, research, policy, & practice*, (pp. 267–320). New York: Agathon Press.
- Hovey, H. (1999, July). *State spending for higher education in the next decade*. Washington, DC: National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Johnson, L., Lee, A., & Green, B. (2000). The PhD and the autonomous self: Gender, rationality and postgraduate pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(2), 135–147.
- LaPidus, J. B. (1995). Doctoral education and student career needs. In A. S. Pruitt-Logan & P. D. Isaac (Eds.), *Student services for the changing graduate student population* (Vol. 72, pp. 33–41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Leatherman, C. (2000). A new push for ABDs to cross the finish line. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(29), A18–A20.
- Levine, A. (2001). Conclusion: So what now? The future of education schools in America. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Faculty work in schools of education* (pp. 235). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Magner, D. K. (1999, February 6). Doctoral programs decide that smaller is better. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 45(25), A12–A13.
- Metz, M. H. (2001). Intellectual border crossing in graduate education: A report from the field. *Educational Researcher*, 30(5), 12–18.
- Nyquist, J. D. (2002). The Ph.D: Tapestry of change for the 21st century. *Change*, 34(6), 12–20.
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Wong, M. J. (1993). The PhD versus the EdD: Time for a decision. *Innovative Higher Education*, 18(1), 47–63.
- Page, R. N. (2001). Reshaping graduate preparation in educational research methods: One school's experience. *Educational Researcher*, 30(5), 19–25.
- Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. L. (1998). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smallwood, S. (2003, December 19). Labor: More organizing and more unrest. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 14, 2004, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i17/17a01003.htm>
- Tierney, W. G. (2001). Introduction: Reforming schools, college, and departments of education. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Faculty work in schools of education* (pp. 235). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Trombley, W. (Winter, 2003) College affordability in jeopardy. *National Crosstalk* (Supplement). The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 1A–11A.
- Viadero, D. (2004). The skills gap. *Education Week*, On Assignment, 30–33.
- Weidman, J. C. & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to academic norms. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(6), 641–656.
- Young, L. J. (2001). Border crossings and other journeys: Re-envisioning the doctoral preparation of education researchers. *Educational Researcher*, 30(5), 3–5.

Linda K. Johnsrud is interim associate vice president for planning and policy, University of Hawai'i system, interim chancellor of the University of Hawai'i–West O'ahu, and professor of higher education in the Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. A past director of the University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly and a 1998–99 fellow of the American Council on Education, she has served as associate dean for academic affairs for the College of Education and chaired the university's faculty senate. As 2000–02 vice president of the postsecondary division J of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), she also served on the executive council of AERA. Her keynote address, "Faculty Lives: Our Work, Our Legacy," focused on the legacy of preparing students to become future faculty.

Jocelyn Surla Banaria received her PhD in educational administration from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. She is program manager for the Transition to Teaching program, and teaches courses on current issues in higher education and higher education finance. She studies the impact of student networking on student achievement and satisfaction, emphasizing the experience of underrepresented minorities, particularly Filipinos and Native Hawaiians.

The Socialization and Mentoring of Doctoral Students: A Faculty's Imperative

Vicki J. Rosser

I remember clearly the day of my doctoral defense when my mentor leaned over to me and said, “the work and rewards of the academy are just beginning for you, and they are never ending.” I now understand the value and truth in those powerful words of encouragement. As a junior faculty member in my fourth year at a research university, I have discovered that there are striking differences in the way faculty members have been prepared and socialized to enter the academic workplace. While some receive a quality doctoral experience with exemplary mentoring and socialization, others do not receive the preparation and training they need to succeed in their academic career.

Individuals pursue their doctorate for a variety of reasons: some for personal attainment, some for status and recognition, some for a credential to achieve an upward mobility goal, and some to become faculty members in the academy. When I applied to the doctoral program, I wanted to become a professor of higher education and to be part of a lineage of academic women who believed in quality teaching, research, and service. In my mind the honor and responsibility of being accepted into a doctoral program meant that I should persist and finish, and get the most out of my doctoral experience. I clearly wanted a dissertation chair/mentor who would thoughtfully guide me through this experience. In my case I chose to continue working with the advisor who had chaired my master's degree committee. I selected my chair for the following reasons: 1) she was the most constructive and rigorous instructor in the classroom and in grading my papers, 2) she was an exemplary teacher, 3) she was a productive scholar, 4) some of our interests were similar, and 5) she believed in, exhibited, and wrote about mentoring, socialization, and the professional development of doctoral students. Therefore, I'm pleased to be able to share some of the many aspects of my professional and academic socialization and mentoring experiences that I received in my doctoral education, as well as what I have learned as a new faculty member in a research university.

Preparing for the Professorate

At a recent graduation ceremony, a new PhD in education came up to me and said that she too is going to be a professor at a research university. I enthusiastically extended my congratulations and asked what university was she planning to go to as an assistant professor. She replied, “I haven't started to look for a position yet, but I'm looking forward to the experience.” A colleague asked her if she had any publications in progress, or if she was currently working on publishing her dissertation as a research article. Again she replied that she has no publications in progress, nor had she made any plans to compose any research articles from her dissertation. As the new graduate moved on, the colleague and I looked at each other. We didn't have to say anything; we both knew that she wasn't adequately prepared or socialized to become a professor at a research university. This experience raises two important points about doctoral education: 1) she should not have waited until after graduation to start looking for an academic position; her applications should have already been submitted, and 2) she should at least be in the process of redesigning her dissertation into a research article. Doctoral candidates must have some scholarly work going on in today's competitive academic marketplace (preferably with a faculty member). Now before I blame the student's chair or mentor, it may be that the student never discussed her professional intentions with those with whom she had worked. Sometimes the academic tradition and ceremony of graduation can inspire an individual's thinking in new ways.

Institutional Type

Because the student and I had both mentioned the term research university, I feel that it is important to briefly clarify the responsibilities of faculty who work a research university. In higher education we often refer to the Carnegie Classification of Institutional Type. A research university (or more correctly stated—a doctoral/research extensive university) is one of many types of institutions in higher education. Other institutional types include doctoral/research intensives, master's colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges

(i.e., liberal arts colleges, baccalaureate general colleges), associates colleges (e.g., community colleges), specialized institutions (e.g., theological seminaries), and tribal colleges and universities. Different institutional types have different criteria for the faculty work that is conducted and rewarded in terms of teaching, research, and service, and of course, for earning promotion and tenure. So the notion goes, if you don't like doing research, you shouldn't be working as a faculty member in a doctoral/research extensive or intensive university. At most doctoral/research intensive universities, to earn promotion and tenure faculty members must allocate their time and work to teaching, research, and service. Within the research university classification, percentages of time devoted to these activities can vary by institution. For example, the University of Missouri-Columbia recommends that faculty members allocate 40 percent of their time to teaching, 40 percent to research, and 20 percent to service. The quantity and quality of activities to achieve tenure and promotion can also vary within these categories by institution. It is incumbent on new faculty members to find out and understand the reward structure (i.e., the percentage of time allocated to each activity, and the number of activities to strive for within each category) in order to earn tenure and promotion within the institution where they work.

Now, let's return for a moment to the student who just graduated with a doctoral degree. Although this new PhD may have the skills and capacity to become a professor, earning a doctorate does not automatically "prepare" the student to become a professor at a research university. Based upon my experience as a new tenure track faculty member, becoming a successful professor takes careful preparation, socialization, and mentoring.

Understanding the Socialization and Mentoring Experience

Doctoral education at major research universities is an intense socialization experience designed to prepare students for a lifetime of scholarship and research (Johnsrud, 1990). In their discussion of socialization into the professorate, Tierney and Bensimon (1996) examine the formal and informal faculty socialization process that occurs in two stages: anticipatory and organizational. The first, *anticipatory* socialization, takes place before an individual comes to campus, and in this case, largely occurs during graduate school. More specifically, graduate students observe, participate, and interact with faculty members. From these experiences, students learn the roles and behaviors necessary to succeed as faculty members.

The second, *organizational* socialization, occurs through initial entry and then by role continuance. Initial entry is defined as those acts that take place prior to entering the organization and immediately after (e.g., interviewing and hiring). Role continuance takes place throughout the tenure process. The tenure process is considered formal, whereas the casual conversations that individuals have on this and other subjects are examples of informal socializing experiences (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Johnsrud (1990) contends that mentoring relationships between faculty members and their students are a significant means for identifying and developing the scholarly potential of students as well as for perpetuating the traditional norms and values of academic life and intellectual inquiry. She believes that mentoring is a means by which the protégé is sponsored for faculty positions, coached to succeed in research and publishing, and taught the various aspects of academic life. In essence, mentoring is most often a one-to-one relationship, and if that relationship continues to develop in a positive manner, then it can eventually evolve into one of interdependence and collegiality.

For the new faculty member entering Academe, socialization may be from their dissertation chair or mentor, their doctoral committee, or from faculty members within or outside of their new department. Advice may also come from those faculty members who are actively engaged in the training and development of the future professorate. What is most important here is that the faculty member who is working most closely with the student must ensure that an appropriate socialization and mentoring process is taking place. Although socialization and mentoring continues when the graduate becomes a new faculty member, for the purpose of this discussion, I will primarily talk about those socialization and mentoring experiences that prepared me to become a professor at a research university.

Wanting to Become a Professor

After many years of working in the private sector, and wishing I were in education, I decided to make the shift from executive management to teaching in higher education. I always wanted to teach, so I started working on a master's degree in higher education via the Hawai'i Interactive Television System (HITS) on Kaua'i. In addition to satisfying my desire to teach and to give something back to the community, the experience of working on my master's thesis got me excited about research, and motivated me to move into edu-

cation full time and pursue a doctorate in higher education. More than ever, I wanted to be a professor, so I met with two professors in the department and asked them to prepare me to become a professor, and not to hold back. In turn I would promise to do the same. I firmly believe that what doctoral students put into their preparation and socialization is what they will get out of it. Doctoral students must also take, in part, some of the responsibility for their preparation and academic experience.

Students need to think about where and how to pursue all forms of academic socialization, training, and preparation available as part of their graduate experience. They need to work with, and emulate, those who are productive scholars so that they can learn to become researchers. They need to work with exemplary teachers who love to motivate and work with students, so that they can develop skill in teaching. And they need to work with faculty who model collegiality by contributing their time to serve on committees and participate in activities within the university and surrounding local and national communities. In addition to the triad of research, teaching, and service, new faculty members must also become productive colleagues within their departments. Collegiality is least often discussed in the academy, but it is vitally important to the success of a newly hired faculty member. Collegiality is about fostering positive and productive relationships between department and college peers. In order to learn about the value of teaching, research, service, and collegiality to becoming a faculty member, I knew that I needed to be around faculty in the department so that I could observe their daily work, participate and engage in academic and social discussions, and assimilate and integrate the scholarly work in my field. What motivated me was a powerful sense that my doctoral experience was an initiation into becoming a university professor.

Teaching, Research, Service, and Collegiality

When a graduate student has secured a tenure-track position, how do they become successful in their institution, establish working relationships with their colleagues, and become productive scholars within their discipline? What are the academic norms, criteria, and expectations by which their peers will judge their productivity, performance, and collegiality as a new faculty member? Although departments and college missions differ in their requirements for promotion and tenure, Silverman (1999) contends that successful faculty members require exemplary performance in the four critical areas: teaching, research and scholarship, service, and collegiality.

Learning to Become a Teacher

A lifetime of educational experiences offers many insights into the different levels and varying quality of teaching practices. Good teaching involves both a commitment to and a sense of responsibility for student learning. In education, we are held to a high standard in the training and preparation of future educators. Therefore, it is critical to seek answers to the question, "How should doctoral students prepare themselves to become exemplary teachers?" The responsibility lies in our commitments: to the public, to our students, and to our own desire to better ourselves as educators.

In graduate education, good teachers do not give an "A" or a smiley face to make the student feel good. When they do, they are not doing the doctoral student any favors. Good teachers, as well as advisors and committee chairs, should provide doctoral students with rigorous and constructive feedback on their academic work and writing. They should stimulate and push the student's thinking intellectually, and if doctoral students feel they are not getting this quality feedback, then they must ask for constructive guidance and input. My advice to the aspiring faculty member is to watch and emulate those who are exemplary teachers. When students have a bad teacher, they will know it. And they will learn from these experiences what not to emulate in their teaching.

Some institutions offer a more formalized approach to teaching with internships and graduate credit for teaching college coursework. If there is no formal training for teaching effectively within a doctoral program, offer to teach an undergraduate or graduate class in the same institution or at a different one. I remember sitting in some classes a second time to learn how to deliver the material and teach the course. Adopting the perspective of a teacher is a very different experience from the student perspective of learning the material for the first time. I also suggest that advanced doctoral students ask to help their professor grade papers. They can duplicate papers and compare their evaluation and assessment with that of their chair.

Another means of getting useful feedback on your teaching is to tape your lessons. I vividly recall my first graduate teaching experience via interactive television to students on various neighboring islands (i.e., Kaua'i, Hawai'i, Maui) from the Mānoa campus on O'ahu. I was fortunate that the classes were taped, and I was able to review the tape and discuss my teaching strengths and weaknesses with my advisor.

Finally, doctoral students and new professors should use student evaluations as constructive criticism. Don't be hurt by them or take the feedback personally, but rather use the evaluations to learn to become a better professor. Yes, there may be a "crackpot" or an outlier from the norm who can get personal or destructive in their comments, but try to remember, and this can be hard for the individual who really cares about good teaching, that extremely negative comments are neither worth the time nor the energy, as they are usually unhelpful.

Learning to Become a Researcher

I remember attending a conference session designed for doctoral students that featured several journal editors from several of the journals in my field. There was a young man from a top ranked university who stood up and asked the journal editors: "How do doctoral students get involved with research?" I was stunned that a doctoral student could ask this question. I was even more surprised to learn that he was from a noted research university. What does this say about his research socialization? I also clearly remember the terse response from one of the editors who replied: "If you want to conduct research and be a professor at a research university, then you need to work with someone who does research." When asked to be more specific, the editor added: "All faculty members do research—some faculty do enough to just get by, and others are highly productive scholars. So it is important to work with those faculty members who are exemplary researchers. They are, of course, best qualified to teach and prepare doctoral students for the rigors of conducting research."

I strongly believe that obtaining a graduate assistantship is the best way to experience the benefits of socialization and mentoring in research. Yes, the pay is very low, and graduate assistants may not be able to go to the movies as often as they would like, but I considered my experience as a graduate assistant as a professional investment in my future. Doctoral students need to read broadly and learn the work of those exemplary scholars who are writing on the important and defining topics and issues of the day. These readings should be in addition to formal coursework. Working closely with a professor to learn about the various elements of a research article is invaluable. My advisor would duplicate manuscripts and proposals for me to read, evaluate, and assess. Then we would come back together and compare our notes. It was fun to see how closely my notes would come to her evaluations

and assessments. I also asked to read and discuss her writings and sought to become involved in her research. Clearly, I was the protégé driven to learn all that I could from my mentor.

In addition to working with those faculty members who are active researchers, doctoral students need to attend and participate, as much as possible, in national research meetings and conferences. Attending a national meeting allows doctoral students the opportunity to observe respected researchers within their field and to listen in on and even participate in important national debates on important issues. Reading a paper at a conference is a valuable experience in presenting one's ideas to a critical audience. It is also important for students to know their field of study and be professional about the presentation of their work. New faculty members are expected to "hit the ground running" (Whitt, 1991) with respect to their research. The dissertation will serve as a treasure trove of data that can be mined by the new faculty member to produce one or two articles to hold them over until they can establish a research agenda and get their writing and publishing cycle in full gear. A senior professor once told me always to try and keep something in review. This way the new faculty member will always have something in the research cycle (e.g., obtaining data, writing a conference proposal, presenting the work at a national conference, revising the conference paper to an article, submitting the work to a refereed journal, revising and resubmitting the manuscript, and, finally, getting it accepted for publication). If doctoral students want to be professors at a research university, they need to be inspired by a love and desire for discovery—to create new knowledge through their research endeavors. Successful research and scholarship, it should be noted, are essential requirements for earning tenure at research/doctoral-intensive universities.

Learning to Serve the Academy

Service and committee work (e.g., student committees, faculty senate work, task forces, ad hoc committees, local or national service) is the faculty's contribution of their time and expertise toward a university, scholarly, or community activity. Service and committee work can take place at many levels within the university (e.g., department, college, university, system), as well as externally to the institution (e.g., local, state, national, international). I remember watching my mentor and her willingness to serve the university community, her students, and her professional association. I would attend

some of these service activities or committee meetings with her and when we returned we would talk about the various experiences and agendas that people were supporting or not supporting, and why they had the perspective they had, or why we didn't have a clue as to what was going on with personalities or agendas. The value of these experiences has been to provide me a better understanding of the various institutional structures and processes of faculty decision-making within higher education.

I suggest that when students become new faculty members, they should try, as much as possible, to select or match service activities with their interests and areas of research. This approach will serve a dual purpose: 1) to enhance the faculty member's research agenda; and 2) to provide the faculty member areas of professional development. Although I believe in serving the academy, service activities can also be less rewarding than teaching and research. In addition, service can quickly drain time from the new faculty members' research work. The new faculty member needs to be mindful of how to manage time with respect to service. From my limited experience, I recommend that new faculty members should not go out of their way to look for service activities. All too often, it beats its own path to them, and at a much faster rate than they expect, especially if the new faculty member is perceived as a willing servant and citizen of the academy. There are times, however, when the new faculty member must say no.

Other forms of service activities are also important to the tenure and promotion process. Faculty can serve as a manuscript reviewer for journals, a proposal reviewer for research meetings, and a contributor and participant in professional associations. This work is about serving the academy—both within and outside of one's institution. If students want to be professors, I recommend that they attend professional research meetings in their field, present their research, and eventually aspire to holding a national or international office. Boice (2000) contends that in order to fail in teaching and writing, one has to prove oneself incompetent beyond doubt. To fail socially, one needs only the appearance of aloofness and uncooperativeness. Boice suggests that by downplaying socialization and service, you greatly increase the risk of a poor start, which can lead, ultimately, to failure.

Learning to Become Collegial

Being a good colleague to peers within the institution and across the country undergirds everything else that a new

faculty member does, but it is rarely discussed by chairs and mentors. Collegiality entails that everyone gives each other positive, as well as critical feedback. It entails that they discuss and debate ideas and issues openly—without getting personal or taking criticism personally. The operative word here is 'personal.' Unfortunately, insecure or less productive individuals often are the first to feel that someone is out to get them. If there is "something" going on in the department among and between colleagues rarely is it discussed with students in the department, nor should it be. Despite the issues and debates that may exist among colleagues, the goal should remain clear—to make the department or program a better place for faculty members and their students to achieve their best work.

There are, however, other aspects to collegiality. For example, to what extent is a faculty member contributing to the department's teaching, research, and service activities? Is she or he being a good colleague by doing their fair share of the committee and service work? Are they taking on a fair load of student advising and teaching? Are they maintaining respectfulness to one another? Respect in the academic world should not be a matter of whether one agrees or disagrees with other members in the department. Respect is the glue that holds collegial relationships together.

A Few Concluding Thoughts

Tenure-track positions are posted throughout the academic year and most are open to a nationwide search. Securing a faculty position depends on the number of candidates seeking employment, the number and types of employers seeking new PhDs, and the candidate's training, capabilities, skills, recommendations, and presentation of self (Kronenfeld & Whicker, 1997). New faculty members can be selected for a variety of reasons: potential for scholarly work, expertise or a desired line of inquiry, social and collegial fit in the department, the prestige of the school from which they earned their degree, or the scholar with whom they worked. Rarely are new faculty members hired at research universities for their potential in teaching and service skills. When new faculty members are appointed to tenure-track faculty positions in the academy, they must focus on becoming productive and successful scholars in their area of expertise, earning tenure, and fostering collegial relations (Rosser, 2003). Pursuing these goals can be the most challenging, and rewarding, steps to a successful academic career. New faculty members need to move completely from their student role to a faculty role in

order to become a contributing colleague within their department, an exemplary scholar in their field, and an inspirational teacher, advisor, and mentor of students.

As new faculty members are preparing to enter the academic workplace, they are best served by a professional and academic socialization that comes from a positive and rigorous mentoring experience. I'm grateful to have inherited so many valuable learning experiences from the legacy of academic women who have gifted their professional experience in higher education to a new generation of doctoral students. I remember my mentor telling me that there is no greater reward than to hood a doctoral student at commencement. As with much of her advice and guidance, these are words of wisdom to pass on. I recently hooded my first doctoral student. She is right, there is no greater reward for a faculty member who wishes to serve the academy and his or her students.

References

- Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for new faculty members: Nihil Nimus*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tierney, W. G. & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Johnsrud, L. K. (1990). Mentoring between academic women: The capacity for interdependence, *Initiatives*, 54(3), 7–17.
- Kronenfeld, J. J. & Whicker, M. L. (1997). *Getting an academic job: Strategies for success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Nyquist, J. D. & Woodford, B. J. (2000). *Re-envisioning the Ph.D. What concerns do we have?* Center for Instructional Development and Research and the University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
- Rosser, V. J. (2003). Review Essay: Preparing and socializing new faculty members. *Review of Higher Education*, 26(3), 387–395.
- Schuster, J. H. (1999). Forward. In R. Menges & Associates (eds.), *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Silverman, F. H. (1999). *Publishing for tenure and beyond*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Vesilind, P. A. (2000). *So you want to be a professor? A handbook for graduate students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Whitt, E. L. (1991). "Hit the ground running": Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. *Review of Higher Education*, 14(2), 177–197.

Vicki J. Rosser is an assistant professor of higher education Vicki J. Rosser is assistant professor of higher education in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia. She received her PhD in higher education (with a cognate in Sociology) from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. Her research interests include faculty and [midlevel] administrative worklife issues, leadership and academic governance, and advanced quantitative research methods. She participated as an invited panelist in the two symposia at the Association for the Study of Higher Education's annual research meetings: Publishing Together: faculty and graduate Students, and The Quality of Faculty and Administrative Worklife: The Status of the Research. She has also participated as a panel member in the annual graduate student seminar on preparing graduate students for faculty positions in higher education of Division-J of the American Educational Research Association.

Reflections on the Dissertation Process and the Use of Secondary Data

Rochelle Mahoe

When I was asked to write an article on how I used quantitative research methods in my doctoral dissertation, I eagerly jumped at the chance. Not because I am some sort of expert on the topic, but rather because I wish someone had given me some insights into the journey I was about to embark on. Although the course work for my doctoral degree served as a strong foundation for the voyage, the dissertation phase was still a leap of faith. I often felt as though I was “shooting in the dark” and would be lucky to hit the target. In the following paragraphs, I would like to share the personal experiences, struggles, and “aha moments” that I endured and enjoyed during the dissertation process. I hope that these thoughts will provide others with some insights and words of encouragement to persevere in completing what is undoubtedly one of the most rewarding challenges in a doctoral student’s education. A good place to start, then, is to tell the story of how I became interested in the topic that would eventually become my research project.

Introduction to Problem

Developing a research problem is usually a personal process that unfolds over time. As a teacher at a local public high school, I have always been interested in how critical the student’s first year of high school is to later graduation. Early in my career, like most beginning teachers, I was assigned the “lower,” less rigorous, courses. I quickly became familiar with teaching freshmen, including “repeat” freshmen. This experience helped me understand that if students fell behind early in their high school years, then they would be trapped in a discouraging game of “catch-up” for the remainder of their high school career. Thus, my interest in freshmen retention began with my early experience as a teacher.

Coincidentally, a few years later, my school principal shared with the faculty that for the past five years, the freshmen retention rate at our school was approximately 20 percent. Almost one out of five freshmen had not earned the required five credits to be promoted to sophomores. This regrettable figure inspired me to investigate the problem further and determine how our freshmen class consistently averaged nearly 600 students per year in contrast to the graduating senior class that averaged about 400 students. These

numbers suggested that only two-thirds of the freshmen class were graduating in four years. If so, what was happening to the other 200 students? Were they dropping out, graduating late, or transferring schools? More importantly, was this problem unique to our high school, or did it plague our entire public school system? These alarming statistics strengthened my passion to learn more about this phenomenon, and it became my personal quest to find answers to the problem.

Background Information

By this time, I had completed about half of my required doctoral coursework. And because high school freshmen retention was my hot topic of interest, I began to incorporate the subject into my remaining course assignments. In other words, whenever it was possible, I used my courses to explore related topics to gain background information on the problem. In one of my doctoral seminars, for example, the assignment was to complete an annotated bibliography on a topic of our choice. Knowing that at some point I had to write a review of the literature in my dissertation proposal, I decided to research the topic of freshmen retention in high school. I found very little, so I widened the search to other related topics, such as social promotion and the transition to high school. In other courses, I focused attention on related areas of interest, such as school-to-school transitions and dropping out of high school. Although I was still far from developing a research question, I gradually began to assemble the kinds of knowledge that would serve me in my dissertation work. Having established a solid literature base in the preliminary stages helped me to build a strong dissertation proposal that needed few changes.

In another of my advanced research courses, I was able to conduct a preliminary analysis of freshmen retention rates using the Hawaii State Department of Education (DOE) database under the guidance of a professor who had been given access to it. Unfortunately, the numbers were not very revealing. The database showed that the greatest percentage of retained students occurred during the ninth grade year, but the percentage was too small to allow me to make any useful inferences. Perplexed by these numbers, I asked my school registrar about the large discrepancies in percentages between

the school level and the state level. She explained that some of the inconsistencies might be due to the timing of the reports. On any given day, the numbers could vary depending on when the registrars from the individual schools entered the appropriate information. Thus, the percentages varied from school to school depending on whether students were flagged as retained or recorded as promoted. In addition, the database was limited to those students who remained in the public school system until they graduated. Students who moved out of state or left for a private school were dropped from the database. This made it difficult to track whether a student dropped out or transferred schools once they exited the system.¹ This practice decreased the number of students per grade level and, subsequently, lowered the retention rates.

Need and Significance

At this stage, I needed to take a moment to reflect and reassess what I was doing. I was convinced that it was a phenomenon that was not unique to my school that high numbers of ninth graders were not being promoted to the tenth grade. In addition, I realized that because of the way that data was recorded in the DOE database, I would not really be able to use it to dig deeper into the issue and get answers to this problem. The roadblocks and challenges that I encountered, however, only served to strengthen my resolve and encourage me rather than discourage me in seeking my goal. The fact that I could not figure out what was happening to these students at the school and state level, and the lack of available literature, convinced me that this was an untapped area that needed to be explored. I believed that this was an important problem to understand in more detail and that my efforts would not be wasted. I also believed that my findings would make a useful contribution to the accumulated research on dropouts. It is important to know this in dissertation work, as it helps provide the critical element of motivation to the process. You need to feel that what you are doing is worthwhile.

My initial hypothesis was that the problem at the ninth grade was due to the transition to high school. I thought that many students probably had a difficult time adjusting to their new social and academic environment, and therefore, fell quickly behind at an early stage in their high school careers. This seemed plausible, but I also wanted to know the lasting effects of this early experience of failure. Do students ever recover and graduate on time? And if so, what are some of

the factors that can be attributed to their success? These were questions to which I could not easily find answers, and they kept circulating through my mind. I questioned whether I could really find the answers. At this point, if I wanted to pursue this topic, I had only two choices: to analyze the data at the school level, or to use the data provided by the DOE. The inconsistencies in reporting data discouraged me from using the DOE's information. The alternative was to pursue a case study of my school. When I really thought about it, however, in order to accomplish my goal I would have to track one freshman class for four years. This was discouraging. In addition to the time element, I would also have to develop a survey in order to gain information that was not available from student records. I did not want to spend 5–6 years on my dissertation, so I abandoned both ideas.

These choices brought me to something of a stalemate. But I was not quite ready to abandon the topic of freshman retention. Instead, I did some additional reading on at-risk students and effective school research as I worked to expand my literature base, hoping to gain some insights into what to do next. Fortunately, a few months later, by chance, one of my professors was given information about several workshops sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). He noticed that one of the workshop topics included the transition to high school and forwarded the information to me. I later learned that these workshops were actually all-expense paid training sessions that showed researchers how to use the information compiled by the survey work of NCES. Luckily, there was one study, the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) that followed a cohort of eighth graders through their transition to high school and college. Seeing that this could possibly be the answer to my prayers, I applied for the workshop in March and received my acceptance in May for a one-week training session in June.

At the training session, I once again found myself in unfamiliar territory. Many of the professors and other graduate students were already conversant with the database. And as I knew nothing about it, I spent most of the time struggling to understand why the study was conducted and learning how to access the information. Meantime, the others were more prepared to ask specific questions relevant to their purpose.

¹ Since the time of my preliminary analysis (which was over 5 years ago), the DOE has made considerable efforts to improve their record keeping in the database system. It is possible to gain more consistent information with their updated information system.

In hindsight, I should have read about the NELS:88 database on the web and requested the public access database ahead of time. If I had done so, I would have made much better use of my time and the expertise of the NCES statisticians at the training sessions. Instead, I spent about 3 months after my return trying to figure out if this database was something I could use. Fortunately, by playing with the dataset, conducting a few simple analyses and reading several articles that used the dataset, NELS:88 gradually emerged as a dataset that would address my research concerns. One of the key objectives of NELS:88 was to provide longitudinal data about critical transitions experienced by students. Although no follow-up survey was conducted during students' ninth grade year, transcripts and course information were available for every year of high school through the "restricted access" database, which I later obtained.² Although many studies had been conducted using the NELS:88 database; very few had been published using the restricted student files.

Once I had determined that I was going to use the NELS:88 database, I began my dissertation proposal. I expanded the scope of my literature review to also include student resiliency, positive psychology, student persistence in higher education, and small school research. By doing so, my study of a high school freshman retention problem evolved into a comprehensive examination of student persistence. More specifically, the study extended previous work by combining the psychological and sociological perspectives of dropping out and simultaneously investigating the effects of individual-level and school-level variables on students' decisions to stay in school until graduation. The multilevel study examined how school structures and processes serve as supports to students' academic and social engagement (for all four years of high school), and their subsequent influence on student persistence.

Methodology

There are many advantages and disadvantages to using secondary data. The obvious advantages in this case were the cost and time. First, the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88) conducted by the National Center of Educational Statistics (NCES) offered a source of data at no personal expense to me. This comprehensive study followed a nationally representative sample of eighth graders through their secondary schooling and post high school experiences. Millions of dollars were spent over a twelve-year period to obtain information from students, dropouts, parents, teach-

ers, and schools to help track student achievement, educational status, and transition to school and the work place. Second, over the twelve-year period, in addition to the initial student survey given at the eighth grade, four follow-up surveys were conducted during the tenth grade, twelfth grade, two-years after high school, and eight-years after high school. In my opinion, the time it took me to learn and gain access to this comprehensive study was minimal compared with the time it would have taken me to conduct my own surveys and collect other student information.

On the other hand, there are also some disadvantages to using secondary data. One major disadvantage is that someone other than you designed the surveys. Therefore, the questions and available information are not always coded or worded exactly as you might like them to be. Although I did not have to spend time creating a research instrument, I did have to spend time fine-tuning and adjusting it to fit my needs. This is why it is critical to have a strong literature base. When using secondary data, it is essential that one should familiarize oneself with other empirical studies that have used the same dataset. This will provide information about the struggles and limitations that others have encountered. In addition, a strong theoretical base is crucial to a solid dissertation. Every decision made regarding the study should be grounded in theory. For example, the variables selected and the method in which they are recoded³ should be justifiable. Arbitrary decisions without a theoretical basis may weaken your study or cause future headaches. The researcher should be able to give a plausible explanation for every significant and non-significant finding based on the pertinent literature.

Concluding Thoughts

Although the dissertation phase is a lonely venture, it is also the most rewarding part of the doctoral process. I would like to offer some final words of advice. First, the research will be consuming. It is critical, therefore, that you select a topic that you are passionate about and can keep you motivated. You will be your best cheerleader. Second, when you

² The data are available to researchers holding a license issued by the NCES. A license (control number 030227729) was awarded to Dr. Ronald H. Heck of the University of Hawai'i. In addition, this study had been determined to be exempt from a full review from the Committee of Human Subjects. In accordance with U.S. Department of Health and Human Service regulations, the University awarded a certificate of review (CHS #11529).

³ The response for survey items are typically written as a string variable (e.g., A-F) or numeric variable (e.g., 1-5). However, based on the researcher's needs and the theoretical and empirical literature, it may be more meaningful and useful to "recode" (such as rewriting 1-5 as 5-1), "dummy" code (creating a dichotomous variable), or combine variables to create new ones.

hit a roadblock, do not get discouraged. Instead, try to understand why you are faced with this hurdle. By understanding the limitations inherent in the problem, you may learn how to get around it. Your persistence may lead you to make a future contribution to the larger body of research. Third, the role of background research is critical to any study. You need to understand the “bigger” picture before you can attack your area of interest. Look into all the related areas for insights. A strong literature base will prove helpful in the long run and offer insights that may enable you to work more efficiently. Last, use all the members of your dissertation committee. Each professor brings her or his own unique expertise to the table. Keep them informed along the way and utilize their knowledge. You will be the expert on the topic, but they will help you elevate it to a higher scholarly level.

Rochelle Mahoe received her PhD in educational administration (K–12) from the College of Education, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa in 2003. She is currently vice principal at Princess Miriam K. Likelike Elementary School on Oahu.

Confessions of a Qualitative Researcher: Reflexive Photography and the Exhibition of Culture in Schools

Michael J. Zambon



Introduction

In their introduction to the *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) identify five phases¹ that define the research process, adding that “behind all but one of these phases stands the biographically situated researcher” (p. 19). My biography as a qualitative researcher began long before I entered the doctoral program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in the fall of 1998, and I can situate my early interest in the exhibition of global cultures in K–8 schools to my second year as an ESL teacher at a high school in Toronto, Canada where, in 1991, I was selected, with other teachers from the district, to participate in a workshop on multicultural and antiracist education. One of the goals of the four-day workshop required each participant to facilitate and plan events at their school that would engage the school faculty and student body in conversations about issues related to diversity. As someone who had traveled extensively throughout Latin America, Europe, and Asia, and who had attended numerous exhibitions of culture, one of the ideas generated that year was a “Cultural Variety Night” where high school students and members from various racial and ethnic groups would perform “traditional” music and dances for the school and local community. The event, which lasted over three hours and involved the participation of more than 100 students and performers from the wider community, was a sell-out and by every indication a “success.” However, it was not until some seven years later, during my first year

in Madison, when I received an invitation from the office of International Students Services to participate in a cultural outreach program, that I began to critically examine my involvement in the design and implementation of these events. Because the focus and interest of my graduate studies was multicultural education, I attended the meeting and listened with interest to students from several non-Western countries discuss the types of activities they had participated in when visiting local area schools. Some spoke to the high school students about issues relevant to their country, some performed dances for middle school students, while others worked with elementary students to make traditional handicrafts. Their experiences immediately brought back recollections of a cultural event that I had planned several years before and I realized how similar the format of this cultural program was to the one I had organized. More significantly, as I looked around at the faces of the students, I realized that, apart from the program director, I was the only other person in the room from a “first-world” country. As a result, I began to think

¹ The five phases of the research process are the researcher as multicultural subject, theoretical paradigms and perspectives, research strategies, methods of collection and analysis, and the art, practices, and politics of interpretation and presentation.

about my own participation in the design of such events and to question whether such programs were actually perpetuating, rather than challenging, issues such as colonialism and racism that I was reading about in the graduate courses I was enrolled in. Although I was never asked to speak at a local school that year due to the tremendous demand for international students from Muslim countries after the tragic events of September 11th 2001, my experience with this program was the initial reason that I became interested in examining these cultural events from the perspective of a researcher.

In this article, I do not intend to debate the epistemological, ontological, or methodological premises of qualitative research or challenge its validity and reliability. My aim is to share with the reader some of the insights I have gained through my experience of using photographs as a research tool during a year-long investigation of cultural events at three universities and schools in the Midwest of the United States. My article is divided into two alternating sections: the ones in plain text, provide a description of the project; while the sections in italics, compose a commentary, from the perspective of the researcher, aimed at offering some insights, drawn from my experiences in using qualitative research for doctoral research.

Methodology

In order to determine how students and staff at educational institutions ascribe meaning to the cultural events at their schools, I used a method of research based on Collier's (1967) technique of qualitative analysis referred to as photo-elicitation. Photo-elicitation is a methodological tool that incorporates visual data in the form of photographs, film, or videos into interviews in order to "elicit" information from participants. The conventional uses of photo-elicitation in the interview process are illustrated in Harper's *Working Knowledge: Skill and community in a small shop* (1987) and in Gold's examination of the relationship between two subpopulations of Vietnamese refugees in *Ethnic Boundaries and Ethnic Entrepreneurship: A photo-elicitation study* (1991). This technique requires the researcher to assemble a set of photographs on the assumption that the images will have some significance for the subjects. The photographs are shown to individuals and groups, who are then interviewed to explore their attitudes towards the images. After the interview, the researcher interprets their responses to particular images and attempts to incorporate these conclusions into the data to be analyzed. My study employed a slightly different technique called "re-

flexive photography." The difference between photo-elicitation and reflexive photography is that in the latter case the images are produced by the research participants rather than the researchers. For Harper (1987), photographs produced by research participants are "reflexive" photographs because the subjects share in the definition of the meaning of the photographs during the interviews, and are thus said to "reflect back" from the subject (pp. 64-65). A major advantage of using this technique over more conventional photo-elicitation methods is that it enables the research participants to document their experiences through photographs. As a result, it removes the problem of researcher bias, as it is the participants who take the images used in the interviews.

Commentary

The question of when to take a research methods course during my doctoral studies was one that I wrestled with during my entire graduate program. In my first year, the majority of my time was spent on trying to make sense of different theoretical paradigms, many of which I had never heard before, and I felt that I was not ready to identify a suitable topic for my research, let alone select the method I would use to investigate it. My major advisor recommended I take a course in statistics, and while I found it quite helpful in conceptualizing possible approaches to research, it was not until my second year, when I took an introductory course on qualitative research, that my research methodology began to take shape. The course provided a general overview of the different epistemologies and methodologies of the field. It also included a number of books and articles on qualitative research, case studies, and ethnographies, various chapters from the Handbook of Qualitative Research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), and opportunities to practice interview and observation techniques. A documentary theory class taken outside the School of Education helped increase my interests in visual culture and the methods associated with its study. I also developed more interest in exploring and working with "alternative" methods of generating data.

It was not until my third and final year of coursework, and the last class before my qualifying exams, that I finally settled on the idea of using images as a research methodology. My decision to use reflexive photography as my principal research strategy was supported by my observation that many teachers, students, members of community, and university personnel were taking photographs either to document an experience for the school or to use later in promotional materials. I have often wondered whether I would have decided to use this methodology had photographs not been an integral part of schools' cultural programs. The lesson

I learned here, is that in addition to taking courses and reading handbooks and articles on qualitative research, it is also possible to develop potential research strategies from careful observation of the particular phenomenon under investigation.

I soon discovered that simply reading about a particular research methodology was no guarantee that the process would go smoothly. The literature offered few answers to questions I had when problems arose. Reflexive photography seemed straightforward enough in principle—all I had to do was to give each research participant a disposable camera, provide them with guidelines for participating in the study, and then collect the cameras at the end of the day. One consequence that the literature failed to mention was that in giving participants responsibility for taking all the images I had no control over what pictures the participants were taking. This was especially worrying as there was only one opportunity to document a cultural event. When I walked around each school on the day of the event and looked at the range of displays and performances, I felt myself hoping that one of the participants had taken a picture of a particular set of objects. When I attended a presentation I felt myself wishing that someone would take a shot. Several times, I was tempted to grab a camera and take a picture myself; but I resisted the urge. Naturally, having to rely on someone I didn't know for data caused me great anxiety, and I wondered whether I had made the best decision. But as soon as I saw the images from the first research site, I knew that I had made the right decision and that my fear of not getting good photographs was unwarranted: the set of images more than adequately documented the phenomenon (see photographs A and B).

By using disposable cameras instead of digital ones, I was able to ensure that participants would take a set number of images and that they could not erase any. They were also inexpensive and readily available, though there was no guarantee that they would work properly or that the flash would recharge after each picture was taken. I thought about using a more expensive camera, but after seeing some of the photographs taken using the disposable cameras, I was convinced that there would likely be a similar percentage of images that were either too dark, too light, or with an index finger blocking part of the image. After looking at the more than 700 images taken from the three research sites, I was confident that there were sufficient numbers of photographs with a range of subjects that could be used in the eventual analysis of these events.

Design and Structure of Cultural Outreach Programs

My research project began with the selection of three outreach programs designed by universities in the Midwest of the United States for students in K–12 school

communities that are ethnically and racially “homogenous” (>90% White²). Generally, these programs are coordinated and organized by the universities international students’ service personnel who are often in direct contact with international students. Undergraduate and graduate students often serve as coordinators for the various activities and act as intermediaries between the international students and the program directors. At the beginning of each semester, international students are solicited by university personnel and faculty to participate in these outreach programs. These programs are promoted as opportunities for these students to enhance the cultural awareness of students in school communities and as opportunities to expand their contact with “American” students. In addition, the university sends information and brochures to administrators and teachers in local K–12 schools informing them of the availability of their outreach programs. The participation of international students is typically voluntary³ and visits are generally scheduled when a specific request from a school has been received for an individual to speak to students about a particular country or current issue. One university in this study, however, actively recruits international students from overseas to attend their institution and in return for their participation in the outreach program, they receive a significant reduction in tuition. International students involved in these programs generally do not receive any training from the university prior to the school presentations.⁴ Information on how to design and conduct a workshop is usually gathered through informal conversations with other international students from their home country who have prior experience working in the program. They can also discuss issues with university personnel and graduate students responsible for coordinating the events. While teachers and administrators from local elementary and middle schools may be involved in discussions about dates,⁵ locations, and areas of interest, university personnel and

² Demographic information about each potential research site was obtained from profiles of each community and from the United States Census (2000).

³ International students who volunteer their time do not receive any remuneration for their participation. Some universities do offer students transportation to the school while others may offer a small stipend.

⁴ Of the three universities involved in the study, only one provides training to international students via a mandatory weekend workshop on how to design and tailor information to a particular grade or panel. Students who are interested in participating in class presentations must complete this credit course that they also pay for as part of their tuition.

⁵ Interestingly, all of the events in this study took place on a Friday. One event was both morning and afternoon while two were conducted only in the afternoon.

international students on campus are generally responsible for the design, content, and structure of the presentations and workshops. The role of the school is typically one of “support.” Individual teachers or school committees arrange for the scheduling of students during the day and coordinate with the parent teacher organization (PTO) to provide refreshments and assist in getting the school ready for the event.

Commentary

The selection of potential research sites can be a time-consuming process for any researcher and one with significant implications for their investigation. My decision not to look for research sites locally was based, in part, on the fact that many graduate students from the University of Wisconsin-Madison were already conducting research in neighboring schools. In addition, I was interested in comparing different approaches to the design of these cultural events, it would be necessary for me to look at universities in other states in the Midwest. Of course, this decision meant that I had to scroll through a number of university websites to determine whether they had a cultural outreach program, and once I had selected one, I would have to drive long distances to meet with university faculty and school administrators to discuss my research agenda. In two cases, after doing all the preparatory work—after looking at information online and then taking the time to visit—I was unable to include the school and university in the study due to factors such as program design and date of event. In the end I was able to locate and work with three sites where there was little or no research underway. Of course, it meant a lot of driving for me. A number of factors were important in choosing the type of qualitative research I wanted to conduct; for example, whether I would do a case study or ethnography: I had to travel to get to the schools and universities, the events occurred on one day of the school year rather than over the course of the academic year, I had limited funding to visit out-of-state research sites, and I was interested in examining the design, structure, and implementation of a range of programs that were geographically isolated from each other. I had to consider the amount of time I would be able to spend at the schools and universities, the types of data I was interested in generating, and the types of relationships with the research participants that were necessary for an investigation of these events. After reading a number of ethnographies, I realized that I would be unable to meet the criteria required for an ethnographic study due to the limited amount of time I would be able to spend at each research site. I decided that a case-study approach would be the most effective.

Once I had selected the research sites and defined the type of research I wanted to conduct, the next major challenge was to obtain access to the sites and participants needed for the study. I naively assumed that after I had satisfied the criteria for The School of Education’s institutional review board (IRB), this documentation was sufficient and would comply with each institution’s guidelines for conducting research. I had signed copies of my proposal from my committee, sample consent forms, and approved IRB documentation. However, I soon discovered that while the universities and schools were generally satisfied with the forms, these documents did not guarantee automatic access to a potential research site and that each institution had its own criteria for conducting research that I had to meet prior to beginning the study. For example, one school district had its own IRB and forms that had to be turned in at specific times of the year. Another school required a meeting with the district curriculum coordinator and the school principal. All that was needed in a third district was a telephone conversation with the superintendent of the school board, who gave his permission over the phone. To complicate matters further, while I had satisfied all the university’s criteria for conducting research, I would often not know who to contact at a school until the university had received a request for a speaker from a teacher at one of the local elementary or middle schools. This meant that there was often a very short time between finding out the name of the school the university was visiting and date of the event to begin the process of contacting district personnel to get permission to conduct my study and sending out of the necessary consent forms. Given the uncertainty of the process and the chance that I would not be granted access to one of the identified research sites, I found that I had to contact additional universities and schools, and complete additional sets of IRB forms. Although this demanded extra travel time and work, it gave me further options to deal with unexpected situations. In one case a university decided to bring some elementary students from local schools onto its campus to attend a cultural event. This made it impossible for me to contact the schools and obtain the necessary consent forms signed in advance by all participants.

International Day, K–5

The international day at Jackson Elementary School⁶ was organized by the local state university and involved more than 80 international student participants. The program consisted of individual classroom presentations

⁶ All school names used in this article are pseudonyms.

in the morning, a lunch of authentic Malaysian cuisine, and a cultural finale in the school auditorium in the afternoon. The classroom presentations⁷ were 25 minutes in length and generally focused on one country or region of the world, although some presentations involved the participation of international students from as many as three different countries.⁸ The structure of the presentations included the following elements: a greeting and introduction by international students wearing traditional clothing;⁹ the use of a globe or map to locate the country, capital, and landmarks; a discussion of the meaning of the country flag; a language exercise where elementary students would count up to five and/or greet each other in the presenter's language; an overview of the exhibits, which included cultural objects, books, posters and photographs; an opportunity for elementary students to try on a variety of national costumes; and an introduction to, and demonstration of, a game or activity. If time permitted, students and teachers could ask questions.

Although it was the second time that the local university had visited this school to conduct the daylong event, for most school students at Jackson it was their first experience with international students. The day consisted of moving from classroom to classroom with teachers. Each student carried a "passport" on which to write down information about each country. They also had the presenters write a few words in their language as proof of the students' visit. At the end of each presentation, the principal would inform students that their visit to the country was over and that the "plane" was getting ready to "depart for the next destination."

The cultural finale consisted of a flag parade, dance and music performances, a fashion show, and a song that everyone sang on the theme of difference. In the flag parade, which began with the first "International Day" back in 1989, international students carried a flag onto the stage in the auditorium and announced the name of their country. Dance and music performances included exhibitions of Tai Chi, a Nepalese dance, and a guitar solo. A number of students from Jackson Elementary School had been selected to wear "costumes" provided by the university and representing various countries.¹⁰ As both international and elementary students exhibited their clothing on stage, they each gave a short commentary on their attire. The finale concluded with an international student leading a rendition of the song "Love in Any Language,"¹¹ which reflected the theme of diversity.

Commentary

Qualitative research is a process that requires the ability to adapt and respond to unanticipated events. I had spent weeks leading up to conducting my first study of these cultural events making sure everything would be ready to go on the day of the study. This included testing, checking, and numbering the cameras; collecting consent forms and gathering the names of the students, international students, and teachers; sending out consent forms to parents of children who didn't want their child photographed; and going over the schedule for the day with the school principal and the program director of the outreach program. It was an exciting moment for me as this site represented the start of the process that I hoped would provide me with the data necessary to write my dissertation. To make sure things were in good order, I arrived at school an hour early. However, as soon as I stepped into the school office, I was informed that a parent of one of the student participants had called and decided that my "sample size" was too small and that his child would not be participating. I called the parent and we had a conversation about the study, but I was unable to change his mind. Two international students and one elementary teacher were unable to attend due to illness. My immediate concern was to find replacements before the day started as I had stated in my proposal that there would be at least three elementary students, three teachers, and three international students taking photographs during the study. As I accompanied the principal and the program director to find individuals to replace the original participants, I realized that I should have anticipated the possibility of people not showing up by making a backup list of additional participants. Although things did not match the ideal situation that I had in mind, we were able to find individuals who agreed to take photographs. As the volunteers

⁷ Classroom presentations were from the following countries: Bangladesh, China, Hong Kong, Brazil, Colombia, India, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Malaysia, Turkey, Poland, Nepal, Angola, Ethiopia, Sudan, Pakistan, Thailand, Korea, Taiwan, Palestine, Jordan, Syria, and Tunisia.

⁸ For students in grade K-2, the classroom presentations included "African Market," Bangladesh, Japan, South America, Turkey/Poland, Nepal, Malaysia, and Thailand/Korea/Taiwan. The schedule for students in grades 3-5 consisted of the following presentations: Kyrgyzstan/Latvia, Kenya, Nepal, China/Hong Kong, "Malaysian Restaurant," Pakistan, Bangladesh, India, and Syria/Tunisia/Palestine.

⁹ The wearing of "traditional" clothing is mandatory for all students participating in the classroom presentations. While most are informed of the need to bring clothing prior to their arrival in the United States, most have to write home to their families and have it sent. Depending on the country and culture, the purchase of a traditional garment can be an expensive investment for an undergraduate/graduate student.

¹⁰ A number of students in the fashion show provided their own outfits. Teachers were also encouraged to wear clothing from another country during the day.

¹¹ Patti Sandhi wrote the song, the lyrics can be found at <http://www.lyricsmp3.net/D24000/kk23799.htm>.

were signing their consent forms, I had all the participants meet me before they went into the classrooms to give them their disposable cameras and to discuss the guidelines for the day. I explained that they were free to document the event as they saw it; they should not let anyone else take pictures with their disposable camera; and they could take as many images on the roll of film as they wanted to, though they were not required to finish the roll. It is impossible for me to determine what impact these “replacement” participants had on the study, but I was sure that I had additional names of people to work with at the other two sites.

Cultural Awareness Event, K–5

The cultural event at Banyan Creek Elementary School consisted of four 30-minute presentations by international students from the local university. This was the third time the event had been held at the school, and it was planned to coincide with United Nations’ International Week. Teachers were provided with information about each of the presentations prior to the event, which ranged from Indian games and clothing, to shadow puppets from Indonesia, to songs from Honduras. While each class could sign up to attend one, two, or three of the presentations to be held in various locations throughout the school, no class attended all four. The presentation entitled “Indian Games” consisted of students playing “kho-kho,” an improvisation of tag in the school gymnasium. The other three presentations were designed with the following elements: a flag of the country; a visual display of cultural objects, such as souvenirs, photographs, t-shirts, posters, postcards, and clothing; an activity involving elementary students in a performance using shadow puppets or participating in a regional dance; discussions about general living conditions in the country; and time for questions from students during and at the end of the presentation. Students moved from one presentation to the other with their teacher without any form of documentation, such as a passport or notebook, to record information. At the conclusion of the event, international students packed up their materials and returned to campus.

Commentary

The process of conducting research requires flexibility and an understanding that a research proposal is precisely that, a proposal. When I submitted my proposal to my committee, I stated my interest in generating data on the perspectives of three different groups: international students, elementary or middle school students, and school faculty. At the first research site,

there were sufficient numbers of international students available to participate in the study, particularly to take photographs and then to be interviewed. However, at the second site, with only four students presenting, there were no additional students available to take photographs. This raised an important dilemma for me because I had the following question in my proposal: How do international students, elementary students, and staff members perceive the performative nature of these cultural events? How would it impact my study if international students were unavailable to take their own photographs? Given the inherent constraints of this outreach program in that it relied on the voluntary participation of international students, and the fact that the students presenting were unable to see the other presentations, it meant that only students and teachers were available to take photographs and be interviewed. Furthermore, of the three research sites in the study, only one had international students available to take photographs. The question for me as a researcher was how I could address the perspectives of each group if there was less data available from one of the groups. In order to maintain the integrity of the study, and to address this issue, I included the data collected for each group, emphasizing the perspectives of students and teachers and noting the difficulty I had in generating data from international students. I was disappointed that I was not able to fully achieve all of the research goals stated in my original proposal. However, the experience did challenge me to respond to several unanticipated situations by modifying my research while, at the same time, maintaining the integrity of the study.

Global Outreach, 6–8

Although it was originally advertised as an event for music students only, the 45-minute presentation at North Glendon Middle School was open to all students and included topics that went beyond music such as topics on South Africa. The presentation, designed by two international students from South Africa and the director of the outreach program at the local university, was intended to provide middle school students with a general overview of the African continent, with specific emphasis on southern Africa. As soon as they arrived at the auditorium, the presenters set-up their materials on tables at the front. These included posters on apartheid and objects from the region. Off to one side they displayed a large political map of Africa. The presentation consisted of the following: an overview of the geography of Africa with an emphasis on southern Africa; introductions and greetings in Xhosa, one of South Africa’s official languages; an overview of living conditions in black townships

through a story about a young boy named Themba¹² who had moved from the rural countryside to work in Johannesburg after his father failed to return from working in the gold mines; a talk about apartheid and its effects on people who were classified as “colored;” a rendition of the South African national anthem while middle school students stood and saluted the flag; and an opportunity for students to view displays of posters on apartheid and a range of cultural objects, including textiles, jewelry, and wood carvings from South Africa. The majority of the approximately 100 students in attendance then returned to their scheduled classes while the music students performed pieces from Africa in the music room. One of the presenters translated the lyrics of the songs into English and provided a commentary on the song’s social and cultural context. During the informal performance, presenters were invited to sing along while the middle school students played their instruments.

Commentary

The process of conducting research is not just about generating data. Just as important is maintaining sincere relationships about the intent and nature of one’s research with all participants involved. As a researcher, I was candid with all university personnel and school faculty about my interest in examining these events and did not hide the fact that I had questions about their program design, about whether they were actually meeting their stated goals, and providing students with opportunities to challenge stereotypes. I was interested in looking across all the programs and not focusing on just one. In response to a discussion I had about the rationale for my study, one university faculty member stated that it did not matter what I found because “they were going to continue with the program the way it was.” While I encountered some reluctance from university personnel about the nature of my study, as no one had conducted a study of the university program before, there was one program director, who, despite the information I had provided to her, was “suspicious” of my intentions in conducting the investigation and with the overall aim of my research. As a result, it was difficult at times to get information about upcoming visitations to schools, find out the names of international students who had participated in the program, and obtain replies to requests for an interview time.

I had met with all the international students who were participating in the event at this research site and had provided them with an overview of the study and its goals. All students were given the option of not participating in the study, and I was sympathetic when one student informed me that she did not want to be photo-

graphed. However, when she then claimed, unreasonably, that the research was exploiting her, I was at a loss for words. Until then, I had met no resistance to any of the requests I had made any of the participants, and I was dumbfounded by this person’s reaction to the study, in spite of the fact that I had sent her information by email and letter weeks before the event. As I had already spent considerable time making arrangements for the study and sending out consent forms to everyone, rather than changing the research site, which would probably have meant waiting months for another request from a school, we agreed that teachers and students would not take photographs when this person was presenting. The fact that the final set of images did not document this part of the program appears not to have had a significant impact on what participants discussed during the interviews, as this person decided only to talk about a book with the middle school students. Interestingly, I came to discover that this person’s objections were based on the fact that she was not being compensated for her participation. In any case, I was in no position to offer her any money as this is a question each researcher must answer when submitting forms to an IRB, and I had made no provision for such an eventuality.

Some Final Thoughts on the Research Process

In the introduction to this article, I stated that one of the reasons for me to research these outreach programs came from my desire to examine my own involvement in the design of such events. I would like to conclude by sharing some thoughts and insights that I have gained about the research process and the impact it has had on my ability to answer this question. In terms of a research methodology, I firmly believe that reflexive photography was the most appropriate methodological tool for an investigation of these cultural outreach programs in spite of the hurdles that I encountered. I do not believe that I could have generated such informative data if I had relied on a quantitative approach, such as a survey. The main reason for this is that the photographs not only helped the participants discuss what they saw in the image, but more importantly, they led to conversations that were often unexpected and unanticipated. For example, a number of the participants commented on the displays of cultural objects and their similarity to exhibitions of artifacts from non-Western societies they had seen in museums.

I have come to see qualitative research as “endlessly creative and interpretive” and that the photographs generated offered me unique possibilities that are both “artistic

¹² Sacks, M. (1992) Themba. New York: Lodestar Books.

and political” for writing the dissertation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 23). For example, *Let us now praise famous men: Three tenant families* (Agee & Evans, 1960), a portrait of depression-era sharecroppers, begins with a set of photographs that both stand apart from and reinforce the narrative. Using this model, my dissertation begins with 20 to 25 images, one picture to a page. The photographs are self-explanatory. They are representations of the cultural events. While I had originally intended to analyze the data from one theoretical perspective, the information generated from the interviews and an analysis of the photographs offered me the opportunity not only to draw analogies between these displays in schools and cultural exhibitions in museums, but to use an additional framework from which to examine and critique these events. In reading the interview transcripts of the students, teachers, international students, and university personnel, I discovered that the data from the study revealed the following points: a) there is no theoretical framework or model that guides the organization, design, and structure of these popular programs; b) programs offered by the office of International Student Services or ethnic studies departments often replace program that are developed locally by schools; c) programs represent an unthreatening approach to multiculturalism and presenters are encouraged by university personnel not to deal with controversial issues or topics; d) international students have not been included in conversations with university personnel about how they want to represent themselves; e) no formal evaluations of the programs have been conducted to determine whether they are actually meeting their goals of prejudice reduction; f) all three programs, despite being geographically isolated, have very similar approaches to exhibiting the cultures of non-Western societies; g) students and teachers retain superficial information about the presenters and the cultures represented. Given this information, I have come to the conclusion that the cultural event I organized more than 10 years ago was conceptualized using similar as-

sumptions and perspectives to those found in these current programs about how to represent peoples from so-called “third world” countries. I have also found that the continued use of such programs in school communities that are predominantly white may significantly impede the opportunity for students to develop the analytical tools necessary to examine their own role in the continuation of injustice and oppression in the world.

My experience conducting this first qualitative study using reflexive photography has led me to look at the use of this methodological tool to examine these types of programs at universities throughout the United States, and as an approach to investigate popular weeklong and month-long multicultural events, such as International Week or Black History Month. My hope is that this work will lead to a fundamental re-examination of the structures of these popular programs and to assessments of their impact on students in classrooms across the country.

References

- Agee, J., & Evans, W. (1960). *Let us now praise famous men: Three tenant families*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Collier, J. (1967). *Visual anthropology: photography as a research method*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd Ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp. 1–28.
- Gold, S. J. (1991). Ethnic boundaries and ethnic entrepreneurship: A photo-elicitation study. *Visual Sociology*, 6(2), 9–22.
- Harper, D. A. (1987). *Working knowledge: Skill and community in a small shop*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Michael Zambon is assistant professor in the Institute for Teacher Education at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. His research interests include multicultural education and postcolonial theory, with special attention on visual and cultural studies.

The College of Education Doctoral Student Association at the University of Hawai'i: Providing Peer Support and Community to Doctoral Students

Lynn Tabata and Jamie Simpson

A single description cannot accurately depict the “typical” PhD student at the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i. Our students come from a wide variety of backgrounds and circumstances. One student is the wife of a US Marine, pursuing her degree while her husband is stationed at Mokapu. She is planning to complete her coursework, comprehensives, and dissertation on a strict two-year timeline. Another student is a recent MEd graduate from the College of Education who has already completed a majority of her core requirements and is ready to move almost directly to the dissertation phase of her work. Another is an international student who has come to the United States for the first time and is facing the challenges of adapting to a new culture, learning a new language, and understanding a different education system while striving to making progress in the program. Yet another is a lifetime resident of Hawai'i with full-time professional responsibilities and three children. She attends one course a semester, and, on that basis, is making steady headway toward the degree. This lack of uniformity creates a set of distinct challenges to the PhD program at the College of Education, while, at the same time, offering the benefits and strengths of diversity.

Each student inevitably encounters numerous challenges and obstacles in the course of pursuing and completing their degree, and the range of these challenges is increased in proportion to the diversity of our student body. In their journey from novice to scholar, they must develop the knowledge and abilities to conduct original research. They must learn to critically examine and evaluate their work, and the work of other scholars, and learn the relationship between their work and the field of research. All this occurs within the context of meeting a wide variety of personal, financial, and professional requirements. The enormous challenge presented by this endeavor is evident in the figures: only 50 percent of all students entering doctoral programs nationwide will reach their goal of obtaining a doctorate (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992, p. 105).

Peer support and socialization are frequently cited in research on doctoral students as two of the most important factors in aiding student success during their graduate

studies (Anderson, 1998; Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Lovitts, 2001; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). However, the provision of support, and the sense of community that attends it, is often inadequate or simply unavailable. Doctoral candidates frequently complain about the loneliness of dissertation research and writing. They feel alone in a sea of academic requirements, striving to develop their own research, and struggling to meet individual professional goals. The College of Education Doctoral Student Association (COEDSA) was established to address some of these problems by creating a sense of community and providing peer support for doctoral students.

COEDSA is a student-based organization that continues a tradition of students helping students as they navigate the doctoral process. The association provides core support services in socializing doctoral students to academic life and in easing them through their critical transformation from students to scholars. For example, COEDSA brings new students together with specialization coordinators and veteran PhD students in a New Doctoral Student Orientation. Every August for the past ten years COEDSA has invited new doctoral students to meet together with experienced students and faculty. This meeting introduces them to essential support systems from the very onset of the program. For the past three years, COEDSA has also conducted workshops to help students refine their research skills. For example, there have been workshops on using EndNote, a bibliographical software program; researching electronic databases; and other essential resources that support their inquiries and enable them to use technological effectively. COEDSA also organizes an annual reception that brings students and faculty together to discuss various issues relating to their doctoral studies and to their future professional work. COEDSA is responsible for a full range of ongoing services: providing peer support and networking opportunities; conducting informational workshops covering topics of interest and relevancy to the doctoral experience; creating opportunities for faculty-student exchanges; and communicating information on a variety of services and resources available for doctoral students.

COEDSA is a relatively young organization. Its origins may be traced to the early 1990s. At this time, aware of the absence of appropriate support services available for doctoral students, a few people began to meet informally under the guidance of Dr. Linda K. Johnsrud, a professor in the educational administration department. The students formed a support group and met periodically to discuss their experiences, their research, and the highs and lows of being a doctoral student. These informal meetings continued until 1996, when, under the leadership of Vicki J. Rosser, a doctoral candidate in the educational administration department, who is currently an assistant professor in the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis department at the University of Missouri at Columbia, work was begun to expand the informal student group into an organization that would more formally address the academic needs of the College of Education doctoral students.

The result of this work was a document called the Five Guiding Principles, which articulated the goals and mission of the organization. These principles establish five key aims critical to the development and socialization of doctoral students in the college:

1. strengthen the professional development and research skills of doctoral students;
2. enhance the quality of doctoral training beyond coursework;
3. provide effective guidance through the stages in the doctoral process;
4. create a social and professional network with faculty and peers; and
5. foster collaborative research and dialogue through interdepartmental cooperation.

At the same time, the planning group also addressed the issue of governance by creating a new COEDSA Executive Council that would be composed of students representing each of the five areas of specialization in the College's doctoral program. They also agreed to hold monthly meetings to plan events and address issues of mutual interest and concern to doctoral students. Today the executive council includes one representative from each of the specializations to sponsor special events and facilitate the regular dissemination of COEDSA information.

Once the organizational and operational framework had been created, COEDSA began a series of support projects.

They established an electronic email listserve for the doctoral students. They obtained a room within the College of Education for doctoral students to study, work, and socialize. They developed an annual orientation for new doctoral students entering the College of Education. They arranged monthly workshops on assorted topics of interest. And most notably, they played a decisive role in changing the College of Education's doctor of education degree (EdD) to a doctor of philosophy degree (PhD). The success of these projects gave COEDSA greater visibility, credibility, and recognition within the College of Education. As a result, COEDSA has representatives serving on a number of College-wide committees and boards including the College Advisory Council and the Editorial Board of Educational Perspectives.

The success of COEDSA in providing assistance to doctoral students is based on its peer-support approach—doctoral students in many instances are the best people to help other doctoral students. COEDSA has been fortunate in obtaining the assistance of many volunteers over the years, representing all five PhD specialization areas. Each has taken an active role in the operations of the council and the work of the organization as a whole. They include

Curriculum and Instruction	Anne Ashford, Ranee Cervania, Chenling Chou, Kimmetta Hairston, Hazel Hasegawa, Jamie Simpson
Educational Administration	Lynn Inoshita, Joseph Sanchez, Vicki Rosser, Lynn Tabata, Ginny Tanji
Educational Foundations	Wallace Napier, Gabriel Molieri, Warren Nishimoto, Nancy Rice
Policy Studies	John Anderson, Michael Massey, Valere McFarland
Exceptionalities	Thomas Duke, Marcia Howard, Rachele Reed, Serena Shimabukuro,

COEDSA has also greatly benefited in the support of the faculty. Dr. Andrea Bartlett, Dr. Mary Anne Prater, Dr. Mary Jo Noonan, Dr. Linda Johnsrud, and more recently, Dr. Donna Grace, have served as faculty advisors to the organization. Numerous other faculty members have generously donated their time and expertise as panelists and workshop facilitators. The dean's office has also made important contributions by providing travel funds so that students can attend

conferences to present their research. It has also helped with scholarships, and has provided refreshments and resources for a variety of COEDSA functions, including the annual New Doctoral Student Orientation.

COEDSA continues to support doctoral students in the college. Over the next few years, COEDSA hopes to play a stronger role in the establishment of peer study groups to discuss reading, research, and writing. COEDSA also hopes to begin operating with an annual budget. Thus far, the organization has survived with small donations and on the goodwill of volunteer students and faculty. An annual budget will help to increase COEDSA's ability to distribute information while ensuring the sustainability of the activities.

To learn more about COEDSA's informational workshops, download workshop handouts, and locate doctoral student resources, please visit the organization's website at <http://www.hawaii.edu/coedsa>. COEDSA is always open to new volunteers to serve on the Executive Committee. If you are interested, please contact us at jamiesim@hawaii.edu.

References

- Anderson, M. S. (1998). *The experience of being in graduate school: An exploration*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L. (1992). *In pursuit of the PhD*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* (Vol. 28(3)). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Lynn Tabata is a doctoral student in education specializing in educational administration. She served as chairperson of COEDSA from 1999 to 2001. Her research interests include technology issues in higher education. She is currently writing her dissertation which examines faculty attitude on adoption of technology innovation in higher education and its influence on participation in distance education instruction and higher education policy.

Jamie Simpson is pursuing a PhD in curriculum and instruction at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa with an emphasis on arts education and research interests in teacher preparation. As a graduate assistant with the Institute for Teacher Education, she instructs and supervises preservice teachers. She also serves students and teachers through Honolulu Theatre for Youth. Jamie is the current chairperson of COEDSA.

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
College of Education
Educational Perspectives
1776 University Avenue
Wist Hall, Room 113
Honolulu, HI 96822

Website: <http://www.hawaii.edu/edper>