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An Interdisciplinary Approach Using Shared Competencies for Applied Doctoral Programs in Business and Education

Abstract:

Doctoral degrees designed for the continuing education of professionals are part of the global perspectives of diversity and expansion of practitioners’ work in business and education. A collaborative approach of shared competencies strengthens programs. In the global economy, the relationships between schools and business are significant. For example, the National Targets in Europe 2020 include five targets: (1) employment; (2) research and development; (3) climate and energy; (4) education; and (5) social inclusion. Each component includes an educational and business goal and standard (European Commission, 2014). Furthermore, the National Reform Programme in Denmark (2014) incorporates unique initiatives for Denmark in 2013 in addition to the National Targets in Europe 2020.

Practitioners involved in blending content knowledge with practicum experiences as part of applied research in doctoral level coursework are able to use experiences in their workplace to contributing to the related work in a global economy. Research supports the implication for applied dissertations in various fields, but recognizes variations between programs based on state accreditation, state regulations, programs that require state or industry standards (Auerbach, 2011; Baker, V., Pifer, M., & Flemion, B. 2013; Kyvik, S. & Olsen, T. 2012).

Doctoral programs must find a way to balance rigorous research applied to programs for practitioners, and define how this approach addresses issues in practical matters in work settings. If the work setting is a school, there are specific variables that impact the ability of doctoral students to analyze and share data. In work settings, variables that are similar but different (due to settings where children learn as opposed to a corporate setting) impact efficacy of research protocols.

Our experiences with various Ed.D. programs and DBA programs have resulted in programs of study that use similar competencies for students in each field as they pursue their doctorates, with a targeted focus on contributions to the fields that encompass diversity of practitioners and work sites. These transferable skills are integrated into the program of study and enable students to use program skills daily in their work environment.

In addition to the coursework from the doctoral education, practitioners attempting to earn a doctorate degree must balance various other life responsibilities, including but not limited to, work assignments, personal relationships, and community commitments. The extensive time commitments from all of these diverse roles jeopardize the student’s ability to focus and complete the program. According to Delmont (2011), there are, several key components should be embedded into the program to enhance the learning experience and to increase the possibility for doctoral student success. Several considerations for review include convenience and flexibility in course delivery, relevant curriculum presented in a predetermined sequential format to ensure students have access to required courses at the appropriate time in the program, clear learning outcomes, well-communicated completion milestones and processes that lead to successful completion of the dissertation. A cohort approach can
help benefit doctoral students by enhancing the community of learners which provides opportunity for collaboration and support (Ford & Vaughn, 2011).

This workshop session will enable participants to discuss parameters that work and develop, and enhance their programs. Focus on variables include: program completers; residency options; advising protocols; alignment of courses; practicum requirements; course sequences.
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Results from the workshop on issues in the design of professional doctorate curricula that took place at the International Professional Doctorates Conference in Cardiff, UK, March 2014 will be presented for further discussion at this workshop. The workshop will explore some of the salient issues involved in designing curricula for professional doctorates (PDs), at a time when the values and purposes of doctoral education are coming under increasing scrutiny from a range of stakeholders nationally and globally. These stakeholder perspectives include:

- the candidate – who is aspiring to personal and professional development;
- the employer – who requires a proficient, confident, autonomous practitioner;
- the university as doctoral provider – aiming to enhance higher education to reflect the needs of society;
- the professional body – enabling the candidate to practise effectively, according to appropriate professional standards; and
- the state/society – requiring economic growth and a return on investment (McAlpine & Norton, 2009).

In this complex and changing scenario we discuss what kinds of curriculum models are available in the design and development of a professional doctorate? To what extent do these complement or challenge existing and developing models of the ‘traditional’ doctorate, to address the needs of the various stakeholders? Specific issues around three major themes will be discussed: the values and purposes of PDs, their structure and content and the selection of appropriate pedagogies. Each theme will consider the various stakeholder perspectives outlined above.

**Theme A Values and purposes**

PDs are compared with the more well established PhD (Neumann, 2005), and there is evidence that some parts of the academy are sceptical about their purpose and value in comparison to PhDs (Taylor, 2008). Conversely, others have argued that PDs play an important part in the development of the knowledge economy (Fink, 2006). Clearly, there is a range of views on what a PD is for. But it is clear that there has been increased demand from candidates (Brown and Cook, 2010). With the increasing financial pressures on universities, it could be argued that this demand has provided an opportunistic solution through recruitment of full cost or surplus making students. Doctorates have traditionally been seen as ‘loss leaders’, with candidates often being taken on as research assistants with career goals closely predicated on those of their supervisors, to align with specific university defined subjects of interest, and to support funded research projects. However, with PDs most candidates study part-time and many have career goals that are externally focused on their respective professional fields or communities of practice: a very different candidate demographic emerges. Also, with employer sponsorship and some PDs being connected to a license to practise, some professional areas may be better able to afford the PD fees than others. How should the university, as provider of PD educational opportunities, consider these value based issues? What values do our universities use in deciding which PD to validate and what is included in their curricula?
Theme B Structure and content

PDs are normally structured around a substantial undertaking of research that can appear in many different forms e.g. a thesis, project, portfolio or artwork. The approach taken to the research is often that of practitioner-led research requiring a focus upon practice and outcomes of the research that have some direct implications for practice. The relationship between theory and practice, especially in comparison to the more long-established PhD (Costley, 2013), can be of a reflexive nature with practice informing theory. Curriculum models can be modular and so the teaching and learning of combinations of research methods, research proposals, professional knowledge and reflective essays that may also include possibilities for accreditation of prior learning, are often included in programmes of study. Although this emulates postgraduate training that is usual in most doctorate study, because it is presented in the so-called ‘taught’ area of universities it becomes part of a quality assured process. There can be some confusion in the university about how this works, under whose remit the components are presented, i.e. teaching and learning or research. The design of curricula for professional doctorates, in particular the taught component, needs to be sufficiently flexible to enable not only a deep, reflexive engagement with theory-practice and the development of research skills at a high order but also the formation of what might be called timely, impact-driven connections to the world of professional practice. Does the design of curricula entail an understanding of professional spheres outside of the academy, the purposefulness and creative intentions that are often the impetus for PD candidates and the research needs of candidates undertaking research in their own organisations or professional areas?

Theme C Pedagogies

Pedagogy characteristically encompasses activities such as teaching and learning methodologies, curriculum design and assessment (Leach & Moon, 2008); but it is also increasingly about construing these and related activities in more systemic, collaborative ways (Schatzki et al., 2001; Hmelo-Silver et al., 2013). The nature of the professional doctorate - not least through its established record of including a significant ‘taught component’ (QAA, 2011) - highlights the added importance for pedagogy of fostering and building on relationships, professional conversations and learning cultures within a wider social context (Facer, 2011), in ways that extend beyond the higher education institution to work based and other community settings (Sandlin et al., 2010). As Loxley & Seery (2011) put it, reviewing the professional doctorate from the student perspective: ‘A little bit of context goes a long way’ (5). From the perspective of the developer of professional doctorates, salient issues now also include: peer learning strategies (Boud & Lee, 2005); signature pedagogies (Golde, 2007; Guring et al., 2009; Shulman, 2005); and blended learning approaches aiming to develop community-building and transformational learning (Kumar, 2013). These issues inevitably influence ‘supervision’ processes (Lee, 2008; Boud and Costley, 2007) and have attendant staff training requirements.

The workshop will provide a forum for the discussion and debate on these themes and includes:

a) a short presentation including feedback from a previous workshop on this topic;
b) discussion groups around the above themes and other concerns raised by participants; and
c) a plenary discussion aiming to synthesise the key points to enable some conclusions for the effective development of PD curricula.
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Engaging Doctoral Student Research to Create Course Content for Professional Development

Engaging students in research is a critical part of doctoral education. Additionally, doctoral students are often highly engaged professionals that bring much experience and motivation to the classroom. The doctoral program described in this presentation is an Ed.D. in Adult and Community College Education that prepares professionals in the fields of adult, higher, and human resource education. These professionals obtain positions as community colleges faculty members and administrators, workforce development professionals, leaders of learning in organizations, consultants, four-year university administrators, and faculty members. The programs has multiple goals however, one of the main objectives of the program is to create scholarly practitioners that serve as educational leaders in their respective fields.

The main goal of this presentation is to describe two examples of research based assignments, a q-sort assignment and a case study, that create professional development opportunities. Additionally, the presentation will provide the context of the doctoral program, an overview of the content of the doctoral program to prepare executive leaders and feedback from the doctoral students that completed the assignments.

Context of Doctoral Program

The executive format doctoral program in Adult and Community College Education at North Carolina State University is offered off-campus and seeks to develop professionals that serve as leaders in the fields of adult, higher, community college, and workforce development. Students in the program take two courses each semester and one course in the summer. After the students complete the coursework, they complete a comprehensive exam process and dissertation. Each cohort has between 20-25 doctoral students that are working professional in their respective fields of study. For each course the students meet in a weekend format from 6 to 9 pm on Friday and from 8 to 4 on Saturday. Each course meets four weekends. While the majority of the courses meet face-to-face, many of the courses do utilize the learning management system and offer components of blended instruction.

Content of the Program

The program contains coursework for an adult education core, electives in adult, higher, and human resource education, quantitative research methods, and dissertation hours. A description of the each of these areas will be provided.

Doctoral Student Class Projects: Research to Create Continuing Development
The two class projects that were used to create current content for courses by students researchers included a case study assignment and a Q-methodology research project. The case study was included in an organizational behavior course and the Q-methodology project was integrated into a current issues in community colleges course.

Case Studies. Students were assigned specific topics in the course on organizational behavior issues. Each group then used real life experiences to create cases that could be used to examine the issues. The student teams each wrote a cases, developed questions to engage professional development with the case, finally develop answers to the case, and presented the case to the class. The students then share these real life case studies that can then be used in professional development in their own professional situations as leaders. Examples will be discussed.

Q-Methodology Project. Students were assigned in groups and followed the protocol to conduct a Q-methodology study on current issues in the community college. The Q-methodology is a technical that allows researchers to examine the subjective view of subjects toward a topic. The Q-methodology protocol will be described. One example of a project that was conducted that gained insight into how counselors viewed career and technical education at the community college will be presented. The students collected the data and were engaged researchers on a topic at the local level. The research became content in the course.

The presentation will conclude with feedback from the students on both projects.
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This study was conducted at the University of Central Florida to inform the Ed. D. in Education program within the College of Education and Human Performance. The main purpose of the study was to determine the Dissertation in Practice (DiP) project types that should be allowed for use as the capstone project based on a needs analysis of K-12 schools and school districts. The secondary purpose was to inform the instructional design of the program to ensure the necessary skills and knowledge required is included in the program.

The study was conducted in the University of Central Florida’s Ed. D. in Education program and employed a qualitative approach to a needs analysis. Interviews were conducted with two distinctly different participant groups. The first group was comprised of administrators and teacher-leaders identified by a superintendent of a rural school district in Central Florida as “highly effective”. The second group of participants was comprised of current Ed. D. students working in K-12 education with more than 10 years’ experience.

This research identified specific project types that best support school improvement and should therefore be integrated into the Ed. D. in Education program as allowable project types for use as the Dissertation in Practice. The results also identified qualities of highly effective administrators and teacher-leaders that may be considered by program faculty for inclusion in the design and implementation of the curriculum for the Ed. D. in Education program.

Implications of this research include using the results to inform instructional practices and the allowable DiP projects for the Ed. D. in Education program. As this study was a needs analysis that serves as a basis for program instructional decisions, the results of this study may inform other Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) member institutions how to modify or enhance their programs as well.
The focus on this study was exclusively on K-12 education. However, many students enrolled in the program work in business, government, or non-profit settings. This research could be replicated to determine improvement project types that are commonly implemented in those settings in order to better meet the needs of all students enrolled in the Ed. D. in Education program.
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From Scientific Discovery to Health Outcomes: A Synergistic Model of Doctoral Nursing Education

Over the past 15 years, transformation of the US health care delivery system to improve
effectiveness, safety, and efficiency has become a national priority. This mandate includes a specific focus
on the delivery of evidence-based care by health professionals and acceleration of the rate at which research
findings are translated into practice (Melnyk & Fineout-Overholt, 2015). In response, a new model of
doctoral nursing education has emerged. The model includes two terminal degree options: the research-
focused Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and the practice-focused Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP). This
structure reflects the academy's awareness of the critical need for advances in nursing science as well as the
need for nurse leaders prepared at the doctoral level with a critical blend of leadership, clinical, and business
skills to develop, implement, and evaluate innovative models of care that provide the context for accelerating
the translation of evidence into practice. Under this arrangement, unprecedented opportunities for advancing
the scholarship of discovery, teaching, application, and integration (Boyer, 1990) have been created. The
discussion which will be presented includes an overview of the context, the evolution, and recent
developments in doctoral nursing education in the US and the inherent potential of the current doctoral
nursing education model for accelerating the rate of translation of evidence into practice to improve
population health through PhD and DNP collaborative learning and investigative efforts

The US Health Care System: A Context for Change in Doctoral Nursing Education

Between 2000 and 2006, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) published a series of landmark reports
highlighting the fact that despite spending more than any other country in the world on health care, the US
health care delivery system falls short when it comes to quality, safety, cost, and access. Through this series,
the IOM called for sweeping reform and challenged health care professionals to improve the quality of care
provided to patients. Prominent among these was a 2003 report outlining a new vision for health professions
education in the US based on five common core competencies: patient-centered care, quality improvement,
informatics, evidence-based practice, and the capacity to work in interprofessional teams (IOM, 2003). The
report served as a catalyst for acceleration of the evidence-based practice movement in nursing including the
integration of evidence-based practice content and competencies into nursing curricula and professional practice standards at the national level.

Collectively, the initial series of IOM reports referenced above have served to define the nature and impact of the current gap that exists between health care practice and the evidence base that informs practice in the US. This, in turn, has generated a national call for changes in the way knowledge and evidence are developed and applied in health care along with new study methodologies that are adapted to and integrated into the practice environment (IOM, 2007). The vision for this paradigm shift is being advanced through the IOM Roundtable on Evidence-Based Medicine. The Roundtable initiative was established in 2006 to provide a forum for dialogue and action that will change the way evidence in health care is generated and used to improve health care delivery and health outcomes. The overarching goal of the Roundtable initiative is to have 90% of clinical decisions supported by accurate, timely, and up-to-date clinical information and reflective of the best available evidence by 2020 (IOM, 2014). Participants include prominent US health care industry leaders and stakeholders. The results of their work have been summarized in a series of reports published since 2007 including a 2013 report in which health system leaders conclude that “Despite the accelerating pace of scientific discovery, the current clinical research enterprise does not sufficiently address pressing clinical questions. The result is decisions by both patients and clinicians that are inadequately informed by evidence” (IOM, 2013, p. 20). This realization has triggered a growing movement at the national level to improve the capacity of the US health system to conduct patient-centered outcomes research and to integrate research and practice (IOM, 2014). It has also generated a call to government officials, practitioners, educators, researchers, patients, and payers to participate in the development of a learning healthcare system that generates and applies knowledge in real time to provide Americans with better care at lower cost (IOM, 2013). The concepts of practice-based research and practical clinical trials that require collaboration among researchers, health care providers, and patients are central to this vision and provide an additional option for advancing rapid development and uptake of knowledge into clinical practice.

The most recent workshop summary report, released in 2014, explores the limitations of the nation’s current “well-intentioned but flawed” research system and the resulting tension between research interests
and health system priorities emphasizing the need for research that is more precisely responsive to the needs of patients, clinicians, and society. The report also focuses on describing the knowledge generating potential that exists within large clinical data sets generated through the normal course of health care delivery and the imperatives for integrating research and practice as a means of accelerating the translation of knowledge into care. The report highlights the significance of the recent establishment of the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Network (PCORNet). The vision for this initiative includes the establishment of a large, highly representative national network of health care information networks that will provide a venue for large-scale observational, interventional, and/or clinical outcomes research projects that will shift the focus in clinical research from investigator-driven to patient-centered studies by engaging clinicians and patients in the process (IOM, 2014). A fundamental premise of this vision is that the consolidation of data will provide the statistical power and rigor necessary for health care improvements; the network anticipates having data for more than 25 million patients. “PCORNet symbolizes a new approach to clinical research, one that is integrated into the delivery of care and that leverages its experiences, rather than creating a set of parallel infrastructure and processes,” (IOM, 2014, p. 1-2). Network members currently anticipate tackling a set of common diseases that include multiple sclerosis, sleep apnea, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, arthritis, major depressive and bipolar disorders, cardiovascular health, and hereditary breast and ovarian cancers---to name a few. They will also tackle a list of rare diseases that includes adrenoleukodystrophy, primary nephrotic syndrome, juvenile rheumatic disease, primary immunodeficiency diseases, Duchenne and Becker muscular dystrophy, and many others. Between 2004 and 2011, the IOM has also generated several reports specifically focused on advancing the involvement and the role of nurses in health care delivery and outcome improvements.

In 2004, the IOM released the *Transforming the Work Environment of Nurses* report highlighting the key role that nurses play in patient safety and calling for transformational leadership in health care organizations to effect the changes needed in order to improve patient and health care outcomes. The proposed changes also included the participation of nurses in executive decision making, in interdisciplinary collaboration, and in designing work environments and cultures that promote quality and safety. A similar
message was echoed in 2011 with the release of *The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health* (IOM, 2011). In this landmark report, the authors charged nurses with the task of being active leaders and partners in the transformation of health care and provided a series of recommendations for increasing the capacity of nurses to lead health system improvement efforts. The list included attaining higher educational levels to address increasingly complex health issues, ensuring that nurses engage in lifelong learning, removing organizational and regulatory barriers to permit nurses to practice to the full extent of their education and training, and providing opportunities for nurses to assume leadership positions and to be full collaborative partners with other health professionals in redesigning health care in the US. They specifically challenged private and public funders, government officials, academic administrators, and accrediting bodies to double the number of nurses prepared at the doctoral level by 2020 as a means of advancing health system improvements.

**Evolution of Doctoral Preparation in Nursing**

Doctoral preparation in nursing in the US has evolved over a period of more than 100 years beginning with the EdD degrees typically offered through colleges of education with little or no specific emphasis on nursing science. Between 1940 and 1970, the PhD in nursing and the Doctor of Nursing Science (DNS) degrees became predominant as members of the academic nursing community recognized the need for the development of knowledge to inform practice and to promote the credibility of the profession. Initially, the DNS was characterized as a professional degree with a focus on testing the knowledge generated through research in practice environments. Over time, the focus of these programs shifted toward research preparation and the distinctions between the DNS and the PhD became blurred. The literature is replete with information on the high degree of similarity between PhD and DNS degrees in nursing. Since 1970, many US universities have retired DNS degree programs in favor of the more widely recognized PhD in Nursing (American Association of Colleges of Nursing [AACN], 2001). Research-focused doctoral programs in nursing prepare graduates with the knowledge and skills needed to develop nursing science through original research, to steward the discipline in advancing the profession, and to provide professional and research mentorship for other nurses (AACN, 2010). Currently there is considerable dialogue at the
national level among nurse leaders, educators, and researchers regarding the need for transformation of PhD nursing education to align with shifts in the focus and nature of research and the evolving needs and expectations of society.

Today, interest in researched-focused doctoral nursing education remains strong with a 49% increase in program enrollments since 2004 and a 29% increase in the number of programs in the US between 2006 and 2013 (Kirschling, 2014). Despite these increases, the number of PhD-prepared nurses is not increasing proportionally or keeping pace with the need for basic and applied research-focused nurse scientists. Opportunities for intradisciplinary collaboration with doctorally prepared advanced practice nurses may provide some solutions. Interest in practice-focused doctoral nursing education has also escalated sharply in the US during the past decade.

Case Western Reserve University is credited with establishing the first practice doctorate degree program in the US in 1979 (AACN, 2004). The purpose of the Doctor of Nursing (ND) program was to prepare expert practitioners. By the turn of the century, practice-focused degrees in nursing were still rare with only a handful of practice-focused doctoral programs in nursing in the country.

In 1999, the AACN appointed a task force to update quality indicators for doctoral education and to address the differences among the PhD, the DNS, and the ND degrees. Taskforce members developed a dichotomous classification model in an attempt to summarize the state of doctoral education in nursing at that time. Under this model, doctoral nursing programs were categorized as research-focused or practice-focused. The PhD and DNS programs were allocated to the research-focused category but taskforce members struggled with classification of the existing practice-focused programs due to wide variation among the existing practice-focused doctoral programs. Members ultimately recommended that AACN appoint a second task force to focus on the elements of the model relevant to practice-focused programs.

The Task Force on the Practice Doctorate in Nursing was established in 2002 and charged with clarifying the purpose, goals, titles, and outcomes of the professional clinical doctorate in nursing. The work of the Task Force was ultimately summarized in a series of recommendations that included establishing practice-focused doctoral programs as a distinct model of doctoral education in nursing that would provide
an additional option for attaining a terminal degree in the discipline and prepare graduates for the highest level of nursing practice (AACN, 2004). At the same time, the Task Force recommended that one degree title be chosen to represent practice-focused doctoral programs and that the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) be the single degree title associated with practice-focused doctoral nursing education in the US. In 2006, the AACN outlined the curricular elements and competencies that must be incorporated into programs conferring the DNP degree. These are organized in two categories: foundational outcome competencies required for all graduates regardless of specialty or functional focus and specialty competencies that prepare the DNP graduate for advanced practiced specialization as delineated by nationally recognized specialty nursing organizations (AACN, 2006). Within this model, there is a strong focus on the development of knowledge and skills required for application and translation of research into practice and the integration of new knowledge to improve health care delivery and health outcomes. Leadership, interprofessional collaboration, information systems and analytic methods, and health care policy are also emphasized.

Interest in practice-focused doctoral nursing education has grown exponentially in recent years. Between 2004 and 2013, DNP program enrollments increased from 170 to approximately 15,000 students. Between 2006 and 2013, the number of DNP Programs increased approximately tenfold from 29 to 241 (Kirschling, 2014). The DNP movement started in earnest less than a decade ago and nurse educators and leaders are currently struggling to precisely define the role expectations for DNP graduates in practice, education, research, and health system improvement efforts during this formative period. Nevertheless, the DNP degree was conceived to achieve two primary aims: to improve practice expertise and to accelerate the translation of evidence into practice (Brown & Crabtree, 2013). Coupled with the national call for integration of research and practice and the possible need for reconsideration of the PhD research paradigm, the stage has been set for a new level of synergistic collaboration between doctorally prepared nurse scientists-researchers and practitioners that could put nursing at the forefront in terms of closing the knowledge-practice gap.
PhD-DNP Model of Doctoral Education: Opportunity for Closing the Knowledge-Practice Gap

As previously described, the health care environment in the US is currently characterized by an increasing demand for accountability, higher quality, cost containment, and evidence-based care. The translation of new knowledge to benefit patients has become a policy priority and the academy is under increasing pressure to demonstrate the relevance of research and doctoral education to solving the problems of society. The knowledge base generated through original research is growing exponentially with explosive advances in technology, medicine, nursing, and other health professions and the traditional systems for transmitting and infusing the knowledge into practice can no longer keep pace (IOM, 2013). The current model of doctoral education in nursing in the US has evolved, in part, in response to the recognized need to close the knowledge-practice gap and to create the needed interface between theory and practice.

Because the educational programs that prepare nurses with terminal degrees in both categories are likely to co-exist within the same nursing education unit in most academic settings, unique opportunities for exploiting the evidence base that informs practice and collaborative investigative efforts have been created. In fact, it seems likely that the expectation for such collaborative efforts must begin within academe with the education and socialization of future nurse scientists and expert clinicians to embrace new paradigms that incorporate practice-based joint research efforts and that establish networking, shared learning, joint publication, and sharing of resources as the norm. Such an arrangement is also conducive to the establishment of "win-win" academic research-practice partnerships and projects that provide superior experiential learning opportunities for doctoral students while furthering the attainment of the quality and safety priorities of health care organizations at the community level thereby contributing to attainment of population health goals at a broader level. Within these contexts, clinicians and health care administrators are uniquely positioned to work with nurse scientists to integrate new knowledge at the point of health care delivery and to evaluate the impact on the health of individual patients and patient populations. At the same time, the leadership and unique research expertise of PhD prepared nurse scientists is critical to the development, implementation, and evaluation of rigorous practice-based research efforts that will generate reliable and meaningful knowledge that can safely and effectively be applied in practice.
Summary

The PhD and DNP degrees represent complementary albeit alternative approaches to the highest level of educational preparation in nursing. Both are based on rigorous and demanding expectations and require a commitment to the advancement of the profession. The focus of PhD education is on knowledge development through original research while the focus of DNP education is on practice specialization and improvement of health care delivery and health outcomes through the translation of evidence. The DNP degree is in its formative stages and was conceived specifically to improve practice expertise and to accelerate the translation of evidence into practice (Brown & Crabtree, 2013).

“Translational science-to-practice initiatives call for dramatic cultural, organizational, and strategic changes in how clinical and translational research is conducted and eventually implemented to improve the health care of this nation and the world. The challenge of interfacing science with practice is complex and requires creative and multifaceted solutions generated by investigative teams of collaborators who offer diverse perspectives and expertise, often reflective of an interdisciplinary perspective,” (Magyary, Whitney, & Brown, 2006, p. 140). Despite these challenges, it is imperative that nursing as a discipline and as a profession steps forward to assume a key role in health system improvement efforts at the community and national levels as envisioned by the IOM. By working together, PhD prepared nurse scientists and DNP prepared practitioners have the opportunity to advance the knowledge that underpins practice, to integrate research and practice through collaborative investigate efforts, to lever the synergy inherent in the current doctoral nursing education model in the US, and to command a lead role in transforming the nation’s health care system.
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Abstract

The task of deciding a dissertation topic can be one of the biggest hurdles to overcome in completing a dissertation. Likely, at the beginning of dissertation writing candidates are still processing and making meaning of much of the content from their coursework. This leads to a lack of direction and focus because everything appears to be exciting ground for research.

The reality soon follows that a topic that is practical to their professional work lives, convenience of sampling, and time constraints ultimately push students to a topic that is more focused, manageable, and practical wherein the results can be applied in real-world educational situations.

Segol (2014) declares that “the dissertation being the final and most significant deliverable in the journey to a doctorate degree, students worry early and deeply about the topic of their dissertation.” (p. 108). For this reason, research into the selection of a dissertation topic and the faculty involved in guiding student dissertations must be supplemented.

Method

The central question to this investigation is, “What are students’ perceptions of how effective faculty are in helping them determine a dissertation topic?” To answer this question, in the spring of 2015, qualitative responses to an open-ended essay prompt completed by three doctoral candidates who are in the beginning stages of dissertation writing will be analyzed for emerging themes. First, the initial coding (Level 1) was conducted to label all data. Second, focus coding (Level 2) consisted of the category development from the larger set of data. Third, axial or thematic coding (Level 3) was utilized to develop refined themes from data. Then, where possible, theoretical or practical implications were discussed based on saturated themes that emerged.

Results

The open-ended responses from the three participants were from 1-2 pages in length. The results of the coding of the data resulted in three main themes. These themes are described here and examples of the data supporting the themes are included as support and continued consideration.

Prior Experiences: Key data points include “reflected back”, “connection to previous career”, “these [prior] experiences”, “opportunities also led to…”, “spent two years reading/writing”, “courses I took”, and “academic background and resources”.

Faculty: Key data points include “after working with my co-chairs.. narrowed my research”, “feel more prepared”, “chair was encouraging”, “met with chair”, “suggested new approaches”, “reviewed work” and “made recommendations”.

Research Interest: Key data points include “had not been done”, “untapped research”, “a topic I love”, and “I enjoy new literature”.

Two other topics were noted in the data from individual participant responses, but because they were not common to all three participants, they did not advance beyond Level 1 analysis but deserve mentioning.

Self-Directedness: (Participant 2) “confident in my ability”, “always been a good student”, “independent learner”, always been able to set a schedule and accomplish it”, “had a vision for my dissertation”, and “I figured it out.”.

Experts in Field: (Participant 1) “a practitioner in the field”, and “told me about”.

Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to determine candidates’ perceptions of faculty effective in helping them choose a dissertation topic. The results of this investigation showed, at the least, that there can be several factors that influence dissertation topic selection.

Prior experience, faculty, and their own research interest are factors shared by all three participants. The main emerging theme “faculty”, in whatever capacity, were effective in helping them, but it was not conclusive that the faculty members actually contributed to their choice of topic. The second most emerging theme was prior experience. Though rated as the second most emerging theme, the actually data points more clearly indicated a connection to helping them choose or influencing their topic. “Research interest” was considered to be effective in terms of students indicating that they wanted to “do something that had not been done”, and researching “a topic I love”.

Ultimately faculty are given credit for helping, reviewing work, and making suggestions, they do not appear to be the most influential factors that help doctoral candidates decide a dissertation topic. The results of this investigation can possibly inform candidates and faculty as to the benefits of articulating a topic selection strategy that may be based more in reality than relying on faculty ideas that stem from class discussions or informal chats. For faculty this research indicates a need for the creation of new opportunities to explore possible dissertation topics that include the use of the candidate’s prior experience, their prior skills, their interest in the topic, and the gap in the literature or research in the field.
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The research aims to compare nurses’ experiences of doing a professional doctorate in the UK with nurses’ experiences of doing a PhD in Turkey as a way of understanding how doctoral approaches contribute to knowledge development and the social capital of nursing.

The Bologna Declaration of 1999 had the aim of creating a European Higher Education area so as to benefit from the economies of scale and networks facilitating research and innovation. The Salzburg Principles of 2005 built on the notion of ‘one doctorate, different routes’, and established new conventions such as considering PhDs and professional doctorates as research, and to encourage a move away from the traditional ‘master apprentice’ pedagogical model, in order to introduce student-centred innovations enabling quicker completion rates and better quality controls.

The project arose out of a mutual interest in doctoral education by colleagues at the School of Nursing, Koç University, Turkey through an initial visit by Mehmet Ali Dikerdem from the Institute of Work Based Learning [IWBL] to talk about professional doctorate pedagogies current in the United Kingdom but not current in Turkey. Dr Margaret Volante as a nurse and core member of the School of Health and Education, also at Middlesex University, Doctorate in Professional Studies team, as well as supervisor to PhD students in Health and Education and IWBL, also joined in. Professor Ayse Ferda Ocakci from Koc University, Istanbul, was also involved from the start.

The research is informed by considerations of how doctoral approaches contribute to personal and social capital in nursing through the debates on knowledge production and the purpose of doctoral education: a PhD produces a professional researcher for the academy and a professional doctorate develops a researching professional for the situated production of practice knowledge (Dreher and Glasgow, 2011). Recent literature is beginning to address the learning of nurses (whose prior learning has been rooted in practice preparation) developed during research orientated doctoral programmes (Arvidsson and Franke, 2013; Conn, 2014). A line of enquiry that continues to report is evaluation of quality of nursing doctoral education and its expansion (Kim et al, 2014; McKenna et al, 2014). Both these literatures show the project is contemporary and of relevance to the community of doctoral level nurse educators. Moreover questions are being asked as to how nurse education prepares students at doctoral level to address the complexity of health problems which are transdisciplinary in nature and invoke the need for innovative methodologies (Sharts-Hopko 2013).

The guiding question for inquiry is: in the field of nursing practice how do professional doctorates contribute to knowledge development and can this be differentiated from the contribution of PhDs for faculty development? To address the question the project makes comparisons of doctoral approaches to knowledge development using two relatively new developmental areas in nursing, namely PhD education for nurses in Turkey and professional doctorate education for nurses in the UK. The Nursing School at Koc University has radically expanded its postgraduate provision, especially its doctoral intake. (The School is at a fairly advanced stage in its application to a US-based nursing accreditation body).

The research has been designed to compare and contrast candidate experiences of doctoral education in the two higher education systems, both marked by centralized quality control and assessment procedures. Since this is a preliminary investigation we proceeded with a purposive sample of 20 plus pilot interviews. Professor Ayse Ferda Ocakci interviewed 10 persons with nursing PhDs from 5 different higher education institutions [HEIs] in Turkey, Drs Volante and Dikerdem, in turn, completed interviews with recipients of 10 professional doctorates also in the field of nursing from a variety of British HEIs.
Both teams utilized a semi structured interview schedule which included a number of demographic filters (age, place of birth, place of residence, parents’ professions) before moving on to questions related to the experiential aspects of the doctoral pathways taken. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed prior to undertaking thematic analysis. Thematic analysis of each set of data occurred separately. With some knowledge and understanding of the countries’ higher education systems, Dr. Mehmet Ali Dikerdem will contribute to the evaluation of the data, its contextualization and subsequent interpretations.

Preliminary findings from the Turkish PhD data identify supervision and shared understandings of student and supervisor as crucial to a quality PhD experience. Findings from the British professional doctorate data (currently in the process of analysis) will be presented alongside that of Turkey and offer conference participants the opportunity to contribute to a comparative analysis of the findings.
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The Perception of Doctoral Students during the Dissertation Process

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the perceptions of doctoral students as they traverse the dissertation process. Findings from this study may help both dissertation students and their committees to better understand those factors that aid or hinder dissertation completion and address them accordingly.

Rationale and Background

National attention has recently been focused on higher education degree attainment rates (Chronicle of Higher Education). Improving doctoral graduation rates requires dissertation completion. This final milestone leading to the conferring of a doctorate is an undertaking many students find challenging (Burkard et al., 2014). This conclusion is supported by a study conducted by DiPierro (2007) which found that doctoral program attrition occurred most often during the dissertation process. In terms of doctoral students in the social sciences, the Council of Graduate Schools (2008) reported the national average for doctoral degree completion is 7-10 years. Liechly, Liao, and Schull (2009) attributed the extended timeline to the dissertation process.

Research has been conducted to investigate the different challenges students experience during the dissertation process. Green and Kluever (1998) noted that in order to complete a dissertation, students must work independently while following the guidance of their dissertation committee. In addition, students must take personal responsibility for their progress. Compared to course work where success is attained by following clearly delineated requirements, dissertation students are often challenged by the level of independence and personal responsibility required to complete the dissertation (Blum, 2010).

Other studies have focused on the relationship between the dissertation committee and doctoral student. Gardner (2009) noted that this relationship had a direct impact on dissertation completion. Zhao, Golde, and McCormack 2007 defined the committee’s role as two dimensional consisting of both a technical and a support component. This aligned with the findings of Sambrook, Stuart, and Roberts, 2008 who concluded that a constructive critique given by the committee may be viewed by the student as criticism or a learning opportunity depending on the relationship established by the parties involved.

Demographic factors may also play a role in dissertation completion. Doctoral students tend to have outside responsibilities including jobs and families that vie for their time and attention (Cohen, 2011; Gardener, 2009). Balancing these factors may prove to be challenging for some doctoral students (Washburn-Moses, 2008).

Premised on the challenges that may impact the completion of a doctoral dissertation, the purpose of this qualitative study was to discover how doctoral students viewed the dissertation process.
Theoretical Framework

Using Locus of Control as the theoretical framework allowed the researchers to explore external and internal factors that may have aided or hindered doctoral students during the dissertation process. According to Rotter (1966) people perform tasks differently depending on their perception of whether they will achieve their goal. Premised on this, Rotter developed a continuum of responsibility based on internal and external factors that determine task outcome. Individuals exhibit an internal or external locus of control. “Internals” believe their behavior is mainly controlled by factors under their control that are internally controlled. These factors include effort, ability, and motivation. “Externals” believe outside forces, including luck, fate, and the will of others control their behavior (Rotter, 1966, 1982).

Academic success has been attributed to students’ feelings of control and their acknowledgment of responsibility (Colucciello, 2000). Grade point average and course grades were found to correlate with students who demonstrated an internal locus of control (Rose, Hall, Bowen, & Webster, 1996). A study by Sadowski, Loftus-Vergari, and Davis (1978) found that “Internals” were careful and confident decision makers and more reality oriented, factors that may impact on educational achievement.

In order to elicit responses that may help to explain doctoral students' perceptions about the type of control they exhibit and how it influences the dissertation process, open-ended research questions were formulated for this qualitative study.

Research Methodology

This qualitative study was conceptualized within the phenomenological tradition (Creswell, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). This research design was chosen as it allowed the voices of the participants who experienced the phenomenon to be heard (Creswell, 2009). The philosophical perspective guiding this study was social constructivism. This choice was premised on the emphasis social constructivism places on the distinct experiences of each participant based on his/her unique position or societal role (Patton, 2002).

Premised on the theoretical framework, open-ended questions for this phenomenological study were formulated by the researchers. After receiving permission from the IRB, students enrolled in doctoral programs in the social sciences who are engaged in the dissertation process were recruited as participants. Data collection was collected using an online survey that included a demographic survey and seven open-ended questions. Data analysis was conducted to reveal recurrent themes related to doctoral students’ perceptions of what factors aided or hindered their dissertation process. The narrative responses to the open-ended questions allowed the participants’ own contextualized stories to emerge (Moustakas, 1994; Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009).

Data Analysis

Data was collected and analyzed from participants who responded to the survey. The goal of data analysis was to extract emergent common themes from the narrative responses to the open-ended questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The data was coded to aid in the identification of patterns across the responses (Smith et al., 2009). The researchers through the use of inductive
reasoning, interpreted the data emerging from the participants’ responses and the extracted themes as empirical evidence of their perceptions based on their lived experience of the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 1998).

Findings

Analysis of the data garnered results demonstrating that students exhibit both internal and external locus of control. When asked who controls the dissertation process none of the participants felt the student had complete control of the process. The perception of all respondents was that control was jointly held by the student and members of the dissertation committee.

“I think that it is mostly my responsibility and the responsibility of the chair and the methodologist to help find ways to encourage the student to complete the process.”
“The doctoral student controls the doctoral process; unfortunately, the doctoral student is also under the time conditions of others, as the dissertation is not a solitary endeavor.”

When the question of effort was discussed, study participants felt it was mainly their effort that moved the process forward.

“It is obvious that the doctoral candidate must put forth the required effort and self-motivation to do well and achieve completion of the dissertation.”
“My efforts and commitment to communicating with my committee and taking their advice and suggestions plays a big role in my dissertation process.”

Interestingly, although previous responses highlighted the influence of both internal and external locus of control on the dissertation process, when questioned about the role luck plays all students negated its impact.

“There is no such thing. Only random, completely objective occurrences.”
“There is no luck. Hard work, patience, perseverance, and the willingness to be corrected are key factors to success.”

The impact of influence over the dissertation process garnered mixed responses with participants showing a propensity to spread this construct between themselves and their dissertation committee.

“Not very much. It is through the chair, methodologist and the entire committee to help guide the prospective student to complete the process.”
“The doctoral candidate has control over the dissertation process; the only problem occurs because the schedule/time line does not go according to the candidate's schedule alone.”

The results of this qualitative study aligned with students attributing their success during the dissertation process to both internal and external factors. Knowledge of these issues may help students and their committees to be proactive in their responsibilities and interactions in order to reach the ultimate goal, dissertation completion and degree attainment.
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Abstract:

In the UK a number of models exist for doctoral education. The traditional PhD is studied full time often relatively soon after initial university education. More recently part time study for a PhD has become common, particularly for those who are seeking to achieve a higher academic qualification following Masters Degree award. This part time study is typically undertaken by more mature students, who may have significant challenges to face in balancing the time required to undertaken their doctorate with their family, work and social commitments. This PhD route is not altered in any way, other than length of study, to suit the needs of part-time study. As an alternative, a doctoral programme has been devised for experienced professionals. The Professional Doctorate is usually undertaken part time while the candidate is in full time employment. There are a number of different Professional Doctorate models in existence and the choice between a traditional PhD and a more practice focussed but still theoretical Professional Doctorate is explored here.

This paper describes a structured two-stage non-modular model which fosters a multi-disciplinary approach to support professionals to research a policy or practice issue related to their professional practice while still meeting the demands of doctoral study. The paper focuses on using this model within the Doctorate in Education (EdD) and the Professional Doctorate in the Built Environment (DProf).

On entry to the doctoral programme, the candidates are supported and given the time to develop a clear focus for their study, based on their understanding of existing practice and research. Academic writing is developed through the completion of mandatory Stage One research papers. The candidates then refine their research proposal and develop a robust design. Successful candidates then progress to Stage Two of the programme, where they work with a supervisory team to complete their thesis. The range of projects which have formed the basis of a DProf or EdD is explored in this paper using examples from candidates who are successfully progressing with their doctoral studies or have completed their theses. Reference is made to the UK Quality Assurance Agency and the UK Council for Graduate Education to demonstrate the robust requirements for all doctoral programmes in the UK.

Data are presented in a number of forms. Numerical data summarising applications and progress are complemented by qualitative data gained from academic staff and students. Candidates and academics are positive about the structure of the Professional Doctorate and how it supports the progress of candidates through their research. Using the candidates own words, the benefits and challenges experienced as they undertake doctoral study in the Built Environment and in Education are presented.

This is a successful model. The potential for Professional Doctorate research outcomes to inform and develop professional practice is demonstrated and key benefits to society are identified.
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Introduction

In the UK a number of models exist for doctoral education. The traditional PhD is studied full time often relatively soon after initial university education. More recently part time study for a PhD has become common, particularly for those who are seeking to achieve a higher academic qualification following Masters Degree award. This part time study is typically undertaken by more mature students, who may have significant challenges to face in balancing the time required to undertake their doctorate with their family, work and social commitments. This PhD route is not altered in any way, other than length of study, to suit the needs of part-time study. As an alternative, a doctoral programme has been devised for experienced professionals. The Professional Doctorate is usually undertaken part time while the candidate is in full time employment. There are a number of different Professional Doctorate models in existence and the choice between a traditional PhD and a more practice focussed but still theoretical Professional Doctorate is explored here.

This paper describes a structured two-stage non-modular model which fosters a multi-disciplinary approach to support professionals to research a policy or practice issue related to their professional practice while still meeting the demands of doctoral study. The paper focuses on using this model within the Doctorate in Education (EdD) and the Professional Doctorate in the Built Environment (DProf).

Challenges to traditional structure of the doctorate

A number of specific concerns have been voiced about the part-time PhD model in particular. The positioning of the research proposal at the start of the PhD is featured too early in the research process for the part-time candidate. Experience at Middlesex University has shown that candidates entering a professional doctorate already possess a rich mix of academic and professional underpinning knowledge which requires considerable time to examine and reflect on, before developing and justifying their proposed project (Armsby and Costley, 2009). In addition, the part-time PhD model, with its emphasis on academic supervision, provides limited potential for exposure to multidisciplinary reflective scrutiny by professional peers working within the field of inquiry. It is argued that traditional routes have sometimes failed to provide the personal and professional skills required for employment and their single discipline nature and focus on academic knowledge does not always meet the need of candidates involved in professional practice.

One response to these concerns was the development and rapid growth in professional doctorates in the UK from the early 1990s through to the present day (Scot et al., 2004). These doctorates were developed at a time when most new university programmes in the UK subscribed and conformed to validation procedures largely designed for taught courses. They were generally approved as a two-stage research degree of six years duration, with the first stage being a modular, credit-rated, taught programme.

This UK Modular Professional Doctorate Model addresses many of the concerns about the part-time PhD, particularly in terms of it being more professionally focused, its delivery of specific professional practice and discipline-related content, provision of time in Stage 1 to reflect on professional expertise and the development of research
skills required for the project, and its more user-friendly cohort experience where candidates can support one another.

However, there are problematic connotations attached to the descriptor ‘Taught Doctorate’ or ‘Taught Component,’ often associated with negative perceptions of the professional doctorate; this was expressed as recently as 2011, by United Kingdom Centre for Graduate Education (UKCGE, 2011). They argue that the terms ‘taught’ and ‘doctorate’ should not be combined, since they can be construed as being mutually contradictory when applied to graduate research degree programmes. The term ‘taught’ implies that a programme is not a degree by research. Stage 1 of these programmes is limited to Masters level study and is studied at a set pace for all, irrespective of ability and circumstance. As such, a Masters programme may not necessarily prepare candidates for the rigours of the doctoral Stage 2.

Revised structure of the doctorate

As an alternative, Anglia Ruskin has developed a professional doctorate which draws on the individual strength of the PhD in terms of its research focus throughout, one-to-one supervision and central training events, whilst taking advantage of the cohort nature of a single well-structured flexible programme. This results in a very supportive environment for doctoral candidates. They have all the support a PhD candidate receives with the addition of formal staged assessment, regular weekend workshops and a dedicated virtual learning environment. Although these programmes are general, they recognise that individual learning is not, with some candidates progressing more slowly than others. The non-modular Stage 1 facilitated this variation of pace.

Candidates entering the EdD and the DProf programmes at Anglia Ruskin University are typically experienced professionals, with many years of practice in their professional fields. For example, the EdD attracts headteachers, school teachers, college lecturers, early childhood practice leaders, health professionals who have moved into university lecturer roles. The range of projects includes leadership, motivation in secondary science students, homework in the primary school, school choice, successful inclusion, mentorship and practical assessment strategies for health professionals. Built environment projects are drawn from concerns over environmental issues, climate change, innovation design and construction practices, current business, and economic problems.

On entry to the doctoral programme, the candidates have an idea for their research project, but the project has not been thought through in detail. Candidates are supported and given the time to develop a clear focus for their study, based on their understanding of existing practice and research. They consider their own insider researcher role, and the opportunities and challenges this may present. This enables the candidate to consider some of the ethical issues of their proposed project, and to review their planned project if necessary. Academic writing is developed through the completion of mandatory Stage One research papers. These papers also support the candidate to think through issues, for example methodological, practical and ethical issues. Candidates are also required to present ‘research in progress’ to their peers. Feedback on the papers and the presentations supports the candidate to defend the choices they make for their research design. The candidates then refine their research proposal and put forward a robust design.

Successful candidates then progress to Stage Two of the programme, where they work with a supervisory team to complete their thesis, in much the same way as within
a traditional PhD programme, but with the addition of a continued cohort experience. In all cases, the project arises from the work practice of the doctoral candidate. They bring an issue from their employment practice, develop the research project, and the findings are used to make recommendations to improve practice.

Conceptualising the support mechanisms

The Professional Doctorate for the Department of Engineering and the Built Environment was created for mid-career and more senior professionals who wished to study at doctoral level and who worked in organisations that potentially saw the benefits that might accrue from this form of educational experience. It was designed to attract applicants who were unlikely to want to undertake the conventional PhD or who had missed this opportunity earlier in their career. The programme was to encourage a doctoral focus on professional practice from the start of the doctorate, set within the context of a structured learning programme. It derived its early nature from the adult learning theories of Knowles (1990) and Work-based learning theories of Brennan and Little (2006), Conner (2005), and Nixon et al. (2006). Reflective practice was set up as a key starting point for candidates (Schon, 1991; Cowan, 2006). As the programme developed with time it drew heavily on the work of Garnett, Costley and Workman (2009) to form a community of professional doctoral practice. It was to have potential value to employers, with possible wider implications for professional practice in the discipline. As Armsby and Costley (2009) advocate, candidates would be working with real-time projects directly related to their place of work or practice and the high level learning that results would inform their future research and development needs. According to Costley, Elliott and Gibbs (2010), professional practice, rather than specific disciplinary knowledge, should become the content and context that shapes the nature of the experience of a professional doctorate, and this, in turn, shapes and provides new insights into the workplace.

The candidates, who require a Masters Level qualification to enter Stage 1 of the programme, work together as a peer-supporting cohort, both at the workshops and online, exploring professional practice issues, theoretical underpinning and research design, using a variety of active learning formats, with support from their supervisors. Working as a small cohort, candidates tackle such problems and issues collectively by listening to the advice of the group and learning from their attempts to change things in an action learning environment. Candidates present their case and identify problems to the group of non-specialist fellow candidates and staff, who ask a series of simple but challenging questions. In this way, the candidates learn to defend their case in a robust manner as a result of the challenging interrogation of the group. Strict deadlines are set for the submission of three research papers to assess candidate early progress. The most important aspect of the assessment is its formative nature, with Stage 1 preparing candidates for the rigours of Stage 2 (Cowan, 2006).

Figure 1 illustrates how the conceptual framework was developed to support candidates. The conceptual ideas from community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991), work-based learning and adult learning were combined to produce the practical support mechanisms of the workshops, assessment and the virtual learning environment.
These supporting mechanisms developed from a sound theoretical and practical basis over the lifetime of the early years of the Built Environment Professional Doctorate. A very important aspect of this was the community of practice which emerged. A key characteristic of this professional community is that, whilst individually candidates lack confidence in academic matters, collectively they can perform at a very high level. As each candidate presents their work for the scrutiny of others (Bolton, 2005), the collective judgements of the community on the quality of the work are of the highest quality. Often the candidates are more critical than the staff present. All candidates who have completed their viva have commented that the community was influential in preparing them for the rigours of the viva. It was clear also that the whole community could benefit from each candidate presentation with considerable incidental learning taking place.

Applying learning from the DProf Built Environment to the EdD

The EdD originally commenced as a programme within this university in 1998. Fifty two (52) candidates were recruited between 1998 and 2005, in annual cohorts varying in size from thirteen candidates to a single candidate. Of these candidates, two left with an exit award of Post Graduate Diploma. Only eight (15%) of the original 52 candidates completed and gained their doctoral award. The mean time to completion was 7 years 2 months, with a range of 3 years 8 months to 11 years 9 months. Attrition at this time (measured as candidates withdrawing with no award) varied between 50% and 100% between cohorts. Clearly both personal and programme issues were present which affected successful progress and recruitment was suspended from
2005. On examination, although candidates were registered on a professional doctorate the programme was not operating as such, with few of the characteristics normally associated with this type of award. A new approach was required and the principles developed on the Built Environment Professional Doctorate were adopted.

This revised EdD programme began recruiting in September 2011, with a new programme leader and a different team of academic staff. The academic staff were ‘invited’ to participate based on their area of expertise and their interest in working closely with doctoral candidates. This ‘invitation’ to be part of the team identified the different skills, knowledge and experience needed by academics who were working with doctoral candidates, and formed the basis of what has become a strong, small team of eight staff. Other staff occasionally take roles in assessing work or contributing specific sessions based on their expertise and arranged on an ad hoc basis. The main team of academics support the delivery of the six weekend workshops per annum, with split sessions for different year groups. These academics also form the main team of assessors for doctoral papers (each paper being marked by two assessors) and take supervisory roles across EdD and PhD programmes.

Table 1 identifies the recruitment to the EdD since 2011, and retention and progression of candidates. Current candidates are undertaking research into fields within higher education (27), further education (3), secondary school education (6) and primary school education (7).

Table 1. Data from 2011 – 2014 EdD cohorts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year started</th>
<th>Number recruited</th>
<th>Withdraw with PG Dip</th>
<th>Currently on programme % (n)</th>
<th>Expected submission of thesis within 5 years</th>
<th>Current time on programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71 (10)</td>
<td>71 (10)</td>
<td>3 yrs 7 mths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82 (9)</td>
<td>82 (9)</td>
<td>2 yrs 7 mths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 (8)</td>
<td>75 (6)</td>
<td>1 yr 7 mths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 (16)</td>
<td>75 (12)</td>
<td>0 yrs 7 mths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data demonstrate much higher retention rates (71 – 100%), albeit with candidates who have not yet completed their programmes, and expected completion times which are much shorter. The fifth column of Table 1, expected submission of thesis, is a judgement based on markers of progress, and on knowledge of personal circumstances of individual candidates through annual monitoring reviews. Table 2 below indicates the data on which these judgements are based for the 2011 cohort.
Table 2. 2011 cohort: Evidence for expectation of thesis submission within 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker of progress within EdD</th>
<th>Passed all Stage 1 papers, completed proposals accepted.</th>
<th>Data collection commenced or completed</th>
<th>Confirmation of candidature completed (due date July 2015)</th>
<th>Thesis submission date agreed before Dec 2015 (4 yrs 4 mths)</th>
<th>Thesis submission date agreed before July 2016 (4 yrs 11 mths)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of candidates completed each stage (N=10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data provide strong evidence of successful progress of candidates with their research projects. From this cohort, there have been eight peer reviewed publications, and presentation of fourteen external conference papers, in addition to numerous poster presentations and internal conference presentations.

In addition to the data presented above, candidates on the programme provide feedback each time they attend EdD workshops. The feedback has been extremely positive. Candidates are invited to make anonymous free text comments to evaluate the workshops and offer suggestions for developments on the programme. Typical comments include:

‘Valuable feedback to support writing the paper’

‘Really useful to share and get feedback, it helps me think’

‘I now have my arguments much clearer in my head, having to justify to peers is scary, but really makes you think’

‘As always, these workshops help me to stay focussed and to plan step by step to keep moving forward’

‘I was really nervous about presenting my ideas to the group, but they asked me really helpful questions, and gave me ideas to improve my design’

Both quantitative and qualitative data indicate that the programme supports well motivated candidates to progress with their research and with writing up their research. Quantitative data collection will continue, we expect to be able to confirm retention on programme and time taken to successful completion. The data confirm that the
change of approach to align to that of the DProf Built Environment is linked to a positive impact on progression.

Conclusion
The research has delivered a flexible non-modular two-stage curriculum model which enables academic practice to support the professional development of candidates as they strive to improve their professional practice by engaging in doctoral level work. The research has revealed the essential elements of support for a professional doctorate. Well-motivated, self-managed and largely self-directed candidates still require appropriate but flexible support mechanisms to complete a professional doctorate within a realistic timeframe. Strong management of a well-structured programme where there is carefully constructed synergy between the candidates’ doctorate, its supporting mechanisms, and their own professional practice are crucial to their success.
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ABSTRACT

A mixed methods analysis of doctoral students’ preparation in research methods in professional practice doctorates in the UK and USA and the consequential relationship between courses taken and capstone design.

In 1994, Gibbons et al acknowledged the changing nature of knowledge production and subsequently proposed that there were typologies of knowledge which they referred to as ‘Mode 1 Knowledge and Mode 2 Knowledge’ (Mode 1 being a uni-disciplinary or “pure” type and Mode 2 as knowledge generated from practice with strong applied focused). Mode 1 is uni-disciplinary, is generated in formal academic settings, has homogeneity and autonomy and is subject to traditional forms of quality control that is the peer-review process. Mode 2 knowledge is, by its very nature, focused on real world issues and problems and as such takes a multi-disciplinary approach which emphasises the applied nature of knowledge production. This is the underlying assumption of the study and as such it will have two main dimensions.

The first is to explore the work / professional orientated nature of the professional doctorate, in comparison to the traditional Ph.D. This will require an underpinning methodological approach, which familiarise the students with a range of methods appropriate for the development of practice. In addition many professional doctorates require an overarching methodology, such as action research to facilitate this process. In preparing candidates for their research studies, institutions provide a range of courses. This study will examine the context of these preparatory courses. An exploration will also be made both of the methodologies candidates use and the particular data methods used in the design of the doctoral research.

Secondly, this research study will examine the variety of ways in which professional doctorate programs prepare candidates for their research study in the UK and the USA. The first major consideration is to differentiate and categorise the variety of programs, this categorisation will act as the unit of analysis. Identified differences and similarities between and across programs will be examined, as well as the differences and similarities between the USA and UK.

Aims:
To identify approaches to the preparation of doctoral students in research methods.
To identify differences in PhD and Professional Doctorate programs
To examine the differences and similarities in the preparation of UK and US candidates
Design:
The design of this study will be mixed methods. A survey of universities offering doctoral programs will be carried out, subsequently qualitative interviews will be completed with a selected sample. The trends and issues emerging from the survey will be explored and developed through the qualitative interviews. Reasons for the trends and particular strategies will be explored data and this will give the research an explanatory dimension. The data will be analysed by SPSS and thematic analysis.

Reference
Insider Action Research Doctorates: Creating Transformative Learning Spaces in Professional Development in Higher Education

Anne Graham-Cagney, Lecturer
Waterford Institute of Technology & Fellow, Trinity University
Karen E. Watkins, Professor
The University of Georgia

This paper reports findings from an exploration of how action research as a method of inquiry used within an Ed.D program at the University of Georgia can enhance the teaching-learning environment and create opportunities for transformative learning. The purpose of this study was to explore faculty perspective transformations about the nature of the doctorate through creating and delivering an innovative doctoral program.

Research questions guiding this study are:
- i) How do individual faculty learn their way through to redesign the doctoral program?
- ii) What facilitates faculty learning of this new paradigm?
- iii) What system barriers to learning do faculty identify in this process?

Conceptual Framework
This study is informed by Mezirow’s (1991) theory of perspective transformation, and Entwistle's (2003) work on enhancing teaching-learning environments.

Methodology
This interview study used qualitative critical incident technique (Ellinger & Watkins, 1998). Data analysis consisted of thematic coding. This study used purposeful sampling. For this study, participants were purposefully selected from the population of current full-time faculty members of a program design group who agreed to be interviewed. Individuals were contacted for a critical incident interview of approximately one hour in duration. In all, a total of seven interviews were conducted. All interviews were conducted by Dr. Graham Cagney. Data analysis was conducted jointly from coded transcripts with all individually identifying information removed (Lincoln, 1985).

Findings
Findings are given for each research question. These initial themes are based on a subset of the full dataset.

i) How do individual faculty learn their way through to redesign the doctoral program?

Hard work was one clear theme. One faculty member commented, “We had to read a lot, work really hard to come up with this innovative EdD... I worked on that committee more than I worked on all other committees that I was on combined.” Another noted that while it was work, everyone’s contribution was important: “So we each brought such unique perspectives that really went into our version of what a scholar practitioner was.”
Learning from the experiences of their students was identified by all with some focused on the action research process itself, “Yeah, I think the core project conceptually they kind of get it - until they get into it. And then, it’s complex and it’s very messy. And I think that’s what’s been an eye-opener for myself as well. . . . And what happens in an action research dissertation is you have the opportunity to entertain all that complexity and reflect on it and deal with it. . . . . each of these journeys were so different.”

Dialogue and a student-centered vision paved the way for innovation. As one person said, “So we had a truly collegial, a sense of we can be different, we can think differently, always keeping this interest of the student at heart, that’s the bottom line. You have a different idea, I have a different idea, how do we make this work so it enhances the student’s experience.” For some, the experience took them outside their comfort zones. Another said: “But it was like, I don’t know, eating stones, you know? Grinding stones, like it’s different.”

ii) What facilitates faculty learning of this new paradigm?

The team and the collective wisdom from that team was critical. One person noted, “So that’s how we did it but it always changed based on the collective.” The sense of ‘we are all in this together’ permeated the interviews. Another commented, “We had a common sense of discovery.” Ideas were welcomed but perhaps not always transformed: “Within the team people always welcomed, people always gave an ear to a different perspective, but in the end the dominant discourse, which is really, pretty much status quo - prevails.”

A similar facilitator was occurring in the cohort itself. Students became resources for one another on multiple levels. A faculty member said, “Some students said like at 3.00 am in the morning I sent a message to the cohort and a couple of students responded right away. All of them were awake at that time, the student found comfort even though they did not give her an answer. There’s somebody out there also struggling at the same time that she’s struggling; she can’t sleep - they can’t sleep.”

A facilitator of learning for both faculty and students was the power of the dissertations that grew out of this experience. “But it really is a way, a strategy that they can take into their workplace. . . . And it’s a lasting kind of imprint that they leave on that organisation. . . . . They have a very visible project that they have enacted and they’ve owned.” The dissertations were equivalent to a PhD yet different they concluded: “it is good academic research; authentic, rigorous; you know, all the things about what makes scholarship rich intellectual work that’s communicated and validated to peers by peers. It certainly meets that criteria. And then some.”

iii) What system barriers to learning do faculty identify in this process?

One barrier that affected faculty learning was the escalating demands of advising multiple cohorts. As one faculty member commented, “it’s as if you’re divorced and married again. Still, it’s not the perfect marriage but you know what to expect from that cohort; so you try to
eliminate all the noise and all the bad things. But you still have . . . to pay alimony for the first marriage. . . . your head is in two places.”

A system constraint that affected team learning was conflict in the larger system. Faculty described the EdD committee as a “port in the storm.” Or, “. . . it became for me EdD faculty as the safe faculty and the other spaces was a more precarious kind of space. . . . The EdD space felt more spacious, more inviting, more collaborative. . . .” Another faculty member was more emphatic. “I was less interested in an EdD in action research, the scholar practitioner - I was more interested in people I can work with. . . . So I found the team. I found my tribe.”

Pressure from the larger system to generate credit hours, and the group’s desire to align with other professional doctoral programs became a barrier. As were the related issues of time to degree and what is a rigorous action research dissertation? One person explained, “We say that we’re emphasising rigor over timeline. . . . Are we a program that’s promising that . . . we develop scholar practitioners that are going to build capacity to lead change and write about [it] in a scholarly fashion? . . . That you can do that in three years? . . . there are programmes out there that do EdDs and they’re doing it in three years. . . . they’re very clear. The PhD programme is a long-term programme. The EdD programme is a capstone programme. They’re not trying to make it the impossible.”

Conclusion
What we have learned on this journey is that more is always revealed [Watkins and Marsick, 1993]. Learning evolves in the process of refining our conception of this professional doctoral program by living it, and integrating our experience through graduating more and more students and growing our repertoire of possibilities. We are not yet transformed; we are transforming.

References
E Pluribus Unum: Transcending Theory-
Five Perspectives on Transformative Doctoral Education

By:
Kimberly Laffont, Deborah McEwan, Kristina Bielskus-Barone, Ramonia Rochester, Allyson L. Hall

Position:
Doctoral Candidates
Florida Atlantic University

Contact information:
Allyson L. Hall
Ahall53@fau.edu

Kim Laffont
kimlaffont@gmail.com

Deborah McEwan
dmcewan2014@fau.edu

Kristina Bielskus-Barone
kbielsku@my.fau.edu

Ramonia Rochester
rrochester2013@my.fau.edu
John Dewey describes education as not the preparation for life, but rather it is life itself. Through culturally responsive and inclusive doctoral instruction, future educators become border crossers that connect theoretical conjecture to practical community application, which aids in the cohesion of local community. This paper attempts to succinctly offer five different perspectives of what it means to effectively empower doctoral students: our future educators, and provides an explication of the emerging needs of one student community. Though the perspectives of the authors vary, we coalesce around an emergent purpose for transformative doctoral education; conscientization and community building.

This article examines the implications of massification through a social justice lens. We discuss the quality of education, evolving mediums of education, accessibility in education, and inclusion and equity through a Freirian framework that espouses true instruction as an edifying, humanizing process--A process which builds community in the doctoral classroom first, then transcends student camaraderie to foster social activism and involvement. Furthermore, this collaborative work examines the needs of multicultural doctoral students, and how those needs are addressed in a way that nurture individual growth and personalized strategies of inquiry.

Our narrative adds to the conversation of emerging mediums of knowledge creation, and offers suggestions towards osmotic doctoral education that encourages further community activism and inquiry that is relevant and useful to community. As students, we aspire to see programs that continue to: 1) Examine the importance of MOOCs as an emerging medium of education 2) encourage students to become politically engaged as future academics 3) Maintain epistemological inquiry and integrity 4) Explore both physical and metaphysical education as valuable contribution, and 5) Expand the accessibility of education across culture and ability all for the sake of conscientization and community building.

Democratic education espouses the common good for all people and an embedded concern for social inequities. We examine the possible societal implication of our interests and pose solutions for overcoming barriers to greater community building and conscientization on the municipal level. This paper contends that obliterating barriers to inclusive and culturally relevant postsecondary education creates an advantage for all students, gives colleges and universities an opportunity to provide a better understanding of diversity in our local communities, and brings us all closer to community solidarity and greater community consciousness.
Author: Maguire, Kate

From Description to Knowledge Narrative: conceptualising professional practice and articulating professional expertise in Doctoral Research

Doctoral supervisors of professional doctorates are regularly called upon to move from a prescriptive approach to getting involved with the sticky issues which arise when researchers are senior professionals working in contexts which do not easily fit into the linear steps required of theoretical doctorates. Scholarly practitioners concern themselves with research into work situations and practices with the intention of influencing work cultures to benefit a range of stakeholders. Work takes place in layered contexts where constancy can be negative and inconstancy productive. Variables are not only multiple but like chemical reactions they can combine and separate in a variety of ways with catalysing or compounding impacts. Professional practitioners work with and navigate complexity on a daily basis. To research such a dynamic environment requires, I would suggest, two necessary capabilities for both the supervisor and the researcher which are often overlooked in pursuit of prescribed doctoral criteria that when followed can result in a usable patchwork but fails to engage, excite, inspire and edify. They are (i) conceptualisation of practice and (ii) the articulation of expertise both of which contribute to a deepening of criticality, a more competent engagement with audience and a contribution to the articulation of the complexities of practice.

The capacity to conceptualise or to metaphorise is a universal capacity as science and arts can testify. Conceptualisation can be an embodiment in words, image or artefact of both the tangible and the intangible (hierarchy, democracy, sorrow, joy, forms of relating), a projected image of possibility (as in a working hypothesis, an equation, a plan) and the capture of different ways of looking (perspectives). As complexity increases, variables grow exponentially, interdependency becomes the norm, and identity and cultures are located in time rather than place, articulation in words becomes increasingly problematic. They frequently fail to capture the complexities of practices, the intricacies of relating because the amount of words needed would be in volumes not pages. Conceptualising can be in words as in a metaphor. In science the metaphor or conceptualisation is most often in numbers or models. E=Mc2 is a distillation of vast amounts of knowledge developed over time and conceptualised, metaphorised in three letters, one numeral and one symbol. In terms of higher education an agreed conceptualisation of an intangible can ensure that what is being conveyed is uniform to students and not dependent on the individual articulation skills of the various teachers. In TEXT Special Issue: Creativity: Cognitive, Social and Cultural Perspectives ed. Nigel McLoughlin & Donna Lee Brien, April 2012 and not depend not can be Morgan (2012) in exploring ‘how academics in the creative arts conceptualise creativity, both as a general concept and also as a set of
situatated disciplinary beliefs and practices, discusses the influences of romanticism and rationalism on reaching and agreed conceptualisation for students.

Conceptualising professional practice for the purposes of carrying out research into practices is not historically bound by such movements. Conceptualising practice would contain such interactions around styles of management systems, external and internal factors, latered contexts, position and role of the researcher, obstacles to change, perspectives and objectives of stakeholder. Such a conceptualisation then becomes a plan of possibility of the conceptualisation factors in what would happen of change was introduced in one part of the picture resulting in a conceptualisation of probability. This also then gives a plan of possibility of interactions as professional bound by In concept professionalism practice is exploring the influences on conceptualisation from discipline fields, in this case Art, that can Conceptualisation has its own problems of course. divisions. For example in conceptualising creativity so that it can be adequately and fairly transmitted to students and not be dependent on the verbal skills of the teacher, romanticism and rationalism all

Conceptualisations of practice at the rudimentary level have included an astralobe (outside influences strong requiring skill in reading the signs), a merry go round (everyone busy and in their comfort zone but the organisation or practice not going anywhere, an alien planet (a closed culture where no one knows what is really going on) to more elaborate conceptualisations in which basic conceptualisations are elaborated upon a rigid spine with creativity hanging off the branches, or aspects of practice: the board room dynamics conceptualised as 12 Angry men, decision making processes as the Goldilocks approach. Through such a device candidates begin to see the complexity, communicate it and anticipate obstacles to change or what would be required to be convincing to which part of the conceptualisation. It is then easier to translate the conceptualisation and the manipulation of it through the research into a verbal knowledge narrative.

The other aspect of articulation is that of the articulation of expertise on which my colleague Dr Dave Adams and I are currently working. At a conference we gave a workshop on if Stadivari were asked to articulate his expertise. W and invited a luthier whom participants were invited to ask a range of questions. Although he answered the all at the end when he was asked how he would know a computer made violin and a hand made, he only said I don’t know but I would know. When carrying out research for the Solicitors Regulation we regularly encountered senior professionals who could not account for their choices of those whom they wanted in their legal practices other than to say I just know. This is an era of increasing accountability when articulation of that high level professional tac knowledge is required to be expressed and it is this that has posed challenges for senior professional carrying out doctoral research. Adams and Maguire (2015) have spoken about conceptualising this articulation as epistemic virtuosity. Pearce and pearce (2000) conceptualise combining of passion with ability as dialogic virtuosity.
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Abstract
Learning to write for one’s discipline is a defining activity of doctoral education. Writing is a constitutive part of the discovery process, as through writing of what has been learned, a student fully grasps the newly acquired knowledge (Paré, 2011; Thomson & Kamler, 2010). Developing one’s textual ‘voice’ as a scholarly practitioner or researcher underlies the solidification of the professional identity created through doctoral study participation (Kamler & Thomson, 2006). Finally, written products are the basis on which doctorates are awarded (Cotterall, 2011).

Studies of doctoral student writing commonly reference a cognitive apprenticeship approach (Maher & Say, in press). In this approach, the faculty supervisor guides the student’s development as a disciplinary writer. Briefly, this approach posits that the faculty supervisor makes visible the cognitive processes underlying textual production as he or she supports, through modeling, scaffolding, and coaching, development of student writing expertise. However, successful use of cognitive apprenticeship as traditionally envisioned is predicated on
assumptions that, given the rapidly changing doctoral landscape, deserve reconsideration.

Cognitive apprenticeship springs from traditional apprenticeship, in which expert and learner were in close physical contact (Collins, 2006). In light of distance learning, today’s doctoral supervisors and students may be geographically dispersed. While they may regularly interact, using cognitive apprenticeship to teach disciplinary writing may be difficult across distance and asynchronous communication. Further, many doctoral programs are now offered in cohort formats, challenging traditional conceptualizations of one-to-one supervisor-students pairings. Finally, cognitive apprenticeship implies that both supervisor and student schedules allow dedicated time for writing pedagogy. However, the pace of faculty life has increased (Austin & McDaniels, 2006) and faculty can be surprisingly uninformed of their doctoral students’ skill development (Feldon, Maher, Hurst, & Timmerman, in press). Additionally, many students lack the opportunity to pursue doctoral studies full-time (Evans, 2002).

We acknowledge the centrality of writing pedagogy in doctoral education and challenges presented by the traditional application of cognitive apprenticeship to provide this pedagogy. In response, in the paper presented we will explore three pedagogical strategies that harness the power of cognitive apprenticeship but respond to the realities of today’s doctoral education landscape. We first consider how to ‘horizontalize’ (Boud & Lee, 2005, p.509) discourse surrounding doctoral writing. Peers, both those contemporary and more advanced, postdoctoral fellows, faculty beyond the designated supervisor, and relevant others might serve as writing mentors. Writing groups have been recognized as a way to make transparent cognitive tasks underpinning textual production (Aitchison & Guerin, 2014). Embedding the development of a written product, such as a dissertation, across a span of sequenced courses can be particularly effective in lock-step doctoral cohorts, and is currently used in the first author’s home institution. Embedding writing production within sequential courses provides scaffolded support and may prevent cognitive, emotional, and social factors that can stall progress (Ahern & Manathunga 2004; Lovitts 2005). Finally, the writing product, or product combination, that lead to degree attainment merits reconsideration. Conference papers or journal articles that ‘count’ as a dissertation exemplify this strategy (Lee, 2010, Paré, 2010)
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The primary mission of the doctorate in education is to advance the knowledge and the preparation of quality practitioners (Shulman, Golde, Conklin-Bueschel, and Garabedian, 2006). Debates about the education doctorate are mainly focused on the identity crisis of the program, and identifying the most effective type of signature pedagogy. It is argued that students in education doctoral programs produce inconsistent levels of research quality and quantity. The perceived lack of research rigor prompts the question, “What level of research skills should recent education doctorate students possess?” A consistent perception is that Ph.D. students are expected to engage in research-intensive programs, while Ed.D. programs focus on preparing practitioners with leadership skills instead of research. Olson and Clark (2009) suggested that a persisting problem is the selection of a signature pedagogy that is practical for administrators, teachers, and others preparing to be leaders. The quantity and quality of research preparation for Ed.D. students has historically been debated and has failed to reach a consensus among majority of the professional doctoral programs (Levine, 2005).

Some scholars believe the professional doctorate is failing to prepare leaders to be scholarly practitioners who are change agents and actively turn research into practice (Levine, 2005; Murphy & Vriesenga, 2005; Evans, 2007). The absence of clarity in the role research plays in the education doctorate and the research qualities that graduates should possess has become central to determining the level of career success students achieve after completing the program. Research could be the key to identifying the measures of success for education doctoral students. The first step is to identify the role research plays in the success of recent graduates.

This session will discuss the role that research self-efficacy and research expectation plays in the success of education doctorate graduates in their perspective careers. Additionally, this study will seek to investigate if there is a relationship between research self-efficacy, research expectations, and how successful recent graduates are in their current profession. Specifically, is perceived research competency associated with the level of success experienced by recent graduates?
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Abstract

This paper focuses on creating and supporting multimodal learning experiences for adults, particularly doctoral students at Regis College. Innovative teaching techniques encourage student ownership of the learning experiences with adult learners (Knowles, 1980; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005). Teaching and learning in higher education can be enhanced by including educational techniques based on andragogy and multiple intelligences as a means to incorporate information/communication technologies into the learning experiences. The paper builds on andragogical theory and techniques by describing the problem based learning experiences used at Regis College to support adult learning in higher education. While potential opportunities and issues are acknowledged, this paper supports student ownership and suggests that ownership of multimodal, multiple intelligences learning experiences enhances adult learning. Suggestions for further research include: short and long term quantitative and qualitative studies on multi-modal student engagement with learning materials and the resulting retention of knowledge; mixed methods studies of the lived experiences of doctoral students engaged in multi-modal learning experiences; and cross-contexts studies regarding the use of specific information/communication technological devices (tablets and smart phones) to increase understanding and skill development in higher education environments.
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Multimodal Learning Experiences for Doctoral Students

Adult learners have several distinct characteristics that educators should build off of so that student retention of knowledge, engagement in the learning process and love of learning are enhanced. Knowles (1970), Kallenbach (1999), and Henschke (2011) suggest that adult learners have different needs than younger students and that adult students conceptualize different connections to organized learning. While young learners and adolescents need guidance, challenges, redirection and consequences as in traditional pedagogy to keep engaged in order to master content (Gatlin, 1998), adult learners have somewhat different needs. Several articles stress that adult students want to engage in learning experiences, want to use their life/work experiences in building new knowledge and want to find success as a personal venture and affirmation (Kenner & Weinerman, 2011; Knowles, 1970; Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 2005).

Further, Cooper and Henschke (2001) states that adult students need to be involved in the creating of “a climate conducive to learning… designing the sequence” (n.p.) so that the adult learner owns the experience. The literature (Brookfield, 1990; Caruth, 2014; Cooper & Henschke, 2001; Cretchley & Castle, 2001; Drinkard & Henschke, 2004; Harper & Ross, 2011; Holton, Wilson & Bates, 2009; Knowles, 1976; Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 2005) supports this active involvement of adult students in co-creating and individualizing the learning experiences with their teachers/professors.

Andragogy in Higher Education

One goal of teaching adult learners is to help their students recognize the need to develop an “attitude that learning is a lifelong process” aimed at acquiring “the skills of self-directed learning” (Knowles, 1976, p. 28). Adult learners respond well to collaboration, mutual respect and building on their own practice and experience (Brookfield, 1990). Cooper and Henschke
(2001) continues the theme that adult learners respond well to a “climate conducive to learning, cooperative planning, [and] diagnosing their [own] needs” (n.p.) so that the adult students negotiate a verbal learning contract so as to have input in the course design including choices to set their own learning agenda, explore the materials in their own way and share in the evaluation process. In a South African study, Cretchley and Castle (2001) reports that outcomes-based education (OBE)—a problem based concept—offer a humanistic approach to adult education that engages the students, values their life experiences and encourages ownership of the process of attaining and understanding knowledge. Drinkard and Henschke (2004) further recounts that adult students extend greater effort and attain more success when the students feel trusted, are treated amongst their peers, share in the preparation and transfer of content, and can sense the professor’s empathy with her learners. This article notes that the obverse is also identifiable: when a student does not feel valued, is treated like an adolescent, or the professor shows little empathy, there is a measureable loss of learning potential (2004).

Cronbach (1963) suggests that human beings show that they have learned new ideas by changing their behavior by building on their experience. Thus, adult learners have more experience than children to bring to the classroom and their behavior will be further informed by new learning experiences. Knowles et al. (2005) indicates that “learning behavior described in the andragogical model are intelligence, field dependence/independence, learning style, locus of control, and prior knowledge” (p. 229). Therefore, adult learners such as doctoral students hunger for appropriate learning experiences that engage them intellectually, build on their prior experiences, and give these adults some measure of control over their course work. This suggests that students should be part of the construction of the learning experiences and evaluation processes offered in a Doctor of Education program.
Doctor of Education professors need to be aware of their student’s readiness and skill level so that the offered learning challenges fit the levels of the students’ development (Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 2005, p. 228). This collaborative effort between the adult student and teacher has great potential (2005). Holton, Swanson and Naquin (2001) supports this collaborative effort since adult students “need to know why they need to learn something” (p. 120) before these adult learners invest in the process. Holton and colleagues (2001) further notes that more mature learners desire to engage in learning challenges—such as problem or project based learning—that encourages self-direction based on previous experience to build new levels of competency. Two more tenets of andragogy that differs from pedagogy are that the “motivation for adult learners is internal rather than external” (p. 120) so that adult students drive themselves to succeed and that adult students want to be involved in the evaluation process since these students understand that they continue to learn long after grades are assigned.

Further, adult students report satisfaction with being treated as respected colleagues in the pursuit of knowledge instead of recipients of knowledge. These adult learners remark that an unexpected side benefit to this positive engagement in the learning process is a return to the "love of learning" (Harper & Ross, 2011, p. 166) that earlier learning experiences had stilted or even extinguished. Caruth (2014) supports this important change in the teaching of adults in “Meeting the Needs of Older Students in Higher Education.” The article states that there is a dearth of understanding by professors who teach adult students so that andragogy is not being used in the higher education classrooms or colleges and universities.

Recently, Caruth (2014) writes that college administrators are responsible for the implementation of andragogy in higher education however these same “university administrators violated the principles of andragogy in favor of the movement toward efficiency” (p. 23). Thus,
very few college level teachers and professors practice these precepts even though “Andragogy has emerged as one of the dominant frameworks for teaching adults during the past 40 years” (Holton, Wilson & Bates, 2009).

**Multimodal Learning in a Blended Environment**

As the Regis College EdD program has evolved, two themes have been our cornerstones. First, the adult students are treated as part of the building team. Student input, learning styles (Gardner & Hatch, 1989) and needs are forefront in our course design and assigned learning experiences. Second, we encourage multi-modal learning and growth using the tools best suited to the experiences thus classes are hybrid or blended (Korr, Derwin, Greene & Sokoloff, 2012). Specifically, Regis College EdD students participate in weekly educational challenges with eleven weeks that are on-line and four Saturdays on-ground or ‘brick’ per semester. This blended experience is especially appreciated by these doctoral students in that they are busy professionals who have fulltime jobs. The asynchronous Moodle based learning experiences allows these students to participate as and when they are able with a weekly due date for all discussions. As Isenberg (2005) notes, the use of the internet to engage student learning requires “(a) visioning, (b) creativity, (c) animation tailoring, (d) …leadership, (e) andragogical principles, and (f) technology” (p. 176). The EdD students are given ample opportunities to grow in their knowledge and skill base both online, and face-to-face. The weekly online learning experiences include student led discussion boards, video links that accent the week’s topics, presentations, readings, and learning challenges. The on-line student led discussion boards are based on interest. We offer three to four prompts while requesting students to select one or two prompts to address. This generates a high level of curiosity while stimulating their intellect as doctoral students. This simple choice allows the students to invest in caring about their answers instead of
responding half-heartedly to all questions to get them done. Most students enthusiastically participate to show their understandings while practicing their scholarly voice (Schunk, 1991).

Multimodal learning goes beyond the teaching side of the learning equation. Students are inspired to try some new digital communication tool, app or technique in their presentations and projects. Since Regis College is an Apple Distinguished School, all our students—undergraduate and graduate—are given iPads© to create and to engage in their own learning experiences. The students are using these information/communication devices in many ways to solve their learning challenges as well as testing the value of such devices in the classroom and online.

Anecdotally, many of our EdD students report that they try new styles of expressing their understandings and explore new multi-modal presentation techniques because the students trust us (Risley, 2012) and “know that it is OK to mess up” (a doctoral student, personal communication, December, 2014). This trust is crucial to enhance adult learning as Risley (2012) points out: adult learning or andragogy needs to be created in a “climate of mutual respect” (p. 43) and “a climate of mutual trust” (p. 44). Further a supportive culture can be enhanced by teachers and professors setting “learners into peer-support groups and coach them on how to support one another” (p. 44).

Teaching adults takes on new dimensions when one begins building on Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 1993; Gardner & Hatch, 1989) and Multimodal Learning Experiences (Kress, 2001; Moreno & Mayer, 2007). Multiple Intelligences theory (Gardner, 1993; Gardner & Hatch, 1989) suggests that each human being has a natural affinity to a certain set of stimuli that encourages skill development, comprehension and knowledge construction. While Gardner (1993) suggests that these intelligences are a gift at birth, we suggest that human beings have learning ‘preferences’ that can be built upon to improve students’ skills in learning through other
modalities. While a person might indicate that she enjoys learning through a particular intelligence lens, she could build skills in different realm by “scaffolding” (Wood & Middleton, 1975) off of her preferred method. This could be a study in itself.

Kress (2001) identifies multimodal learning as making meaning through actions including “actionable, verbal, and linguistic resources” (p. 42) while Korr, Derwin, Greene and Sokoloff (2012) add that blended learning principles align with key principles of andragogy. Sorden (2011) further states that “blended classes are learner centered; personalized; interactive using social media and “The Cloud”; mobile and accessible anytime, anywhere; and meet students’ wants and needs” (n.p.). Blended learning is a unique chance to change how we teach and thus how we help our adult students learn; this requires a major rethinking and innovation of the teaching and learning dynamic. Garrison and Kanuka (2004) reminds practioners that blended or hybrid education is a new venue for teaching that is a disruptive set of techniques that involve a “fundamental reconceptualization and reorganization of the teaching and learning dynamic” that empowers the students and helps personalize learning (2004). Thus, major goals of the Regis College EdD program are to enable our students to own their learning experiences.

The relationship building necessary for adult student buy-in to this multimodal hybrid teaching and learning culture includes building trust and guiding personalized learning (Garrison & Kanuka, 2004) while supporting “distributive education”—inter-student sharing of new knowledge sometimes with and sometimes without the instructor being a part of the exchange. Adult students in these blended learning opportunities (Sorden, 2011) build off of their lived experiences so that they need to understand how the new learning “scaffolds” (Wood & Middleton, 1975) on their previous knowledge foundation. These mature students want to work on solving authentic problems that they have an interest or an investment in.
While these students are self-motivated and self-driven, they do need, and indeed thirst, for constructive feedback so that they can gauge their growth and their growth potential: anecdotally, many adult students still like to know their grade but the grade is not the motivator it was in their youth. These adult students especially appreciate earning their new knowledge when they are able to apply the new understandings to their worlds of work, community, and family immediately as opposed to ‘banking’ for a later date (Korr et al., 2012). Furthermore, these multi-modal learning/teaching experiences for adult learners in higher education can be enhanced by emerging digital storytelling educational techniques and technologies (Alexander, 2011) as will described in the following section.

**Background on the Regis College EdD Program**

The Regis College doctor of education in higher education program is being created on the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) model based on six principles: social justice, constructivism, collaboration, authentic learning through field experience, current professional practical and research knowledge and transforming practice through new understandings. The program is in its second year of existence, has twenty one fulltime students enrolled, serves students in New England and New York state, has a hybrid or blended course format, has female and male professionals as students who work in Kindergarten through secondary schools to college professors and administrators. These students seek credentials to support their professional growth to teaching and leading in higher education.

**Practice of Andragogy in an EdD Program**

Proponents of the line in the sand that ‘there is no andragogy: there are only levels of pedagogy’ could be correct regarding a pure difference between teaching PK-12 students, even until sophomore or junior levels of college. However, Davenport and Davenport (1985) suggests
that there is a continuum of readiness/maturity that might have some 9th grade student able to self-motivate, set their own learning goals, and evaluate their progress in their skill/knowledge development while some older “thirty-something” might not be able to self-regulate, completely engage in a learning experience, or accurately evaluate their level of success and understanding. “Early indications are that andragogical-pedagogical orientations vary by age, sex, and other variables” (1985, p. 77) so the continuum is a sliding scale with readiness, context and interest being the main drivers.

Discussion

We use this as an as yet un-tested hypothesis: Doctoral students will attain better understandings, achieve more skills, and love learning more if these adult students are treated as adult learners. Anecdotally, this ownership of learning engenders self-respect and a depth of knowledge that my students often relate is a “first” in their educational career. Here are several learning experiences that seem to have great power in engaging doctoral students both at Regis College and at a previous doctoral level teaching position at a major university. Our first innovation is a multi-stage, multi-modal writing project.

The 3-in-1 Project

Early in my doctoral teaching career, I was confronted with engaged adult learners who needed support in the ways of learning to write at the doctoral level. Many of my sixty plus students did not write well in the arcane APA style and they could not get beyond basic outlining to develop a foundation for their papers.

I created three concepts that made a huge difference in my students’ communication skills. The first idea was to take my students on a journey through the thought processes necessary to think like a doctoral candidate, then work with the students to develop APA writing
skills while creating literature reviews that will live up to ‘the academy’s standards’ for professional writing. The thought processes for this educational experience are guided by the Universal Problem Solving Model that has five key ingredients: (1) Goal, (2) Input, (3) Process, (4) Output and (5) Feedback (McCarthy, 2009). This thought process, also known as GIPOF, focuses the students on what is essential to their study. Students use this framework to design and present their ideas for the upcoming papers.

The next concept of the learning journey was dubbed “The 3-in-1 Project: A Program or Initiative Proposal to Improve a Class, a Department, or a School” (Details available). Phase one tasked the students with creating a presentation using the GIPOF schema regarding the topic that they wanted to pursue maybe as far as their dissertation or cap stone project. This mission is effective at engaging adult learners in that these students want to: identify an opportunity to improve something; set their own goals; engage in the problem solving system that they will use; then complete their papers so that both the students and the professor can review their progress (Henschke, 2001; Knowles, 1976; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005).

The first section of this project is the five minute Pre-Mid-Term Presentation. Students choose an opportunity of practice, formulate a game plan, begin an annotated references list, create a concept map (Lanzing, 1997; Lanzing, Stoyanov & Kommers, 1999), and produce this presentation with whatever technological device and software that they choose. Many educators in higher education fear the panoply of information/communication tools that are available to students and professors (Alexander, 2011; Alonso, Molina & Requejo, 2013 Garrison & Kanuka, 2004). I do try to keep up although I do not feel that I have to omniscient regarding all the latest information delivery systems. In fact, Gatlin (1998) indicates that students of all ages have different levels of technological skills and resourcefulness to meet this challenge in her/his own
way thus professors do not have “the need to have extensive technological literacy of the learning environment when designing online activities initially” (n.p.). I allow, even encourage, students to step ‘out of the box’ to offer their presentation in their own way. I am often asked how I compare a PowerPoint© to a video to a performance piece. I do not. The presentation rubric is formative and the focus is on the goal of the project, the content, the understanding of the project and further work to be done, not the ‘pizzazz’ of the presentation. Our goal is to allow these adults to build confidence and skills through a safe environment that encourages exploration, trial and error, and constructing new knowledge and skills.

The way these concepts are conveyed is a creative decision made by each student. It is not the information/communication skills that are assessed but the delivery of the content in an engaging, informative and scholarly way that is valued. After I assure adult learners that taking chances on new presentation is encouraged and not penalized, I have had amazing presentations offered. Students are challenged to use whatever communication media—a Prezi©, a PowerPoint© presentation, a Voice Thread©, a poster presentation, a video, a podcast, a wiki, an avatar or other media style—one student wrote and performed a song (as yet unpublished) while playing acoustic guitar along with his poster presentation.

The students’ buy-in is impressive. Additional benefits of this learning experience are twofold: students get much more feedback from their peers than the ‘secret society’ of the student/professor dialogue and the students gain a meta-cognition awareness regarding their topic while preforming their presentation. Kinesthetic and creative style learners enjoy the freedom to interact with the material in their own modality. On the other hand, concrete thinkers and those who thrive in the traditional ‘sit and get’ style of learning find some discomfort with
the presentation piece. In the spirit of supporting all learning styles, I offer a ‘writing round table’ option in which students share their paper with their peers in a read and share experience.

The mini-papers follow in a few weeks so the students are able to incorporate their new understandings and gain new input to add after their presentations. I review these papers in an effort to support APA styling and doctoral level writing using ‘Track Changes’ in Word©. My goal is to get these short papers back as soon as possible so that the students are able to see the reviews and improve their skills sets. There is one more concept that we use before the final paper is submitted for summative review by the professor.

**Peer Review: ATeaming**

Peer review, known to my students as ‘ATeaming’ (Details available), encourages the students to have more than their own eyes on their papers so as to catch issues such as spelling, word choice, APA formatting, logical arguments, clarity, and more that the writer often cannot see after reading the paper many times. The students ATeam each other’s papers so that the final version is as free of minor formatting, spelling and clarity issues before the professor receives the final edition. The hidden curriculum here is that each student sits in the editor’s seat to review at least two other papers thus getting a novel view on writing. The second piece of the hidden agenda is ‘distributive education’ (Dr. Alan Stoskopf, private conversation, September, 2012) defined as sharing of new understandings between peers in which students learn about topics that their colleagues are deeply engaged in thus opening the editors’ world views of knowledge.

While students first viewed this as one more demand on their busy schedule, many relate that now this is the most looked forward part of the course work. My own understanding of ‘distributive education’ crystallized as a doctoral student at UMASS/Amherst in 2002. When the professor handed back the forty papers to the students, I realized that those forty students had a
secret society with the professor, one that I was left out of except with my own paper. A group ‘Aha!’ is possible with ATeaming and a ‘free will’ paper share online at the end of the term. This group sharing of learning and understandings has encouraged much discussion and triggered new research by peers based on previously unknown topics. Another way that adult students can learn in a collaborative way is through team experiences based on problem and project based learning.

**Multi-modal Team Based Problem or Project Based Learning**

Two such team projects based on multimodal andragogy are the *Team Experiential Learning Project - Case Study—College/University President Search* in ED 801 and *The Four Frames Team Experiential Learning Project* in ED 803 and ED 805.

**Team Experiential Learning Project—Case Study—College/University President Search**

Doctoral student teams assume the role of consultants to help a college conduct a presidential search. This project concludes with a live presentation that discusses the work of at least one leadership scholar who explores a theory/model that the new President could explore. The team project refers to at least ten research studies and/or empirical studies in peer-reviewed journals that use this theoretical perspective as a framework for the research investigation.

The team creates questions and prompts drawn from the project to promote discussion at the conclusion of their presentation. Teammates present the team’s newly constructed understandings in an iPad oriented audio/visual format of the team’s choice, examples: PowerPoint®; VoiceThread®; Prezi®; Camtasia®; video; blog; Wiki; or other student created medium. Additional information on all these assignments is available.

**The Four Frames Team Experiential Learning Project**

Student teams are commissioned to review an actual complex organization (either a multi-member department —5 or more, including staff and adjunct members—school or college)
in higher education using Bolman and Deal’s (2013) Four Frames Model in order to offer suggestions and recommendations for improved goal attainment, customer satisfaction and organizational strength. Further, teams use concepts from Senge’s (2006) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* to diagnose issues and offer possible resolutions. Finally, team presentations will suggest ways for this organization to become more innovative based on Amidon’s (2002) *The Innovation Superhighway*. Teammates present the team’s newly constructed understandings in an audio/visual format of the team’s choice.

**Story Sticks a.k.a. Student Led Readings**

Each student is assigned one reading to ‘own.’ This is their chance to develop an educator voice while sharing personal understandings of one reading. In a short live or recorded presentation at Regis College or on-line, students use images and key words to help peers understand the salient concepts and ideas offered by the author(s) of a particular article. Students may add more about the author and expand upon the writings as they wish in a scholarly manner. Students are asked to be creative in their presentations to engage the adult learners who are their peers in an interactive way so as to avoid the ‘stand and deliver’ style of teaching. Students offer their newly constructed understandings in a multimedia presentation style of their choosing in either face-to-face or on-line experiences.

**iBooks and More**

A final way to consider engaging adult learners in a modern multi-modal way is by creating iBooks, blogs, wikis and more. Dr. Bryan Alexander encourages professors and students to contemplate the array of software and apps available to tell stories. These storytelling experiences “inspire students to dig deeper into their subject, to think more complexly about it, and to communicate what they have learned in a more creative way (Alexander, 2012, p. 216).
Furthermore, adults understand the power of metaphors and these “metaphors can drive a story forward” (2012, p. 216) so students are encouraged to build off of analogies and metaphors to deeply engage their peers. When a teacher or, better yet, an adult student creates an iBook or any other digital storytelling medium, one can experience a “metacognition [moment] to consider how they interpreted the new ideas (needs and strengths) and put these new concepts to work” (2012, p. 216). This digital story land is new to many doctoral students and their professors so this can be a joint ‘mountain climb’ in which both the teacher and the students are sharing new understandings, gaining new skills, practicing these skills and assessing their growth in an interactive and interdependent way (2011). These products will need to relate to the learning outcomes rubrics, however, the methods and the means are individually deciphered, GIPOF-ed and improved upon since adult learners are self-motivated to find success. One of the key benefits of these endeavors is student ownership of the design, the exploration, and the learning.

**Conclusion**

This paper supports student ownership and suggests that ownership of multimodal, multiple intelligences learning experiences enhances adult learning. Student ownership is important to adult learners (Gardner, 1993; Gardner & Hatch, 1989; Henschke, 2011; Isenberg, 2005; Kallenbach & Vien Kenner & Weinerman, 2011, 2002; Knowles, 1970; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005; Kress, 2001; Moreno & Mayer, 2007). Adult students have needs and attitudes regarding their education that higher education professors must take into account in their teaching and learning experiences. Students in doctoral programs are self-selected to be over-achievers who need support and scaffolding (Wood & Middleton, 1975) while they co-create their learning schema. These adult learners are able to build upon their life/work/education experiences so as to create deeper understandings (Knowles, 1970; Knowles, Holton, &
Swanson, 2005). These doctoral students benefit from multimodal learning experiences that encourage these learners to build off of their preferred learning styles and strengths of their multiple intelligences while solving real problems. “Regis College's EdD program is working for me because, right from the get-go, I am allowed to "own the learning" and pursue my interest area” (Personal communication, May, 2014).

Suggestions for further research include: short and long term quantitative and qualitative studies on adult student engagement with multi-modal learning experiences and the resulting retention of knowledge; mixed methods studies of the lived experiences of doctoral students engaged in multi-modal, andragogy based learning experiences; and cross-contexts studies regarding the use of specific information/communication technological devices (tablets and smart phones) to increase understanding and skill development in adult students who are pursuing doctoral level education.

It is time to treat doctoral level students as adults who are in charge of their own learning. This empowerment could lead to greater enthusiasm, retention and a life-long love of learning.
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The Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree had its genesis during the rise of the medieval university and, to this day, it is still regarded as one of the most coveted credentials worldwide and as a symbol of individual achievement. In this second decade of the 21st century, colleges and universities must engage in the call for internationalization and, thus, prepare doctoral students for research endeavors beyond their national boundaries, while developing an interdisciplinary framework (Borrego & Newswander, 2010; Nerad, 2010).

A review of the current literature identifies the internationalization of higher education through the development of partnerships between United States (U.S.) institutions and universities abroad. Indeed, the relationship between the European Union and Latin America has served to initiate “global agreements” across higher education institutions in Chile and Mexico in an effort to “facilitate the sharing of knowledge, the transfer of technologies, and the mobility of students, academics, researchers, and administrators focusing on training, employment, and scientific knowledge” (Figueroa, 2008, p. 64). Whereas higher education in the U.S. progressed through a series of changes, such as a system of meritocracy and the founding of land-grant institutions, toward promoting access, Brazil’s model for higher education continued to be focused on training the professional elite until very recently (Oliven, 2014).

Given the need for doctoral education from an international perspective, this pilot study will explore Brazilian and U.S. faculty members’ perspectives as to those essential elements which would constitute a model for the internationalization of the PhD, with a focus on an interdisciplinary context and need for socialization. The researchers are interested in learning about faculty’s perspectives based on their specific disciplines, while bearing in mind the origins as well as current missions of these two higher education systems. The research question is as follows: How do Brazilian and U.S. faculty, from different disciplines, conceptualize a model for the internationalization of the PhD?

**Conceptual Framework**

An interdisciplinary and global view of the world requires individuals to develop socialization skills. Socialization is the “process through which an individual learns the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, habits of mind, and modes of thinking that are required to gain admission and acceptance into a particular organization or culture (Bragg, 1976; Tierney, 1997; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979 as cited in Gardner, Jansujwicz, Hutchins, Cline, & Levesque, 2012, p. 378-379). Socialization as a construct will guide this study while exploring faculty’s perspectives across cultures.

**Method and Data Sources**

A total of 12 faculty members (6 from each institution) from different disciplines, specifically, Curriculum and Instruction and Higher Education Administration will be interviewed either face-to-face or via Skype, using semi-structured, open-ended questions. This pilot study will be framed within the case study tradition. Researchers will analyze archival documents (curricula for the respective doctoral programs of study) at each of the two institutions.
Method of Analysis

Data will be uploaded into qualitative data analysis software. Analysis will be comprised of coding the data for common themes and guided by principles of thematic and narrative analysis (Merriam, 1998; Riessman, 2008).
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Preparing Journal Reviewers:

Mentoring Doctoral Students as Peer Reviewers

The focus of this paper presentation is peer review of manuscripts submitted to scholarly journals, specifically doctoral scholars’ preparation for an activity that is integral to academic and other professional service. Double-blind peer review remains well regarded in academia. The standards of traditional peer-review are maintained by experts in their fields who volunteer their time to scrutinize prospective articles using a variety of criteria. The work of reviewers, or peer referees, culminates in a publication recommendation to the journal editor, usually with specific feedback that is passed along to authors. In doing so, peer reviewers contribute to the selection and refinement of knowledge that eventually reaches a broader professional audience. From a pragmatic perspective, participating in the peer review process holds benefits to reviewers, including establishing professional connections with journal editors, creating a track record of service for promotion and tenure, and learning more about the editorial process. It is somewhat surprising that many new scholars approach peer review with a lack of structured preparation for an activity so firmly embedded in academic service. For example, in a recent survey of reviewers in special education, more than half of respondents wished that preparation for peer review had been incorporated into their graduate coursework. In this presentation, faculty members and a current doctoral student will describe a departmental mentoring program to prepare doctoral students in Exceptional Student Education to review scholarly manuscripts. The presenters will make a case for a streamlined but systematic approach to journal reviewer preparation; describe the main components of the initiative; report descriptive data on their reviews; reflect on the progress of the program, and place peer review mentoring in a broader context of scholarly collaboration. This presentation will be of value to doctoral program leaders, faculty advisors, journal editors, doctoral students, and other scholars who are interested in issues related to the peer review process.
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Te Noho Kotahitanga: a bicultural foundation for a Doctor of Professional Practice programme in Aotearoa New Zealand

Unitec is New Zealand’s largest institute of technology and polytechnic (ITP), and the largest non-university tertiary provider in the Auckland region. In 2013, Unitec had twenty thousand students (ten thousand equivalent fulltime) enrolled in 149 programmes, ranging from foundation education and community skills certificates to doctorate-level programmes. The institute’s primary focus is on addressing the skills needs of associate professional, advanced trades and technology sectors.

The NZ tertiary education sector faces a strong economy and skills shortages as well as increasing expectations from government including the prospect of outcomes funding. Characteristics commonly found in disrupted industries, and that Unitec expects to become increasingly apparent in its sector, include competitive churn – the appearance of new players, many of whom will fail or morph rapidly, and the shrinkage or failure of established players; fighting on two fronts – disruption drives regulatory change, requiring responses to market and legislative challenges simultaneously; and new value propositions that reveal new customer segments.

To that end, Unitec is seeking to achieve an improved fit between offerings and employment requirements, and the Doctor of Professional Practice (the DProf) plays into this space. The DProf development has concluded and is about to be evaluated by the NZ Qualifications Authority for implementation from mid-2015. The Unitec DProf is based on the Middlesex University model.

Market research has confirmed that candidates are most likely to be working across boundaries of conventional academic disciplines even if their core work is in an established profession. They will usually be senior in their field, engaged in high level non-routine tasks, operating in environments that are extremely ambiguous. Motivationally they want an enquiry and innovative approach to practice that produces knowledge that has direct application to their professional endeavours.

In our programme design, the doctoral journey begins symbolically at the Marae, the central meeting place of our community. The Marae sits at the centre of the Wairaka precinct which is Unitec’s main campus. The Marae consists of Te Wai Unuroa o Wairaka (puna and awa [spring and stream]), the pā harakeke (flax plantation) Te Rangimārie, the whare w hakairo (carved house) Ngākau Māhaki, the wharekai (dining hall) Manaaki and the building Pūkenga that houses Maia Māori Centre.

The library of the marae is the whare whakairo, known as Ngākau Māhaki. This is a set of non-verbal texts produced by tohunga whakairo (carvers) and tohunga rāranga (weavers) along with experts from the various vocations taught at Unitec such as architecture, construction, and building technology. It sits alongside the other libraries of Unitec and is a repository of foundational knowledge providing an inspiring site for story-telling and the co-creation of new knowledge through conversation. Ngākau Māhaki challenges conventional expectations about libraries, just as the western knowledge systems brought to Aotearoa New Zealand by the early settlers disrupted traditional Māori ways. Similarly, the professional practise doctorate challenges orthodoxy and invites us to rethink what it means at doctorate level ‘to make a substantial and original contribution to knowledge’.

The development team has embedded Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) into the design of the DProf – a reflection of the Institute’s commitment to Māori, the indigenous people of the land. That commitment is contained in a partnership agreement, Te Noho Kotahitanga (TNK) which has five principles that guide the interaction between Māori and non-Māori at the Institute. These principles are: Rangatiratanga (Authority and Responsibility), Whakaritenga (Legitimacy), Kaitiakitanga (Guardianship), Mahi Kotahitanga (Co-operation), and Ngākau Mahaki (Respect).
The principles have recently been progressed as values that underpin organisational behaviour and academic endeavour generally. They inform the Institute’s curriculum reform initiative which requires programmes at all levels to have a ‘Living Curriculum’. A living curriculum involves complex conversations; is curiosity/inquiry led, and stimulating; integrates learning with work; is socially constructed – self-sufficiency and collaboration are equally valued, and together they help nurture resourcefulness and resilience; embeds Mātauranga Māori; blends face-to-face and web-based learning; is research-informed and encourages research engagement where appropriate; has a discipline base, and is also interdisciplinary; develops literacies for life-long learning; includes embedded assessment; and considers issues of sustainability. Living curricula invite teachers and students to partner as learners and to give life to the mutualities of Mahi Kotahitanga and Ngākau Mahaki.

Curricula are living because they are not designed then enacted. Experiences and pursuits are driven by curiosity and questions (why does ...? what if ...?) that arise within the learning process and lead to inquiry, and by the learning needs that emerge on a day to day basis. Students thus participate in curriculum design within the programme. The living curriculum has been well theorised. Particularly relevant to the DProf are writers who address modes 1 and 2 knowledge (Schön, 1995), open systems (Doll, 1989), conversation (Pinar, 2004, Barnett and Coate, 2005), communities of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991), and reflexivity (Brookfield, 1995, Kolb, 1984, Schön, 1983). Indeed, the DProf curriculum is based in communities of practice where complex conversations amongst practitioners and between the researcher-practitioner and academic advisers and consultants continually bring together modes 1 and 2 knowledge as a dynamic basis for generative application. These communities are open systems which feed on flux and exchange energy and matter to produce new knowledge as contributions to practice.

From the outset, the DProf offers a space dedicated to productive exchanges between different areas of practice, different workplace models, and different bodies of knowledge. Rather than think about disciplines, the development team has adopted Ngā Kete Tuatoru, the Three Baskets of Knowledge, as a metaphor for the holistic approach to education inherent in this doctorate. Te kete Aronui is the basket that holds knowledge of what we see before us; Te kete Tuauri is the basket that contains knowledge that is in the dark, or knowledge that we build out of our relationships and processes; Te kete Tuaatea is the basket that holds knowledge beyond space and time, beyond our contemporary experiences, and can be experienced through rituals and contemplation. The kete are constantly being filled with knowledge which candidates, their colleagues and peers, and adviser and consultants contribute to and from which they can take as and when needed. When the kete fill to overflowing, knowledge is shared with the community at large.

The conference presentation will introduce Unitec and explain the nature of a Living Curriculum. It will then address the design of the professional doctorate programme, explain Mātauranga Māori and introduce the ‘Poutama’ used to analyse levels of Mātauranga Māori embedded in programmes and to identify opportunities to increase depth. It will argue that the embedding of Mātauranga Māori in the design adds unique value to this doctorate. The premise is that a synthesis of factors will enable the transdisciplinary nature of the programme to offer an innovative academic and professional development experience for the doctoral candidate.

The authors are two members of the team responsible for the development of the DProf at Unitec and are supported by the team to make this presentation.
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Increasingly universities in the United States are being called to provide a curriculum that is rigorous and relevant to the needs of practicing K-12 school leaders. At the same time K-12 school leaders are being guided by federal and state mandates. Since 2009, one of the primary drivers for K-12 school leaders have been policies to spur innovation and reform that have emerged as a result of the Ed Recovery Act. This Act also provided Race to the Top funding from the United States Department of Education to reward states and districts that developed and implemented plans aligned with reform initiatives. As such, it is imperative for leadership preparation programs to have a clear understanding of the tenants of the Race to the Top initiative.

The purpose of this multi-phase exploratory collective case study is to understand the elements of successful Race to the Top - District applications and how the roles of leaders are presented in successful applications. Archival data were collected from the United States Department of Education web site. This included over 9,000 pages of documents from 21 Race to the Top - District Winner applications for 2012 and 2013. Preliminary analysis suggests that winning applications articulated comprehensive reform visions that were highly dependent on utilizing technology to individualize instruction and monitor student data. Each winning application also included a continuous improvement process that included professional development for school leaders. These findings have implications for school leaders and educational leadership faculty.
Program Diversity: Doctorate Program Contributions to Intercultural Knowledge, The Islamic College provision

By Dr Mohammad Mesbahi Director of Education, The Islamic College, mesbahi@islamic-college.ac.uk

Based on the promotion of knowledge exchange between Muslim and non Muslim communities and between various branches of Islam itself, The Islamic College (partner linked with Middlesex University) has looked to enhance this by recognising the skills and experience of workers in our communities, Muslim and non Muslim and assisting them in reflecting on, articulating, validating and disseminating their growing knowledge of working at the interface of various cultures and belief systems. In developing a Doctorate programme it has intended to provide a unique multi-institutional doctoral framework that offers a diversity of routes for candidates from the private, public and voluntary sectors to come together and advance community work and mentoring at the interface of difference, allowing individuals and groups to share their experience and experiential learning from practice regarding the needs of the various Muslim communities in our multi-cultural society whom they encounter.

Europe is now home to well over 38 million Muslims, or about five per cent of its population (PEW Forum, 2009). Britain is now a recognized multi-faith country, with Muslims accounting for the second largest religious group after Christianity with the 2011 census showing 2.7 million Muslims living in England and Wales. In our multicultural world this minority has strived to preserve its culture and way of life, with patterns of dress, manners, food, family relationships, social care, and community relations and at the same time be responsive to the dominant culture within which they are located as well as to the various other cultures which exist alongside them in this rich tapestry. Such coexistence has varying degrees of positive and negative impact on notions of integration not least on language, generational dynamics and professional and social practices.

The Doctorate programme aims to help in the development of local communities by recognising the skills and expertise required to work at the interface of cultural differences and by providing the conditions for senior and accomplished practitioners to use their experiences in their various field of expertise to achieve doctoral recognition not only for substantial contributions to Muslim Community Work and Mentoring but for their contributions to stability through mutual exchange of respect and understanding. The Islamic college has a positive approach to dialogue between faiths and cultures and has been recognised for its interfaith endeavours.

This paper will review such a provision, asking a fundamental question of whether a different approach is needed to education in Community Practice. The paper will also examine reports by Dr Siddiqui to the UK Minister of Lifelong Learning, Further and Higher Education in 2007 which has indicated that Islamic “teaching and research programmes need to be re-oriented” and Dr Scott-Baumann to the UK department for Communities and Local Government in 2010 recommending “the study of relevant research and scholarly discussion” suggesting research could be “complex and sensitive” focusing on issues surrounding the
embedding of critical enquiry in community practice. We will draw on examples from our Doctorate collaborative programme with Middlesex University.


Supervision of doctoral students: Looking at institutional support

Abstract

Introduction

Higher education institutions play a central role in providing the structures to support postgraduate research and supervision. I use a literature review to argue for better supervision support by illustrating that the current research and literature on successful postgraduate supervision have insufficiently addressed the convergence in higher education by neglecting to take the issues of institutional context and research culture adequately into account. This presentation will address the global and national debates on the need to increase the doctoral graduate output in South Africa. In this presentation I am discussing the issue of doctoral production and the pressures associated with that from the perspective of various South African stakeholders.

SA national policies

The need for more doctoral candidates is a global challenge. Park argues that in the UK a sustained supply of doctoral candidates is essential – not just to grow the next generation of academics, but to maintain vitality and research momentum in disciplines. A number of national policies and studies have indicated a need for increasing the doctoral output in South African higher education in order for South Africa to be competitive in the knowledge economy. However, these policies do not say how these targets will be achieved. According to the Department of Science and Technology (DST) “South Africa will need to increase its Ph.D. production rate by a factor of about five over the next 10–20 years” in order “to build a knowledge-based economy positioned between developed and developing countries” (DST, 2008: 290). The National Development Plan (2011) poses a target of tripling the number of doctoral graduates from 1 420 to 5 000 per annum, and increasing the proportion of academic staff with PhDs from 34% to 75%.

There is a broad consensus in the science community in South Africa that not enough high-quality doctorates are being produced in relation to the developmental needs of the country
(CHE/CREST, 2009; ASSAf, 2010). The ASSAf report argues that for South Africa to be a serious competitor in the global knowledge economy, and to achieve standards that are internationally comparable, both the quality and quantity of PhDs need to be expanded dramatically (ASSAf, 2010). Most of the existing literature together with the policies mentioned do not say much in terms of how the different institutions should support emerging supervisors with the aim of introducing them to the research culture of the institutions.

The South African higher education system had to face a major reconstruction post 1994 in order to deal with the injustices of the past and to ensure equality in the higher education system. The 1997 White Paper outlines the framework for change, that is, the higher education system must be planned, governed and funded as a single, national co-ordinated system. This was done in order to enable the country to overcome the fragmentation, inequality and inefficiency, which were the legacy of the past where institutional differentiation was based on historical inequalities. This is how the current differentiated higher education system came into being after 1994.

**Statistical data**

The 2009 CHE/CREST report noted that South African academics are increasingly burdened with an unrealistically high load of postgraduate students to supervise. The number of postgraduate students has more than doubled over the past 15 years, while the number of permanent academics has only increased by 40%. Furthermore, only about 34% of South African academics have PhDs. The South African higher education context would need to be taken into consideration in any intervention of postgraduate supervision support, as South Africa has different institutional types as presented by the White Paper on Higher Education.

**Pressures on doctoral production**

In South Africa there are different institutional types as presented by the 1997 White Paper on Higher Education. This issue of differentiation and its historical background may impact on the postgraduate supervision process. I will draw on multiple sources to consider each of
the four pressures on doctoral production in depth, and consider some of the implications thereof. The first pressure is the global and national competition to increase the doctoral output in order to serve the knowledge economy. As we shift to a society in which the ability to use knowledge to innovate and problem solve is most highly valued, so access to the powerful knowledge embodied by the doctoral qualification has become highly prized. The doctorate is seen to be a key indicator of a country’s stability and potential for economic growth in the world of the knowledge economy. It is therefore unsurprising that, from a mere 1 872 doctoral graduates in 2012, the National Development Plan sets a target of 5 000 per year by 2030.

The second pressure identified by Cloete and Mouton is on the quality of the PhD graduates. The HEQSF (2013) sets clear standards on what is expected of a doctorate graduate: “The doctoral degree requires a candidate to undertake research at the most advanced academic levels culminating in the submission, assessment and acceptance of a thesis.” (HEQSF, 2013: 36). Cloete and Mouton (2014) argue that the qualifications of academics affect the quality of what they do and how they supervise.

The third pressure relates to the need for transformation. This is both about equity in ensuring that all South Africans get access to powerful knowledge and about institutional restructuring of higher education in order to do away with the inequalities of the past. The ASSAf report (2010: 16) indicates that “in 2007, 80% of all graduates were produced by Universities While CHET (2012) reports an uneven distribution with seven out of 23 universities producing most of the doctoral graduates and some comprehensive universities doing better than the traditional universities in this regard.

The fourth pressure is efficiency, whereby the government wants high graduate returns on its subsidy investments in doctoral enrolments (Cloete & Mouton, 2014). At present, about 54% of candidates fail to complete their doctorates within seven years (Cloete & Mouton, 2014). Given that public higher education remains highly subsidised in South Africa and that the doctorate is increasingly linked to economic growth, it is not surprising that questions are being asked about efficiency in doctoral education.
**Doctoral supervision**

This presentation looks at postgraduate supervision support and how the differentiated South African higher education supports emerging supervisors in their supervision development. Emerging supervisors in this context refer to those supervisors who have just completed their own PhDs and are expected to supervise according to the requirement as stated by the HEQSF (2013) that “a graduate should be able to supervise and evaluate the research of others in the area of specialisation concerned”. Although there are a number of studies on postgraduate supervision most of the current literature is on the roles and responsibilities of both the candidates and the supervisors (Phillips & Pugh, 2010; Lee, 2009; Mouton, 2005) and little is said about the role of the institution in developing supervisors to ensure that they are able to take the supervision responsibility in order to make the doctoral study possible.

**Conclusion**

I have highlighted the fact that South Africa needs more doctoral graduates in order to be competitive in the knowledge economy. I then addressed the pressures related to this need for growth in doctoral output. However, in focusing on the supervisors and candidates, most of the current literature barely considers the institutional responsibilities. Little consideration is also given to the structural and cultural issues of the institutions.
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Doctoral (PhD) Education in Ethiopia: Status, Opportunities and Perils

Mulu Nega Kahsay (PhD)*

Abstract
The past fifteen years have witnessed remarkable changes in the Ethiopian higher education landscape following the implementation of successive reform initiatives and strategies within the framework of the 1994 education and training policy. There has been rapid expansion in higher education institutions and student enrolment, mostly driven by changes in the external environment of the higher education system. Ensuring quality educational provisions and research outputs in the climate of rapid higher education expansion places significant pressure on universities to train highly qualified teaching and research staff at postgraduate level. The demand to expand postgraduate education in turn has led to greater interest in producing highly trained teaching and research staff at a PhD level. Currently, the doctoral (PhD) training is amidst of rapid expansion in terms of program types and enrolment. However, much empirical research has not been conducted on the status of doctoral education in Ethiopia. This paper thus critically examines the status of doctoral education in the Ethiopian public universities. The paper tries to explore the opportunities and threats that the doctoral education is facing. A neo-institutional theory is used as a theoretical lens in understanding the environment of the universities, more importantly; their regulations and funding that may influence the doctoral education. Equally, the characteristics of universities offering doctoral education are also examined. This paper employs the qualitative approach to gather and analyze data. A total of 40 participants (30 doctoral students and 10 professors) selected from Addis Ababa University, Haramaya University and Bahirdar University participated in this study. The results of this study indicate that both environmental factors and university specific conditions influence the status of doctoral education in the Ethiopian context. The current expansion of doctoral education is in response to the environmental opportunities that can be explained in terms of increasing demand from the newly expanding public universities for qualified academic leaders, advisors and research staff as well as the highly trained labor force need of the growing economy. Nonetheless, absence of human resource planning at national level, the inadequacy of funding for doctoral education, and unpreparedness of incoming PhD candidates become key hurdles for imparting quality and relevant doctoral education. The quality of doctoral education is also influenced by university specific conditions. While the enthusiasm and commitment of academic community to offer doctoral training can be considered as a step forward, organizational factors such as management and organization of doctoral education, quality of advisement and supervision, human and non-human resources, and evaluation of the doctoral programs become major challenges for the doctoral programs in universities. This paper concludes that the expansion of doctoral education by itself is not sufficient to address the highly trained human resource needs of the ever-expanding higher education system of Ethiopia and its socio-economic transformation, unless quality and relevance of education are taken care of. Finally, recommendations for improvement of the current doctoral education are suggested based on the findings.
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ABSTRACT

During admission, induction, and initial coursework, doctoral students begin to form a scholarly identity and experience the mentored nature of doctoral education. Golde (1998) described four “general tasks of transition and initial socialization” in doctoral education, including (1) “intellectual mastery” to assess capableness with regard to scholarly work; (2) “learning about the realities of life as graduate student” to estimate the costs and benefits associated with the struggle; (3) “learning about the profession” to identify and determine whether anticipated career paths remains attractive and available; and (4) “integrating oneself with the department” to see whether a good fit exists between the student and department (p. 56).

As a contribution to the scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990), the author conducted a self-study of praxis (Kemmis & Smith, 2008) at one university to examine how an innovation in pedagogy, forming research teams to write *group-authored reviews of literature*, facilitates the learning of doctoral students in their journey in becoming and being scholars, and eventually, independent researchers in higher education. Requiring students to write group-authored reviews of literature introduces them to the rigorous nature of academic work, supports the development of a scholarly identity, and reveals the creative and collaborative nature of scholarly work. Students learn the challenges associated with scholarship and collaboration as they struggle to complete their first “draft” review of literature with a three-to-four person team.

The review of literature plays an important role in several areas of research and scholarship: acquiring knowledge in a discipline and field, as preparation for designing and conducting a study, and as a recognized publishable form of scholarship (Boote & Beile, 2005). Botte and Beile described “poorly conceptualized and written” dissertation literature reviews as a “dirty little secret” known to those serving on dissertation committees (p. 4). The placement of the review early in coursework sets a high standard for doctoral work. Students conducting research in the field of education face additional challenges because of the interdisciplinary nature of educational research. They often use literature from several disciplines, and as border crossers, engage in additional textual work to interpret research methods and findings.

After introducing the group-authored review assignment, the methods used to organize students into research teams, examples of instructor-assigned research questions (same question to all teams), and the staged instruction of the conceptual and technical tasks associated with writing a review of literature are described. This includes review guidelines and the sequence of instruction, structures for collaboration and information management, goals for text production, feedback on text submissions, and measures adopted to hold individuals and groups accountable for co-authoring the review.

The group-review assignment helps students gain proficiency in locating, reading, and reviewing research as critical readers and writers. Students find the goal of summarizing and integrating research findings *in writing*, and adopting a critical stance toward the literature a daunting challenge. Close readings of texts and discussions with peers provide a safe way to try out interpretations of text in the search for meaning and its eventual translation into words on a page. As students learn the difference between oral language and academic prose, they gain knowledge of disciplinary styles and rhetorical moves (Kamler & Thomson, 2006) in telling a research story (Feak & Swales, 2009).
Eventually, students begin to see the relationship between research and writing – “research is writing” (Kamler & Thomson, 2006). Students select, analyze, and present their review findings with theory during their first semester, making the connection between the conceptual framework and research design. The group-review assignment introduces the review of literature without the expectation students achieve the level of scholarship needed to win approval of a dissertation proposal or study. Reading and reviewing studies provides them with examples of published research. The review demystifies the fear associated with doctoral education by immersing them in the experience of reading and producing text.

The literature review assignment during the early phases of doctoral education introduces the level of scholarship needed to conduct research and also encourages certain “habits of mind” and “skills and abilities” (Gardner, Hayes, & Neider, 2007) throughout the program. Group-authored reviews of literature play an important role in helping students answer Golde’s (1998) four questions common to students during the first year of doctoral education: “Can I do this? … Do I want to be a graduate student? … Do I want to do this work? … [and] Do I belong here?” (p. 56). Doctoral students seek answers to these questions to determine whether they made the right choice. Later, students write and submit an individual critical review of literature to obtain candidacy, taking another next step in their journey to becoming scholars and independent researchers as “stage two” (Lovitts, 2001) doctoral students.

Keywords: literature review, praxis, doctoral pedagogy, doctoral education, scholarly identity, peer learning, scholar, scholarship, apprenticeship
Group-Authored Reviews of Literature:
Discovering the Meaning of Scholarship During Stage One of Doctoral Education

Because professional learning often occurs over a number of years, we may fail to notice the beginning of a substantial change and its long journey to present-day practice. This proved true for me regarding the experience of teaching students how to write a review of literature during their first semester and year of formal coursework in an interdisciplinary doctoral program. The change in practice and its effects on student learning led to a deeper understanding about the nature of doctoral education for students and me.

Like most change stories, something serves as a catalyst for change. In our case the catalyst for change involved “a nagging problem” in practice with regard to the quality of student writing (Noonan, 2013). In this self-study of praxis, I investigated how a curricular change and innovation in pedagogy, forming research teams to write group-authored reviews of literature, supported doctoral students in forming a scholarly identity. The study concerns curriculum and pedagogy, experienced in coursework (the first five credits of an interdisciplinary leadership “core” program) at one regional university in the United States. I emphasize program delivery to alert international readers to the underlying structure of the program, which includes formal coursework, academic/ and dissertation advising, informal mentoring, and department culture and events.

The curricular change and pedagogy described in this paper concern student learning experiences in “stage one” in doctoral education involving student transition into the doctoral program typically accomplished through formal coursework (Lovitts, 2001).
Golde (1998) described four “general tasks of transition and initial socialization” in doctoral education, including (1) “intellectual mastery” to assess capableness with regard to scholarly work; (2) “learning about the realities of life as graduate student” to estimate the costs and benefits associated with the struggle; (3) “learning about the profession” to identify and determine whether anticipated career paths remains attractive and available; and (4) “integrating oneself with the department” to see whether a good fit exists between the student and department (p. 56).

In this paper I describe how a change in practice led to significant changes in student identity and learning. I argue the placement of the group-authored literature review assignment early in the doctoral program supports student accomplishment of stage one goals. After introducing the impetus for change, namely a department effort to improve student writing, I then describe the methods adopted for this inquiry. I follow with a description of a curricular change, including the particulars involved in facilitating group-authored reviews.

Before continuing to the next section, I gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Dr. Kate Boyle, a colleague and friend, and now chair of our department. I also thank Dr. Karen Klein for her contributions over several years.

**Research Question, Purpose and Significance**

I adopted the following question to guide my inquiry: How does the formation of research teams to write a group-authored review of literature help students make the transition into doctoral education and support their future acquisition of stage two and three competencies? My purpose in conducting this inquiry of praxis is to make “pedagogy public” (Andresen, 2010, p. 143) by identifying why and how certain
pedagogies serve the developmental needs and programmatic challenges encountered by doctoral students during the early stages of their education.

**Methodology**

I conducted a “praxis inquiry” regarding how an innovation facilitated student learning in the early stages of doctoral education (Kemmis & Smith, 2008). “Praxis” describes action informed by theory and reflection—capturing the important relationship between the action taken and the reasons for its selection and its effects on others. The essential nature of praxis inquiry involves “being able to look back on an event with hindsight and with access to resources, including discussion with colleagues, references to research, and comparisons with other events,” (Burridge, Carpenter, Cherednichenko & Krueger, 2010, p. 24).

Praxis inquiry follows a familiar cycle of action research (Schoen, 2007), beginning with the identification of an area worthy of investigation, a research question, data collection, analysis, experimentation with methods to make improvements, changes in practice, and evaluation of the effect of these changes on student learning. Action research “empowers teachers in monitoring and analyzing personal practices with the intent of expanding … [the] knowledge base and enhancing instructional prowess” (Schoen, 2007, p. 215). I reviewed, described, and reflected on changes in pedagogy adopted and refined after more than a decade of critical reflection on methods and results regarding how to teach students to write a review of literature as a “practice” exercise early in their program.

A scholarly teacher uses the results of research in teaching (Boyer, 1990), however, a scholar of teaching engages in critical inquiries of practice to discover knowledge and
pedagogy “previously ignored, or inadequately understood or presented” (Andresen, 2010, p. 149). Praxis includes the “agent” or actor’s awareness and intention “to ‘steer’ unfolding action and events toward a desirable state of affairs,” for the benefit of participants but also as a social good for humankind (Kemmis & Smith, 2008, p. 7).

Critical reflection on praxis includes a consideration of history and tradition with the need for “critical consciousness … to find ways of thinking that, at least partially allow us to escape the constraints of that tradition has placed upon our thought, interpretations, and perspectives, and imagine our futures” (Kemmis & Smith, 2008, p. 8). Innovations in curriculum and pedagogy sometimes require challenging dominant assumptions regarding effective practice. The innovation described in this study challenged three dominant assumptions and tensions concerning pedagogical tradition in higher education. This involved an immersive and apprenticeship-type mentorship, engaging students in a “learning by doing” approach to conducting research without a lengthy introduction to methods, (2) emphasized the value of group and individual effort and accomplishment in conducting research and producing scholarship, and (3) viewed the literature review assignment as a “practice” exercise to help students gain “working knowledge” of scholarship without the expectation of technical and conceptual mastery of review elements and style. These moves appear counter-intuitive to good practice. I describe the reasons for these decisions in my paper through the description and analysis of the review assignment.

Kemmis and Smith (2008) offered an elegant definition of praxis inquiry, summarizing the reasons for conducting and sharing the results of a praxis inquiry: a praxis inquiry “concerns how well we did on the day, when we ourselves had to choose
and to act (or not to act), when the consequences of our actions flowed on to others for
better or for worse” (p. 7). I briefly describe the impetus for change and then review
assignment guidelines.

A Department Effort to Improve Student Writing

The actual change in pedagogy started with the addition of the “literature review
assignment” as a new requirement in the “core” doctoral program (18 credits over a
three-year period). The placement of the review assignment early in the program
addressed faculty concerns regarding the overall quality of student writing in the doctoral
program, and the uneven, and sometimes disappointing quality of critical literature
reviews in dissertation proposals.

Department members thought the review assignment early in coursework might
help students gain a realistic appraisal of the expected standards required in scholarly
writing. The “practice” review allowed students and advisors an opportunity to gauge
student proficiency based on detailed instructor feedback. Faculty felt obliged to notify
students of writing as an academic concern early in the program to avoid the
circumstance of learning “too little too late” about a problem and its consequences. Early
notice also provides time for students to take advantage of resources offered by the
university to improve writing, and also inform students of their obligation to pay a tutor
and/or hire an editor at their expense to meet department standards.

As one of two professors involved in this change, I thought the task seemed
impossible. Despite concerns, we added the review assignment as an independent activity
within a leadership course. Over the first few years, co-instructors improved the
curriculum and pedagogy, helping students find greater success in preparing a draft
review. However, dissatisfaction with the limited time (one semester) and level of student accomplishment raised our awareness of a “nagging problem in practice” (Noonan, 2013). The solution involved the change to group-authored reviews of literature, described next.

**Group-Authored Literature Reviews**

Thinking deeply about the power of learning using a collaborative approach, I proposed a change in methods to my then colleague and co-teaching partner, Dr. Kate Boyle. We evaluated the advantages and disadvantages associated with group-authored reviews before making the change. The advantages in changing to group-authored reviews seemed obvious: forming research teams reduced the burden of producing approximately 20-25 pages of text written by individual authors to a now manageable requirement of seven to ten “perfect” pages per student. Students read three texts and wrote two papers in addition to the literature review assignment, prepared several presentations, and completed an end-of-the-course reflection in a three-credit class. We thought this was enough work.

Another benefit of the group approach occurred when students read and reviewed the *same collection of studies* in small groups, putting more minds on the work involved in interpreting studies, identifying themes, methods, and findings in the research, and producing an original synthesis of studies in a group-authored review of literature. The entire process requires a sophisticated set of knowledge and skills, no easy task for novice or experienced scholars.

Yet another advantage concerned our ability to work more strategically with small groups, providing time to coach students regarding *their* review. Addressing the group’s
specific problems, instead of an explanation of general problems in conceptualizing or
describing research, increased the value of feedback. Group-authored reviews reduced
the degree of threat experienced by students based on their perceived confidence and
competence regarding academic writing.

The disadvantages associated with group-authored reviews largely pertained to
individual accountability for demonstrating conceptual and technical understanding of the
review. We wanted to see student effort and accomplishment in locating and interpreting
studies and producing text. We solved this problem by requiring individual and group
submission of text. Another worry involved “social loafing,” defined by Johnson and
Johnson (2013) as “a reduction of individual effort when working with others on an
additive group task” (p. 269). When I described this problem, one student called non-
contributors “loafies,” and the term caught on. We avoided this problem by making
regular visits to workspaces (accessed through shared links), and requiring periodic
submissions of individual student text.

Learning how to write a review of literature plays an important role in forming a
scholarly identity and reveals the creative and collaborative nature of scholarly work.
The group-authored review engaged students in (1) the experience of accessing and
reading scholarly literature, and its importance in research design (Feak & Swales, 2009);
(2) collaboration with peers to critically read and interpret various types of scholarly
literature (Wallace & Wray, 2011); (3) fostered an appreciation of the concept, “research
is writing,” and the role writing plays in discovering and expressing ideas (Kamler &
Thomson, 2006, p. 11), and (4) engaged students in an intense and arduous journey to
help them see and experience the work and importance of “becoming scholars before
researchers” in doctoral education (Boote & Beile, 2005). The goals set the stage for student learning. I next provide an overview of the curriculum and pedagogy used to introduce the review purposes and goals and the structure and strategy used to form research teams and write group-authored reviews of literature.

### Introducing the Review of Literature Purpose and Goals

Several years ago, I read Burke’s (1941) story about the experience of entering a parlor to engage in a “heated discussion” with others already in the room. The story warns the reader of the impossibility of possessing full knowledge of the topic under discussion, and the risks associated with engaging in a heated debate as an inexperienced speaker in the parlor.

I wrote the following story, *The Eternal Conversation*, and simply asked students to read it before beginning the discussion on the goals and purposes of the literature review as a necessary step in conducting research.

Imagine entering a room filled with past and present scholars engaged in a long conversation about an important topic in your field. To enter into the conversation, you must be aware of their contributions before daring to engage in the debate. Scholars with significant work and reputation occupy the most prestigious chairs in the center of the room. Wearing academic robes and calling each other by their formal names (Dr. So and So), they engage in a heated discussion. Their discussion intrigues and challenges you.

You listen intently, while trying to determine if you even belong in the room. Struggling against an impulse to bolt for the door, you remember the reason you entered the room in the first place: a burning desire to know the answer to your research question. You also like being in this company, talking about ideas, and sitting in a comfortable chair.

Putting aside your fears, you muster the courage to enter the conversation. You plan to begin with a brief description of your “issue,” share the reason for its importance in the field, and quickly introduce your research question. Turning to each scholar, you succinctly summarize his or her contribution, tracing the advances in intellectual knowledge in the field as a result of his or her effort. You compare research methods and findings, locating shifts and turning points in research. You note how a few scholars seated in the parlor challenged assumptions and explored new frontiers. The
“heated discussion” now includes your voice and your confidence soars. Worried you might bore or annoy the senior scholars already seated in the parlor, you show how you included their contributions by organizing, integrating and critiquing the body of work with a fresh approach.

A few scholars offer encouragement, recalling their struggle to enter the conversation as junior scholars. They appreciate your command of the literature. Others seemed glued to their chairs, listening intently to your argument before offering an opinion on your review. A few even take notes.

Because you demonstrated command of the research in your review, scholars show continued interest in your research question. You show how the answer to your “burning question” promises to make a contribution to the field and represents the next logical step in research. Scholars refer to this as the, “So why would anyone care about this?” question.

Hoping to win approval for your proposal, you quickly describe how you intend to conduct your research in plain and painful detail. You brought a few props to show your preparation for your study, including a locked safe to illustrate the importance of confidentiality. The scholars appear to be impressed with your tablet computer, digital recorder, and speech recognition software. Feeling even more confident, you describe the tools and methods adopted to collect and analyze your data.

A stack of books placed next to your chair draws the scholars’ attention to the theoretical frameworks you intend to use in your analysis. Becoming increasingly more confident, you risk sharing some of the data and analysis derived from a pilot study. After presenting your proposal, you quickly scan the room to gauge their response. First silence, and then the attack began!

Much to your horror, a few scholars smile condescendingly and ask you why you failed to notice the answer to your question appears in their work. Another described a recent study published by Dr. So and So and look at you with surprise and disappointment. Others appear to have an appetite for violence.

Now you realize your discussion of their work was too brief. A word of warning: lengthy quotations do not serve as a substitute for in-depth description and analysis. Someone from the back of the room asks a deceptively simple question, “Exactly how do you plan on conducting this study?” You thought you described the method clearly.

The American Psychological Association (APA) police pound on the door, charging into the room to arrest the thief who failed to give fair attribution to scholarly work. Closely on the heels of the APA police, the Institution Research Board (IRB) issues its final warning for all to see: “Do not proceed without IRB committee permission; your expedited request is denied.” You realize too late the heated discussion in the parlor involves your research proposal.

Leaping from your chair, you pick it up and use it as a shield against the now attaching pack of scholar wolves. Surviving their questions regarding your review, interpretation, methods of analysis, and conclusion,
you quickly learn defending your proposal is not just a parlor game! Now in a cold sweat you look for somewhere to hide or the nearest exit.

Much to your surprise, one of the scholars in the room offers you a chair. Suddenly the alarm goes off and your proposal nightmare ends. Reflecting on its meaning, you realize the chair you seized to defend yourself against the pack of wolves is not an object, but rather the real chair of your dissertation committee. An experienced scholar, he or she guides you to enter the conversation safely when you are ready. The lesson to be learned: know every scholar of substance in the room, plan carefully, and follow your chair before you attempt to sit in it!

The discussion following this story often fills the room with emotion. Students describe their uncertainty and fear associated with entering a doctoral program, and its importance to their personal and professional identity and goals. After the discussion, we present the goals of the literature review. I adopted Leshem and Trafford’s (2007) visual map of research and added the numbers around the circular image to facilitate discussion (see Figure 1). Students see the “hourly” tasks involved in completing a dissertation proposal and study. The image helps them envision the process and see the relationships between the various elements. The inter-connecting lines between the elements on Leshem and Trafford’s (2007) map show relationships. For example, the map shows the link between the research issue and design, and the gap in knowledge found in the literature at the beginning of a study and contribution to knowledge once completed. I take students on a brief tour of databases, such as ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global, showing students how to explore literature reviews within dissertations on their own. These activities take the mystery out of what a “real” study looks like.
Figure 1. Leshem & Trafford’s (2007) circular graph illustration of research with clock hours added.

Trafford and Leshem (2008) described a review of the literature as more like a review of “your” literature, noting the importance of ownership of findings after careful study, the possession of an intimate knowledge of a body of work, and the unique arrangement and synthesis of literature and theory framing the research study. A poor review fails to include important literature, and lacks order and coherence in the description of findings.

The review of literature plays an important role in several areas of research and scholarship: acquiring knowledge in a discipline and field, as preparation for designing and conducting a study, and as a recognized publishable form of scholarship (Boote & Beile, 2005). Botte and Beile described “poorly conceptualized and written” dissertation
literature reviews as a “dirty little secret” known to those serving on dissertation committees (p. 4). The placement of the review early in coursework sets a high standard for doctoral work.

Students must learn how to “engage,” “interrogate,” and “extort” literature and theory (Trafford & Leshem, 2008) in preparing their conceptual framework. Once provided with a basic description of the research purposes and process, I notice a sense of relief among students. A brief and logical introduction of the review and its purpose provides just enough information to get started. Long explanations at the beginning of a highly complex process lose their value because difficult knowledge must be tackled indirectly with brief forays into the complex ideas and processes associated with research.

This explains the first two counter-intuitive moves: adopting an immersive and apprentice-style approach to teaching students how to write a review of literature and valuing individual and group effort in writing the review. Perkins (1999) three constructivist roles needed to acquire knowledge and understanding of learning conceptually difficult knowledge, including roles as active, social, and creative learners. Active learners “discuss, debate, hypothesize, investigate, and take viewpoints” (p. 7). Social learners co-construct knowledge and understanding “in dialogue with others” (p. 7). Creative learners “create and recreate knowledge for themselves” (p. 8). Students need all three of these roles in learning how to write a review of literature.

Experiential, immersive, and inquiry-type methods combined with cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 2013) help students to gradually build layers of understanding through staged encounters with research tasks and text production. They
receive and discuss instructor feedback as a research team, pose questions within the
group and to the instructors, and participate in debriefing activities after each successive
attempt to learn. To ensure individual and group participation and accountability, we
form teams based on cognitive and social styles, establish routines to share research and
coop-author the review, and require students to establish “author-order” title page to
represent the level of contributions team members. The final counter-intuitive move,
ending the “practice exercise” without the expectation of perfect text makes great
developmental sense. Students achieve more learning together, but cannot master the art
and form of reviewing literature in a single semester. We keep the standards in front of
them, and end the exercise when students meet the assignment criteria.

Teaching the review (or anything difficult) requires a continuous return to central
concepts and strategies adopted after students make successive attempts at meeting goals.
Written guidelines help students see the overall plan (an abbreviated version appears
next).

**Review of Literature Assignment**

You will conduct and write a review of literature on the following question (2013): How do online social networks and other forms of social support affect the mental health and cultural adaptation of immigrant youth and adults? The multiple purposes for this assignment include: learning how to conduct library research; becoming familiar with databases for research; learning how to organize and describe scholarly research; using APA style correctly; collaborating with other scholars on producing research; and continuing to broaden and deepen your knowledge of leadership in a global society. You will work with colleagues in small groups to prepare and submit *one review of literature per team* following a prescribed process.

The literature review assignment and process requires individual and group effort. All group members prepare and produce the review. Individually, you will review a “collection” of literature as well as locate additional literature for consideration. You will also write summaries of research as potential contributions to the body of the review, using a scholarly voice. All members must use in-text citations and
references following APA style. Students will periodically submit and upload their contributions to Blackboard, allowing instructors and peers to review your submission and consider summaries for inclusion in the final paper.

**Research Process: August**

After participating in introductory learning activities regarding the purpose and goals in writing a review of literature, you will identify, locate, retrieve, read, and briefly summarize scholarly literature related to your question. This involves learning how to access databases and retrieve articles available from the University of St. Thomas collection and participating libraries, and also reading and summarizing research.

1. Locate and read studies. To facilitate the initial review process, you will access an instructor-prepared research collection on the research question, using a weblink to access selected studies. You will add 25+ studies to the collection from different databases. Use online articles from scholarly journals (not texts) to allow all group members access to studies. You will use books and articles in future reviews, however, to promote group access, please limit your review to articles accessible to all group members.

2. Summarize findings in a group table. Group members should read the entire collection of articles to gain familiarity with studies pertaining question. Next, assign individual group members to carefully review and summarize key findings in a group table.

3. Create a reference list. Next, insert an accurate APA reference to the group list as your contribution to the review. Do this perfectly.

4. Post your individual contribution to the journal and group workspace.

**September**

During the September class meeting, you will discuss the research reviewed, share articles obtained through your personal research, thematically organize the studies, and adopt three to four main themes. Working collaboratively with a small group of co-authors, you then prepare a concept map or outline of your review and write an introduction to your study.

**October**

You will read and discuss individual submissions, arrange, and edit them, and write the first section of the group review in the October class meeting. The combined text should be logically organized and include a coherent and scholarly description of findings. The process follows the same pattern: first individual members prepare and submit work to instructors and peers prior to class meetings, and then group members discuss the submission, agree on the content, and co-author sections of the review.
November
You will write and submit the final two sections of the literature review using the combined scholarship of the team, and produce a complete reference list in correct APA style. Be sure to upload your individual contribution to your journal and group pages, and color-code your “sentences” in the group review. This should look like a multi-colored rainbow of integrated contributions. You will learn how to summarize your study, discuss implications, and locate the “gap” in the literature during the November class session. After “polishing your text,” your group selects one or two theories to analyze your findings and present the themes in your review.

December
You will determine author-order based on contributions to the study (first author added the most). During the final day of class, you will write a reflection on your learning and the meaning of doctoral education.

These abbreviated guidelines above illustrate the process adopted over a five-month period.

Summary
The change from individual to group-authored reviews now provides an introduction to the scholarship required in a doctoral program through staged encounters with learning how to review literature and write in academic prose (Kamler & Thomson, 2006). As students learn the difference between oral language and academic prose, they gain knowledge of disciplinary styles and rhetorical moves (Kamler & Thomson, 2006) in “telling a research story” (Feak & Swales, 2009). Eventually, students begin to see the relationship between research and writing – “research is writing” and “writing as research” (Kamler & Thomson, 2006).

The instructor-prepared question and initial collection of studies gives student practice accessing and interpreting studies, summarizing research, and co-authoring the review as writers and collaborators. During the last class meeting, research teams share the results of their review with the entire group (“the big reveal”). The results often surprise and intrigue students. All groups tackled same question, accessed a common
“collection” of peer-reviewed journal articles, and doubled the number of studies reviewed, yet significant differences often exist in review findings and analysis. This shows scholarship as a creative endeavor.

The review of literature assignment helps students find answers to Golde’s (1998) four questions: “Can I do this? … Do I want to be a graduate student? … Do I want to do this work? … [and] Do I belong here?” (p. 56). Group-authored reviews help students answer the above questions by addressing issues of capableness, identity, and fit with the program. The review assignment encourages certain “habits of mind” and “skills and abilities” (Gardner, Hayes, & Neider, 2007) needed throughout the program. Students see the value and work required in forming a scholarly identity – and start their journey on the path to becoming a researcher in higher education or their professional field. We get them started: the rest is up to them.
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The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) provides general design concepts that enable program development to be responsive to local contexts. The concepts also provide some degree of consistency among CPED-influenced programs, namely to support through program design and delivery the development of Scholar Practitioners who possess skills and abilities that are meaningful to, and transformative of, their practice.

One of CPED’s design concepts is the laboratory of practice, which is defined by the CPED consortium as “settings where theory and practice inform and enrich each other. They address complex problems of practice where ideas—formed by the intersection of theory, inquiry, and practice—can be implemented, measured, and analyzed for the impact made” (CPED, 2014). As a program design concept, the laboratory of practice focuses not solely on developing students’ research skills and deepening their understanding of bodies of knowledge. Rather the laboratory of practice interweaves and mobilizes theory, research, and practitioner knowledge within authentic contexts of education. As the CPED definition continues, “Laboratories of Practice facilitate transformative and generative learning that is measured by the development of scholarly expertise and implementation of practice.” Based on this brief definition, the laboratory of practice may be conceived of as

- both a pedagogical product and process;
- a location for learning as well as the subject of that learning;
- an opportunity for measuring scholarly expertise but also a means of facilitating the ongoing transformation of that expertise;
- and, a space for exploration and experimentation that nevertheless sees the real-life impact of that exploration and experimentation.

Through a brief survey of CPED-influenced EdD programs, this paper will reiterate the value of the laboratory of practice design concept for a doctoral dissertation model that aims to develop Scholar Practitioners. In the context of a recently developed fully online EdD program offered by a leading research intensive university in Canada, it will also consider how the national contexts in which EdD programs are offered, the diverse range of students within the program, and the program’s mode of
delivery, all require a careful re-consideration of the purpose and functioning of the laboratory of practice as (an already complex) design concept. This case study brings into relief some of the ways in which macro (i.e. policy) and micro (i.e. pedagogical) factors have a deep impact on how “virtual” laboratories of practice for highly diverse student cohorts may be designed and delivered. Finally, this paper will seek to understand the laboratory of practice design concept from a framework that combines the practical experiences of day-to-day program administration with evidence-based learning theories such as TPACK, Kolb’s learning cycle, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL).
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Abstract

This longitudinal study explores the nature and source of mentoring that facilitates doctoral degree attainment for students of color. Within a broad socialization framework anchored by Taylor and Anthony’s Wise Schooling approach, we study of the professional pathways of five participants who earned their doctoral degree in the 1980s and 1990s. We pair survey data collected shortly after doctoral degree completion with in-depth interview data collected recently to explore the nature and source of mentoring for doctoral education received before and during doctoral enrollment. We also explore how earlier mentorship received is reflected in subsequent professional career paths. Our findings suggest (a) mentorship emerged from a wide array of expected and unexpected sources before, during, and after doctoral tenure, and (b) earlier mentoring experiences, both positive and negative, have perceived long-standing influence on subsequent career paths.

In 2013, the survey data set was given reconsideration in light of the growing need to better understanding the experiences of minority doctoral students and their subsequent career trajectories upon graduation. More specifically, we realized the survey responses, collected shortly after doctoral degree completion, could anchor a longitudinal investigation into minority doctoral recipients’ perceptions of the influence of professional and doctoral mentoring before, during, and far beyond doctoral degree attainment.

Of the 160 original survey respondents, nine (6%) self-identified as Black or Hispanic. After receiving institutional review board approval from the institution at which the continuation of the study was undertaken, we contacted all nine to explain the aim of the current study and invite their participation in an in-depth interview designed in part to explore the influence of
mentoring across career trajectories of minority professionals. Five of the nine responded and provided informed consent for interviews.

The research questions that guided this project were:

1. What was the nature of the mentoring participants received, if any, that encouraged their pursuit of doctoral education?

2. What was the nature of the mentoring participants received during and shortly after doctoral studies?

3. How is earlier mentorship reflected in subsequent professional career paths?
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Black students rank at or near the bottom on nearly every quantifiable measure of scholastic achievement in grade school, high school, and in college (Feagin & Sikes, 1995; Jencks & Phillips, 1998; Tierney, 1999; Porter, 2006; Harris, 2006; Cuyjet, 2006). Measures include grade point average, graduation rates, college-going rates, and standardized test scores. These differences are even more striking when broken down by gender as Black male students are lagging behind their Black female counterparts. For example, while female undergraduates typically outnumber male undergraduates across races, the disparity between Black females and Black males is even more pronounced (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2014; Kaba, 2005). Michael Cuyjet (2006) proclaims that Blacks have the most skewed male/female ratios in higher education with women nearly outnumbering men by a 2:1 margin. In 2011-12, Black females earned 7,632 doctoral degrees while Black males earned 4,108, or nearly doubling the number of doctoral degrees earned (NCES, 2014). While it is true that up to 70% of all entering doctoral students will not graduate from their current program or institution (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 2001; Nettles & Millett, 2006; Gardner 2008). The attrition rate for racial and ethnic minority students is even higher (Zwick, 1991; Nettles & Millet, 2006), which suggests disparate experiences for students of color (Gardner, 2008). In this context it is important to understand how Black doctoral students who enroll in doctoral programs are able to navigate successfully at various levels of education when so many of their peers have been unable.

This article explores the pathways to the doctorate for students of color. We examine their educational experiences prior to enrolling in doctoral programs, their lives within both family and community contexts as well as formative experiences with mentors. We have
interviewed 19 Black doctoral students from two predominantly White research universities. Of the participants, 16 were Black males and 3 were Black female doctoral student. This study is part of a larger project exploring the experiences and socialization of doctoral students of color at predominantly white universities. We found that Black doctoral student pathways were 1) often non-traditional and circuitous; 2) mentorship matters and; 2) pathways have a far-reaching impact into their lives, perspectives and research.

**Research Design and Participants**

This qualitative, phenomenological study explores the experiences of Black doctoral students through individual interviews using a semi-structured protocol. Interviews were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim, coded and analyzed.

All of the participants in this study were Black doctoral students currently enrolled and in good standing. Participants came from a wide variety of fields and disciplines. Participants vary widely in terms of background characteristics outside of racial categorization. Participants will be identified through criterion sampling (Cresswell, 1998 Patton, 2002). The following criterion was used to identify participants:

1. Are pursuing the Ph.D. (not other doctorates)
2. Are enrolled in their third year of doctoral study or beyond
3. Are full-time students
4. Entered their Ph.D. Programs with aspirations to become university faculty.
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What Makes a Difference? Cohorts in Ed.D. Programs in Educational Leadership

While Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) Programs in the United States have often been regarded as essential to the leadership pipeline in K – 12 schools, community colleges and four-year colleges; there have been public attacks on their effectiveness. Dissatisfaction is expressed in Arthur Levine’ (2005) report on the preparation of school leaders and in Harvard University’s decision to eliminate its Ed.D. Program. The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate is engaged in a critical study of the Ed.D. with its member universities. Yet, Ed.D. Programs continue to proliferate.

Many classroom-based Ed.D. Programs deliberately enroll a “cohort”, although there is little research on any long-term impact of the cohort experience on the educators/students. Accordingly, it is important to understand if the cohort experience has a long-term role on learning and professional development. A variety of studies look at the impact of a cohort experience on current doctoral students in Educational Leadership (Wesson and Holman, 1996; Barnett, Basom, Yerkes and Norris, 2000; Bista and Cox, 2014; Pemberton and Akkary, 2010; and Teitel, 1997). Goss et al. (2007) consider the meaning of a cohort and ask if a cohort can be considered an intentional community, in general and more specifically as a learning community. They also raise the possibility of the cohort as a type of convenience grouping (Goss, et. al., 2007).

Cohorts as a program delivery model have emerged for societal, pedagogical and economic reasons (Donaldson and Peterson, 2007). Others cite pressures from professional associations, state legislators and licensing agencies (Barnett, Basom, Yerkes and Norris, 2000) to design doctoral programs in which students learn in an environment that cultivates collaborative communication. The benefits of this particular program delivery model are said to be the development of positive social relationships and collegiality (Barnett, et. al., 2000). Cohorts are also associated with student retention. Harris (2006) identifies a common element of effective retention programs as ones that provide a vehicle for the development of peer relationships and the encouragement of a community of faculty and students “that promote shared, collaborative learning experiences within the classroom” (p.2).

The paper describes alumni perspectives on the impact of a cohort-based, Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership developed at UCLA in 1993. It focuses on the perceptions of alumni of the first 15 of the program’s 22 cohorts and what they say they derived from their experiences in the program. The Ed.D. Program, at a public, doctoral research
university emphasizes collaborative learning and improvement across the K-16 continuum. Each cohort has 22–29 students working in K–12, community colleges, four-year colleges or areas aligned to education. Students in each cohort complete all their courses together throughout the three-year program. Small-group activities and collaborative learning and leadership are stressed. Student representatives participate in these faculty meetings and in designing changes to the Program.

The study considered three research questions related to the Ed.D. Program:

1. What do alumni say influenced their learning in an Ed.D. Program in Leadership designed for educational practitioners?

2. What or who do alumni say influenced their leadership style after they completed the Program?

3. What do alumni say was the impact of belonging to a cohort on their professional life?

Alumni from cohorts 1–15 were asked to respond to an online survey in Summer 2010. Completed surveys were submitted by 146 (50%) of the 293 alumni. The survey had closed and open-ended questions; the content of the open-ended questions were analyzed for themes. The five highest ratings for elements that had the greatest impact on learning in the program were faculty (73%), course materials, readings and assignments (63%), the overall cohort experience (59%), the dissertation process (57%), and particular members of the cohort (55%). With regard to the extent to which leadership style was perceived as being influenced by specific people or elements in the program, the impact of the program including the cohort on the professional life of the alumni is mixed. The two most important people or elements are current leaders (41%) and program coursework (34%). Specific students within the cohort were valued as higher (31%) than the cohort experience (22%).

The survey results suggest that belonging to a cohort did not have a long-term impact on the post-program professional lives of alumni. The 146 alumni were grouped into three sets of cohorts based on the year they started the doctoral program. The three groups of cohorts were 1 through 5 (enrolled between 1993–1997), cohorts 6 through 10 (1998 through 2002) and 11 through 15 (2003 through 2007). Only a small number of alumni said that their cohort experience had an important impact on their professional lives after the doctoral program. The long-term impact of the cohort experience was low regardless of when they started the program. The cohort named several elements related to their cohort experience as having a continuing impact on their professional lives. For cohorts 1 through 5, this was networking (15%) and leadership capacity and skills (15%). Cohorts 6 through 10 pointed to three elements: networking (16%), continued connections (16%) and teamwork, collaboration (15%). The most recent cohorts, 11 through 15 identified only one element, networking (15%) as important, but 12% of them said that the cohort had no impact on their professional lives.
Survey respondents provided comments related to the questions. It is clear from these comments that low numbers of alumni had very positive – or negative perceptions about their cohort experiences. For cohorts 1 through 5, positive comments emphasized “gave me confidence”, “learned to work with teams”, “advice and guidance”, “creative and interactive problem-solving”, “shared experiences”, “lifelong friendships” and “learned how to engage leaders”. Two respondents said the cohort experience had made little or no impact. Comments from the middle group of cohorts are similar. Most comments are linked to networking, remaining in contact with fellow cohort members, learned about working with others, “connects you to a group that you can always return to for feedback”, “I now look for cohorts or sorts or form my own”, “a chance to have your style critiqued in a trusted and caring environment.” Comments from the most recent group focus on “continuing to seek out my fellow ‘cohortians’ to for support, professional advice and to learn about new issues”, “jobs and career”, “helped me to develop better listening skills”, and “networking”. But, other cohort members concluded that “thus far I haven’t experienced much impact on my professional life”, “none, really, I never talk to them” and “none”.
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Complex change, greater connectivity, demands for flexible learning options, a greater need for research innovation and creativity, define the context in which doctoral education has to operate. Students must develop new and different skills and perspectives; and new innovative models of doctoral education and ‘doctorateness’ have emerged (Trafford & Leshem, 2002; Trafford & Ruskin, 2009; Wellington, 2013). Evidence of the efficacy of these “new” responses is limited; research is required to explore their effectiveness. This study explores students’ doctoral learning experience; in particular, the transformative learning impact of a professional program with a signature pedagogy of insider action research designed to develop advanced professional practice.

Theoretical Frameworks

Action research offers a rich tradition of theory and practice. Originating from Lewin in the late-1940’s, it’ characterized by a dual purpose of taking action and generating knowledge about that action as it unfolds (Reason & Bradbury, 2008). The EdD takes an insider inquiry action research (Coghlan, 2008; Coghlan & Brannick, 2014; Coghlan & Graham Cagney, 2013) approach.

Transformative Learning, adopts a cognitive/rational approach emphasising the critical role that experience and reflection play on existing assumptions about the world in order to arrive at a new worldview. Jack Mezirow (2000) theorizes on how adults interpret their life experience and derive meaning from significant learning events.

The ‘inner’ Teaching-Learning Environment (TLE) conceptual map identifies students’ perceptions of four overlapping contexts (course contexts; teaching and assessing content; staff-student relationships; students and student cultures) that influence their experience of learning (Entwistle, 1987, 2003). This organising framework of the ‘inner’
TLE can identify how to encourage deeper student engagement with the subject matter and the achievement of higher quality learning.

**Research Design**

The **specific context for this study** was an Ed.D. at a large public university in the Southeast of the United States. The **purpose of the study** was to explore students’ experience of doctorateness through their personal transformative learning experiences of the program. Questions guiding the study scope include:

1. What is the experience of a professional practice doctorate that uses action research as its signature pedagogy?

2. In what ways did the student’s perspective shift during and after the doctoral program?

3. What is “doctorateness” in this program?

4. What facilitates and inhibits a student’s learning journey in the professional practice doctorate?

Participants were drawn from a **purposive sample** of alumni. Consistent with qualitative methodology, interview transcript analysis was related back to the research questions using the modified inductive Framework Approach (Smith & Firth, 2011), and a mix of inductive coding and the constant comparative method (Charmaz, 2014; Glaser & Strauss, 1967); resulting in an analysis of themes within each category to produce the findings (Glesne, 2006).

**Benefits & contributions**

Knowledge gained from this study will inform the nature of doctoral student learning; the meaning of ‘doctorateness’ in professional programs; and how process consultation (Schein, 1996) as a mechanism for transformative learning can be applied to management learning and
development (Coghlan & Graham Cagney, 2015; Lamm, 2000). The need for more research on professional doctoral programs is identified.
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ABSTRACT
Mentoring has long been identified as a standard model of
learning in doctoral education programs with traditional
mentoring relationships often consisting of a faculty mentor
and student protégé (Jacobi, 1991). In recent years,
however, more attention has been paid to the benefits of
alternate models such as peer mentorship (Noonan,
Ballinger, & Black, 2007). Despite increased research on
the effectiveness of mentoring relationships, however,
agreed upon definitions and practices remain nebulous at
best.

In response to research outlining the benefits and challenges
of graduate mentoring relationships, a cognitive
apprenticeship model (Collins, 2006) is proposed as a
potential guiding framework for mentoring programs.
Common models of faculty and peer mentorship are
discussed, as well as the benefits and obstacles of these
models, to illustrate how a cognitive apprenticeship model
can build and improve upon traditional approaches to
mentoring.

Two commonly identified outcomes of mentoring
programs, increased self-efficacy (Paglis, Green, and
Bauert, 2006; Eby et al, 2013) and decreased time-to-degree
(Wao, Dedrick, & Ferron, 2011; Maher, Ford, and
Thompson, 2004), are also explored. Supporting research is
provided to show how mentoring relationships provide
psychosocial and instrumental support systems which can
positively affect student self-efficacy and time-to-degree.

Keywords
Doctoral and Graduate Education; Mentoring; Cognitive
Apprenticeship; Self-Efficacy; Time-to-Degree

INTRODUCTION
The application of student mentoring programs in graduate
education and their potential to help students achieve is far
from a novel concept. Research has shown that mentoring
can be used to address a number of relevant issues in higher
education, ranging from administrative concerns such as
time-to-degree completion (Wao, et. al, 2011) to more
personal issues such as student self-efficacy (Paglis et al.,
2006). Despite the rich history and perceived benefits of
student mentoring in graduate education, however, common
definitions, practices, limitations, and proven benefits
remain elusive.

The Council of Graduate Schools has listed mentoring as
one of six factors related to PhD completion (Lunsford,
2012) and so a need to better understand how mentoring
plays a role in doctoral education is a major point of
concern. Procedural models such as cognitive
apprenticeship have the potential to provide a guiding
framework for mentors and protégés to work within, and
non-traditional models such as peer mentorship could
possibly address some of the logistical concerns commonly
identified with mentoring programs. Moreover, through
reviewing research conducted on mentoring in graduate
education, we will be able to better identify gaps in the
literature, methodological research barriers, and improve
mentoring experiences for students and faculty alike.

METHODOLOGY AND JUSTIFICATION
Empirical research for this literature review was limited to
studies conducted between the years 2000 and 2014 to
observe current trends. Research focused on mentoring in
higher education was given preference with particular
emphasis on mentoring in doctoral education. The review
was conducted using primarily computer-based research
methods accompanied by manual reviews of several texts.
Key search terms were chosen based on situational contexts
of mentoring programs, outcome variables related to this
study, and types of mentoring programs. Key contextual
pieces on the nature of mentoring, self-efficacy, and
cognitive apprenticeship were also included to provide the
reader with common definitions and background
knowledge.
CURRENT MODELS AND FINDINGS

Cognitive Apprenticeship – Definitions and Applications
One of the current problems research on mentoring faces is an obscurity of terms associated with the process, as well as the context and procedures related to its application. This ambiguity of process is commonly cited in the literature as a point of concern for students and faculty participating in mentoring relationships (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000; Noonan, Ballinger, & Black, 2007; Paglis, Green, and Bauert, 2006). Some models of mentoring, however, seek to give structure to this seemingly nebulous domain.

Collins, Brown, and Newman (1989) define cognitive apprenticeship as “learning-through-guided-experience on cognitive and metacognitive, rather than physical, skills and processes” (p. 456). The cognitive apprenticeship model, based in situational learning, has a primary goal of making tacit cognitive processes more visible to the learner and learning transferable.

One of the benefits of this model is its guiding framework, which helps users move from theory to practice. The framework, consisting of four guiding principles, focuses on fostering learner expertise in a respective area through the dimensions of content, method, sequencing, and sociology (Collins, 2006).

Faculty Mentorship
Traditionally, mentor-protégé models in higher education are built upon the idea of a faculty member mentoring a student (Jacobi, 1991), particularly at the doctoral level. Issues regarding the effectiveness and logistical obstacles surrounding these types of relationships, however, are in question.

Traditional faculty mentoring relationships are tied to beneficial outcomes such as psychosocial and instrumental support, development of academic self-concept, career development, and research productivity (Eby et al., 2013). Obstacles of this model, however, include faculty time constraints, perceived added value, and personal or ideological disjunction between faculty and student (Eby et al., 2013; Holley, 2012; Jacobi, 1991).

Peer Mentorship
Typically identified as more personal and less formal than faculty-student models, peer mentorship can include multiple mentor-protégé relationships and be highly interdisciplinary.

Benefits of peer mentorship models include increased psychosocial support, mentor availability, and reciprocal benefits for mentor and protégé (Grant-Valone & Ensher, 2013; Holley & Cadwell, 2012; Noonan et al, 2007). Obstacles include decreased instrumental support, ill-defined roles, issues with inexperience, and even increased levels of stress (Eby et al., 2013; Grant-Valone & Ensher, 2000; Khan & Gogos, 2013; Paglis et al., 2006).

Mentoring and Self-Efficacy
Mirroring the goals of cognitive apprenticeship which help students develop metacognitive skills, increased self-efficacy has been framed as a health-related outcome in mentoring research (Eby et al., 2013; Paglis et al., 2006).

Mentorship and Time-to-Degree
Empirical research related to the effects of mentoring on time-to-degree (TTD) in doctoral education shows that mentoring can play a significant role in TTD and may be more significant in specific student populations (Wao et al., 2011). Moreover, peer mentoring has potential to be as effective at decreasing TTD as traditional models from a psychosocial standpoint (Maher et al., 2004).

Limitations, Conclusions, and Implications
Empirical research on the effects of mentoring often relies on cross-sectional and self-report data. This limits researchers’ abilities to make causal inferences and raises concerns about source bias (Eby et al., 2013). Many studies are also conducted within a particular field or context, limiting generalizability.

Students and faculty alike clearly value mentoring relationships and recognize their potential to provide psychosocial and instrumental support. With this in mind, obstacles such as ill-defined processes, roles, and logistical constraints (e.g. time, access to mentors, etc.) limit potential for success. The proliferation of more systematic, generalizable research is needed.

Utilizing process models, such as cognitive apprenticeship, and non-traditional models, such as peer-mentorship, could potentially mitigate commonly identified mentoring problems. As a result, improved mentoring relationships could produce more self-efficacious doctoral students and decrease institutional concerns, such as time-to-degree.
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For most faculty members in a doctoral program, their view of what makes for successful doctoral education is closely connected to their own experiences as a doctoral student. Yet, changing institutional contexts, the lifestyles of students, and the diversification of the applicant pool necessitate shifts in these prototypes. Based on a US-based case study of a 43-year old doctoral program in curriculum and instruction in a state university, this presentation will discuss four inter-related contemporary challenges: shrinking faculty lines and pressures towards candidates’ timely graduation; adequately addressing the needs of candidates who are full-time educators in high stress K-12 settings; the development of meaningful research agendas that contribute to equitable policy and practice; and diversifying the pool of candidates admitted to the program with accompanying commitments to their success.

This discussion is situated in the dialectical tension between the framing of education as a democratizing endeavor (Dewey 1916; Giroux, 2002), and the pervasive view of education as a corporate entity (see Apple, 2006; Steck, 2003). Giroux (2011) calls for the preservation of the university as a public good and democratic public sphere which, if realized in a doctoral program in education means that students and faculty will “take seriously and rigorously [the university’s] role as a guardian of wider civic freedoms, as interrogator of more and more complex ethical problems, [and] as servant and preserver of deeper democratic practices…” (Morrison, 2002, p. 7). In contrast, corporatization frames educational success in terms of quantity and efficiency: the number and percentage of graduates within a limited time period. Standardization (one-size-fits-all programs) with limited electives gets students through faster, but typically missing the opportunity for more personal engagement through electives, time-consuming community engagement and politically risky public intellectualism. Each framework has implications for the purpose, curriculum and pedagogy of the program.

Can one program serve both these masters?
The purpose of doctoral research in challenging and/ or ameliorating inequitable conditions of schooling is easily apparent to educators who comprise 85% of program participants pursuing their doctorate while working fulltime. Such transformative research, however, requires alternate research paradigms (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011), not currently addressed in the required course work though available in electives. When university efficiencies require early determination of plans of study, a few faculty are assigned to mentor large numbers of students, and the pace of completion ranks high, it is inevitable that students’ options are curtailed, resulting in a programs that favor expediency and mirror’s their advisor’s bias rather than the student’s choice. This becomes particularly difficult for students of international or under-represented backgrounds whose dissertations are devoted to community-based concerns often alien to an advisor’s research agenda. This paper will explore these tensions in the democratization of a doctoral program, exploring the challenges that come with expanding: what counts as appropriate research, the body of program decisions makers, the diversity of students admitted, the flexibility of programming and, ultimately, the pursuit of the public good in our research.
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It is not often in the life of an academic or of an academic institution that circumstances coalesce to bring about a new academic discipline. But it happened recently, thus a review of the circumstances may be of interest and potentially instructive.

Disciplines are typically characterized as a field of study at institutions of higher learning; they have a definable body of knowledge, scholars who contribute to that body of knowledge, teachers who teach in the field, a community of people who identify with the field, a refereed journal, are often associated with a professional practice and, in many cases, the discipline offers a doctorate as the terminal degree. Prior to 2008 the academic discipline of aviation did not exist.

While working at Central Missouri State University (CMSU) in his previous position, the then department chair of the Power and Transportation Department had been involved in the development of a multi-university Ph.D. program in Technology Management at Indiana State University (ISU). As the ISU program was being developed, a needs analysis survey revealed that there was a high interest in aviation as a specialization. The chair then left CMSU for the position of dean of the College of Aviation at the Daytona Beach campus of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (ERAU) and, consequently, the aviation specialization was not developed in the ISU program. However, the new ERAU dean’s vision for an aviation Ph.D. was established.

Soon the dean began to advocate for developing a Ph.D. in aviation. There is a substantial need for research and, thus, qualified well-trained researchers in the field of aviation. Commercial aviation has entered its second century and, quite literally, has transformed the world. It is estimated that over 3 billion passengers and 50 million tons of cargo are transported
on commercial aviation annually, supporting over 57 million jobs and $2.2 trillion in economic activity. ERAU authorized the dean to establish a Ph.D. planning committee.

One of the first tasks of the planning committee was to quantify the demand. A survey was provided to 10,356 students and alumni. The results were surprising. Of the responses, 1,903 (83%) indicated either Strongly Agree (50.4%) or Somewhat Agree (33.9%) to the statement: I would be interested in enrolling in ERAU’s Ph.D. program in Aviation program. With this strong evidence, the committee presented the program to the Board of Trustees which approved it in 2007.

Shortly afterward, the institution submitted an application to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Commission on Colleges, which denied it for various reasons, but the most poignant was this statement, “Address faculty qualification issues. Specifically, ensure that faculty have terminal degrees that relate to the courses they are teaching and/or have specific and described ‘other qualifications’ that make them appropriate instructors.” Since there was no previous terminal (Ph.D.) degree in aviation, it became necessary to select faculty who possessed the doctorate in some other field and whose academic and professional backgrounds matched the subject matter of the course to be taught. Using this strategy, a second application was submitted to SACS which was accepted. The first cohort of students began in 2010.

The program admits only one cohort of approximately 15 students each year and now has an enrollment of 65 students. Eight have graduated.

Early on in the development of the program the faculty realized that they had the opportunity to select a color to be associated with the degree; the color is often used for trimmings of doctors’ gowns, edging of hoods, and tassels of caps. While dark blue was an option since that color is associated with philosophy, the faculty desired to identify a color that
would be unique to the discipline of aviation, much like purple is to law, orange is to engineering, and drab is to business. Examination into this issue revealed two interesting facts. First, there is no single authority on associating a color with a discipline. There are agencies that publish the various discipline colors, such as the American Council on Education (ACE), but none that acts as an approval agency. ACE encouraged the university to adopt the color of its choice. Second, nearly every color is already associated with a discipline. In all there are 25 color and discipline combinations listed by ACE, including obscure colors such as peacock blue (public administration), lilac (dentistry), citron (social work), and apricot (nursing). Armed with that information, the faculty considered several colors and ultimately decided to associate the color with something meaningful to the field of aviation – silver was chosen in honor of the color of the Wright Flyer.
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**Introduction**

In late 2013, the Bloomsbury Doctoral Training Centre (DTC) led by the University College London (UCL) Institute of Education was one of 20 successful bidders to be awarded a share of £25m for the Postgraduate Support Scheme (PSS) from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). The bid was successful because we had identified a target group of mature professionals in England who might be encouraged to move quickly from postgraduate taught provision to postgraduate research.

There appears to be a growing trend in England, possibly as a result of increased student debt from undergraduate study coupled with rising postgraduate taught fees, for a reduction in demand for postgraduate taught provision particularly for non-traditional students (Wakeling, 2005). This trend poses concomitant risks to the flow through to postgraduate research. The National Postgraduate Committee (NPC; Hoad, 2001) suggested that the Higher Education White Paper 2004 did not address the needs of taught postgraduates. Particularly at risk, appeared to be mature students in work (Conlon 2005), for whom a greater urgency to progress is already common, coupled with a more pronounced need to acquire the foundations of a research mindset and a desire to apply this within their professional setting (Blasko et al. 2002). Whilst they may be seen as an existing target market, our analysis suggested they are at the forefront of a growing trend. At an individual level, these needs play into the wider economic and labour market imperatives of ensuring effective progress beyond postgraduate taught study, not least the growing international recognition of the role played by both research and doctoral training in generating the most highly skilled layer of the workforce.

There is a growing emphasis on research training and postgraduate research provision serving a wider purpose and constituency, oriented much more to the intellectual skills and expertise required for careers both outside and inside academia. Thus, finding the right ‘fit’ between postgraduate taught provision and postgraduate research is integral to the future health of the UK economy as well as the UK academy through widening participation.

This paper reports the context and rationale for a new programme with the aim of widening participation; an overview of the curriculum, pedagogy and assessment of the programme, together with tentative findings from data gathered from the first cohort including their progression into doctoral study.

**The Postgraduate Diploma in Social Science Research Methods**

The NPC (Hoad, 2001) suggested several barriers to postgraduate study, including: no access to financial support; inappropriate or inflexible modes of attendance; pressure from employers; perception that postgraduate study is not aimed at them, and potentially greater childcare needs. Therefore the Bloomsbury DTC felt it essential to develop novel forms of postgraduate research training provision to meet the needs of under-represented groups and to address these potential barriers. This was especially important given the implicit pressure that undergraduate reforms in England place on maintaining broad-based research training, which has been the accepted cornerstone of postgraduate research provision for more than a decade.
To support the enhancement of widening participation into postgraduate research, the UCL Institute of Education, on behalf of the Bloomsbury DTC developed the Postgraduate Diploma in Social Science Research Methods (PGDip SSRM). The PGDip SSRM is an accelerated taught social science research training programme that allows participants to ‘dip their toes in the water’ and evaluate their own suitability for doctoral research or a research career as part of their professional role (Taylor, 2014a; 2014b). The programme specifically targets under-represented groups and attempts to remove the potential barriers outlined above (ibid). Funding from HEFCE as part of the PSS allowed the Bloomsbury DTC to offer 60 bursaries across three cohorts of eligible students to overcome the financial barriers to postgraduate study. Bursaries covered costs of course fees; child-care; associated costs of a research placement; travel, and cover to allow time off work where necessary. Table 1 provides the characteristics across the three funded cohorts.

Table 1: characteristics of three cohorts of PGDip SSRM students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
<th>Cohort 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over age 24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate research</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first cohort commenced in May 2014 and has now completed their studies; cohort two commenced January 2015 and cohort three will begin in April 2015. All students are over 24 years of age (our baseline age determinant for mature students) with the exception of two, both of whom will reach the age of 24 whilst studying on the programme. Females were reported as being the most under-represented due to childcare barriers and perceptions that postgraduate study was not appropriate for their gender (Hoad, 2001). However, just over half the numbers studying for the PGDip SSRM are female. Since funding was through HEFCE, only students who have ‘leave of stay’ to remain in UK were eligible for a bursary. Despite this eligibility criterion for the bursary, a third of our students self-identified as Black or minority ethnic (BME).

At the time of writing, only the first cohort has completed and eight students have applied for postgraduate research. Of the remaining four: one is involved in research and development in a professional capacity; two have self-identified that they are not yet ready for postgraduate research and one has joined cohort two for the latter half of the programme due to particular and specific challenges at work. These characteristics confirm our previous analysis and demonstrate that there is a need for such an access route into postgraduate research.

The PGDip SSRM is being evaluated by HEFCE to establish the effectiveness of our widening participation programme. No ‘official’ data from the evaluation is currently available although the course is evaluated by the programme team and we have actively sought feedback from the first cohort of students both ‘formally’ through our programme evaluation mechanisms, and informally by building in opportunities during weekly sessions.
The fact that we were able to fill all 60 funded places clearly demonstrates the need for our programme and indeed, we had more expressions of interest than available funding.

Having ‘removed’ some of the aforementioned potential barriers, we looked to develop a programme whose curriculum, pedagogy and assessment was conducive to the achievement of under-represented groups.

**Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment of the Postgraduate Diploma in Social Science Research Methods**

The programme involves completion of four modules, each the equivalent of 30 learning hours and providing 30 credits: Developing Research Questions; Methods of Investigation; Designing a Research Study, and Developing a Research Proposal.

*Curriculum Design:* the PGDip SSRM is an accelerated programme of eight months duration. It is a full time programme aimed at professionals, many of whom are in full-time employment (Taylor, 2014b). Designing a programme that would appeal to, and be achievable by these professionals was not straightforward as we had to ensure the balance between attendance and online learning facilitated the necessary progression.

The curriculum was designed so that each module builds on the preceding one, leading to a deeper understanding of the research process in preparation for the transition to postgraduate research. For both cohorts one and two, the curriculum was designed to enable students to make connections between the conceptual ideas in both Modules 1 (Developing Research Questions) and 2 (Methods of Investigation) by studying both simultaneously from part-way through Module 1 (Table 2).

**Table 2: Cohort 2 Modules 1-3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06-08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module 1 - Developing Research Questions**

- Online activity
- F2F Seminars
- Assignment

**Module 2 - Methods of Investigation**

- Online activity
- Internship
- Assignment

**Module 3 - Designing a Research Study**

- Online activity
- F2F Seminars

For cohort three however, we are trialling running Modules 1 and 2 consecutively (Table 3) due to observations and reflections on the curriculum, pedagogy and assessment noted below. Once we have ‘data’ from all three cohorts, we will consider the programme’s success in meeting its aims before finalising the design of the programme when it becomes self-funding in January 2016.
Module 2 also includes a research placement (internship), and students are required to keep an online research journal (Burgess, 1981). This placement is negotiated with students and based on their self-identified research focus at application stage as well as through further conversations during Module 1. The placement is designed to demonstrate the ‘reality’ as well as the theoretical aspects of the research process.

**Pedagogy:** over 15 years experience of working with mature professional adult learners has demonstrated that they do not always engage with virtual learning environments (VLEs) but often prefer face-to-face collaboration. This has been borne out by evaluations from the first cohort who, through online evaluations, stated that they preferred “face-to-face sessions, questioning by peers on research question topics”. However, offering a programme solely based on face-to-face sessions would appear likely to exclude both wider geographical participation and students in full-time employment. We therefore developed a blended approach to learning using our VLE platform, Moodle. Previous research by the PGDip SSRM programme leader (Taylor et al., 2013) suggested that an andragogical approach to learning (Brookfield, 1986; Knowles, 1984) is effective with adult professional learners. Knowles (1984) identified six principles of adult learning: adults are internally motivated and self-directed; adults bring life experiences and knowledge to learning experiences; adults are goal oriented; adults are relevancy oriented; adults are practical, and adult learners like to be respected. We used these principles to guide our pedagogy and for Modules 2 and 3 combined andragogy with online learning. To support students make the transition to online learning through andragogy, Module 1 was facilitated through face-to-face sessions but supported with online discussions, modeling how students might learn to take responsibility for their own and each other’s learning for Modules 2 and 3. Students planned and facilitated each other’s learning based on readings and session outlines provided by session tutors with pairs/groups of students each taking responsibility for two sessions across Modules 2 and 3.

**Assessment:** the assessment of all modules involves the equivalent of a 5000 word assignment which requires students to reflect on their learning journey. Module 1 critically reflects on the journey from initial research questions to refined research questions. Module 2 requires critical reflection on the student’s research placement and integration of these reflections with module content and by drawing on their online research journals, using extracts from these to illustrate both conceptual and practical aspects of the research process. Module 3 involves the writing of a short research proposal and the conduct and write-up of a small-scale pilot study.
including some analysis of data together with reflections on the research process itself. Module 4 involves the writing of a research proposal, drawing on all elements of the PGDip SSRM programme, together with a peer review of a colleague’s proposal. Students have the opportunity, and are actively encouraged, to upload an initial submission to the VLE for formative feedback before submission of the final assignment. Feedback is designed to be formative and constructive as well as ipsative (Hughes, 2011).

Gathering evidence

To support future developments (and improvements) to the PGDip SSRM we built in many opportunities for evaluations. All students from the first cohort contributed to these evaluations, and all students from subsequent cohorts will also be invited to contribute.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with cohort 1 at the outset and mid-way points in the programme and follow-up interviews are planned in March on completion of the final assignment. Cohort 2 has had their preliminary interviews at the commencement of the programme and they too will be interviewed at the mid-point and on completion of the final assessments. Data from completed interviews were combined with on-going in-built opportunities for evaluative comments, together with the student voice through a delegate at programme team meetings. Data from these sources were combined with data from individual student evaluations; observations of online engagement; documentary evidence from work submitted for assessment, and external examiner comments.

General themes and trends were noted and fell into the following categories: andragogy; online learning; assessment; preparation for postgraduate research, and time.

What have we learned so far?

Andragogy: Some students appreciated the opportunity to engage with the andragogical approach adopted: “[I] enjoyed this aspect working with another via email/telephone; great to encourage others when leading learning”. However, many in the first cohort were from an education background and were familiar with planning and facilitating learning, albeit in schools. Others, it appears would have preferred more direction: “The ‘andragogical approach to learning’, this is new to me; and is quite challenging”, and “We have been offering our own ideas but not engaging with others as much”. Reflecting on the engagement with online discussion, this latter statement particularly appears to refer to andragogy during Module 3 when engagement seemed to begin to lapse, coincident with submission of both initial and final submissions of assignments for Modules 1 and 2. Another student noted: “Maybe more hands on guidance/direction” whilst another commented: “I would have appreciated more tutor input into online discussions”. However, it did not appear that it was the andragogical approach per se that was problematic, but rather the overlap of modules: “A very interesting approach to learning; but it can sometimes be busy especially when you think of the fact that there are a whole lot of other things to do at the same time”.

The Virtual Learning Environment and online activity: engagement in online activity and discussion greatly reduced during Module 3. This reduction in online engagement and collaboration coincided with submission of the final Module 1 assignment and submission of the draft Module 2 assignment: “Quite a lot to take in when doing both modules at the same
time and meeting up for placement activities but this was suitably challenging and enjoyable”. Another student also suggested that the overlap between Modules 1 and 2, although challenging in terms of time commitment, was invaluable in seeing the relationship between research questions and the role of theory and the reality of live research: “...research by its very nature is an integrated process; so the overlap was obvious and useful - drawing attention to key concepts”. Students were happier to engage with online written discussion than through the virtual classroom, Collaborate, although students were positive about some aspects of the VLE: “Very well organised VLE pages with linked readings”, “Clearly focused and accessible reading”, and “first time using e-learning for discussions but this improved as the course progressed”. Preliminary analysis from interview data confirmed that online learning proved most challenging for some students: “the main problems experienced by students were in relation to the online element”.

Nevertheless, there were some positive lessons from our first cohort and the use of Moodle. For example, the external examiner stated: “I looked at the Moodle page structure and course materials for both Module 1 and Module 2, and I think they are of very good quality. I particularly appreciate your capacity to familiarize the students with pretty abstract epistemological and philosophical concepts, while at the same time giving them a very concrete sense of how these principles are applied in the reality of research. It seems to me that most students have got a good grasp of it”. She also noted: “Congratulations also for managing to involve the students actively in Moodle discussion forums – which in my experience, is generally difficult to achieve. One reason for this was obviously the online delivery of Module 2, and indeed there is more participation in Module 2 Moodle forums”.

Assessment: students largely felt assessment of each module was relevant, worthwhile and facilitated reflections on the learning journey, from refining research questions to the writing of a research proposal for the final module: “The assessment for the unit linked very well with the topics and coverage. I felt that through doing the assignment, I was able to apply/revisit the key areas, whilst also applying it to my own research interests”. No students specifically mentioned the opportunity to submit an assignment for each module for formative feedback prior to submission of the final assignment. However, students did mention how much they appreciated the detailed formative feedback they received and the overall tutor support. Interview data confirmed this appreciation: “They had nothing but compliments about the tutor support”.

Preparation for postgraduate research: Table 1 illustrates that two thirds of cohort 1 felt ready for progressing to postgraduate research, with one student reporting: “I am also grateful for having had the benefit of taking the PGDip SSRM which has been an invaluable process in developing my research proposal”. Interview data confirmed this in-built aim had been met: “In terms of their aims of testing the water for a PhD, of trying to take a step towards the ultimate goal of a PhD without the commitment of giving up a job, and reassuring themselves they were up to it before making the decision, the course seemed to be fulfilling this function”.

Time: this did not appear too much of an issue at the outset of the programme when students were attending Module 1 only. However, the accelerated nature of the programme meant by default it had to be intense in terms of time commitment. It was also deliberately aimed at
mature professionals already in either fulltime or part time employment, yet this was validated as a full time programme. We and the validation panel realised from the outset that this could pose potential challenges. However, these challenges did not manifest themselves for most until Module 3, with the culmination of two assignment submissions and online learning, together with the demands of students’ professional roles: “the challenge of not having enough time/conflicting demands trying to do a FT programme and sometimes a full-time job simultaneously”.

From synthesis of the above sources of evidence, we have already made changes to the andragogy/online learning aspects for cohort two, and more changes based on our continued cycles of data collection are planned for cohort three.

**Where do we go from here – future developments?**

For cohort two, which is almost double the size of cohort 1 and representing greater diversity from across the Bloomsbury DTC, we have built-in to our programme:

**Andragogy:** More tutor-led ‘prompts’ for online discussion to guide the andragogy. Students no longer take responsibility for the planning and facilitation of the online element. Tutors provide specific prompts for each session. So far, all students have engaged with this approach to learning and seem to have enjoyed the responsibility it entails, whilst appreciating the structure for discussion.

**Virtual Learning Environment and online activity:** for cohort 2, students are required to engage with Collaborate at a specific time and day (we noted we had been particularly ‘loose’ in our expectations for each of the Collaborate sessions for cohort 1) or engage with an online discussion forum using the same prompts provided by tutors for both discussion forums and for Collaborate sessions. To date, more than half of cohort 2 has engaged in Collaborate for Module 2 with the remainder engaging through the discussion forums. Students have decided to ‘appoint’ a chair for each Collaborate session and this seems to have worked well. For cohort 2, we provided more ‘tuition’ in the use of Collaborate in a range of ways. We re-scheduled induction sessions from attendance on two consecutive evenings to sessions one week apart to allow for assimilation and ‘practice’ using the VLE as well as allowing sufficient time for all students to be fully enrolled (a necessity for online engagement). Time has been built into each face-to-face session for Module 1 to re-visit the use of Collaborate. An instruction document has been provided for students to follow as a guide to the use of Collaborate. A ‘permanent’ Collaborate ‘test’ session has been set up for students to trial technology without engaging with the complex conceptual ideas of the programme. Collaborate is now only available at a specific time and date for each scheduled session and students are reminded in advance through Moodle notifications.

**Assessment/time:** although assessment *per se* was not regarded as problematic, time was seen as a challenge to successfully completing the programme. We decided to try to reduce the overlap between so much assessment being coincident with Module 3. Accordingly, assessment deadlines for Modules 1 and 2 have been brought forward (Table 2). We will review this change as the programme for cohort 2 progresses. Nevertheless, as cohort 3 commence their programme before cohort 2 get to this crucial stage in their programmes, we decided to ‘trial’ running Modules 1 and 2 consecutively to relieve some of the attendant
pressures of simultaneous learning across modules. The balance of seeing the relationship of each module against time pressures will need to be constantly reviewed.

Summary

The high level of demand for the PGDip SSRM (all 60 bursaries have been filled with ease) clearly shows that a bridge between postgraduate taught provision and postgraduate research training is necessary. Given the age range of students on the programme (and of those who had expressed an interest or applied and not received a place on the programme), it also appears that our assessment of the need amongst those who are currently under-represented in postgraduate research in England is accurate. The curriculum, pedagogy and assessment of the programme seem largely appropriate although interview data from all three cohorts will further inform which of our three approaches best minimises potential barriers whilst preparing students for future independent research.

Finally, we aim to recruit further cohorts for the PGDip SSRM from January 2016. However, the PSS through HEFCE have changed the funding parameters and future cohorts will need to be self-funded. We are currently in the process of formulating a fee structure for future self-funded places on the programme, and need to establish whether the bursary made a difference to the ability of under-represented groups to participate. The level of interest when no bursaries are available will be interesting. Consequently, a balance between continuing to provide the benefits of the programme and meet the needs of the target group of under-represented students moving into postgraduate research, and ensuring that programme fees are not prohibitive in terms of cost will have to be achieved. However, as the PGDip SSRM is designed to give direct access to the +3 route to PhD or to a shortened professional doctorate it could still be financially attractive as it offers a considerably shortened overall postgraduate research course, with an attendant reduction in total fees.
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**Abstract**

The creation of, and subsequent student enrollment in, Professional Practice Doctorate (PPD) programs in disciplines not previously requiring doctoral degrees has skyrocketed in the last decade (Zusman, 2013). This trend raises questions about what professional doctoral education should include and what new role PPD graduates should play upon return to their respective fields. It also raises concerns about PPD program quality and validity, especially in relation to ‘credential creep’ (La Belle, 2004; Zusman, 2013). In most cases, the first professional master’s degree ‘creeps’ to a PPD degree (Zusman, 2013). However, a unique situation exists in the design disciplines, in which a bachelor’s degree is considered the first professional degree while the master’s degree of fine arts (MFA) is considered the terminal practice degree and historical credential for tenure track eligibility (Weigand & Hardwood, 2007).
While the design disciplines have yet to join the PPD ranks, academics and practitioners in the interior design field in particular are engaged in heated discussion about the role and identity of their field’s terminal professional degree (Dickinson, Anthony & Marsden, 2012; Dohr, 2007; McCoy, 2012; Weigand & Harwood, 2007). Current MFA programs find it difficult to blend professional practice and academic research needs into a single degree that applies equally to practice and academe. This in turn leads to a perceived lack of value on the practice side and assistant professors unprepared for tenure track research (Dickinson, Anthony & Marsen, 2012; McCoy, 2012). As a result, an extreme dichotomy has developed. Interior design practice jobs require low levels of education and high levels of experience, while interior design academic jobs increasingly require a Ph.D. from areas related to, but outside the field, as this field does not commonly offer one (Birdsong, 2001; Dickinson, Anthony & Marsden, 2012).

This dichotomy would seem to indicate separate tracks. However, this issue is complicated because eligibility for tenure track positions requires professional experience and certification, not just a terminal degree. Clearly, a relevant and valuable doctoral level professional degree is needed. Current discussion has explored rebadging the MFA as an MID, but this ongoing dialogue has failed to result in any action or cohesion between practitioners and academics (Kroelinger, 2007, Weigand & Harwood, 2007). Additionally, the number of Ph.D. programs related to interior design (e.g., design history, environmental design) have quietly increased, but have garnered no discussion in the field’s literature, have generated very few graduates (Dickinson, 2013), and have not been integrated into the field of practice (Dickinson, Anthony & Marsden, 2012).

In this paper, I will explore the content and consequences of a professional Doctorate of Interior Design (IdD). What content, in terms of theory and practice, should an IdD degree include? What competencies should be acquired as result of earning this degree? What role should IdD graduates play that differs from and would add to current theory and practice? I will frame these questions within the current perception of graduate level design competencies and the need for integration between practice and academic skills.
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Paper Session
Abstract

As the U.S. economy is being weakened in light of our global competitors, more policy makers and educators have realized that deep and continuous cuts of teachers’ salaries and benefits would be detrimental to the next workforce generation. Teachers at all levels possess the right kind of knowledge, skills, attitudes and above all the right kind of instructional strategies to turn our next generation into a productive and competitive workforce. In cultures other than the Western cultures, teachers are called “engineers of the soul,” which means one of their major responsibilities is to influence the minds of our students of all ages. Because other countries do not cut funding in education at all levels, and because other countries invest more in education, their students have repeatedly scored higher than U.S. students, including college students, on standardized assessments in math, reading and science. The test results of the 2009 PISA (Program for International Student Assessment) paint a vivid picture of the 15 year olds’ capabilities in reading literacy, mathematics literacy, and science literacy. It is so telling that U.S. students receive lower test scores than students from other industrialized nations including the newly emerged industrialized countries such as China and India. As universities deliver courses and programs in international education in the United States, they have one common goal, that is, to align education with the next-generation workforce in order to keep the U.S. economy the only super power house, not to be surpassed by any other economy. To attain this goal, we must compare U.S. education with that in other major economies in the world. We must study the opportunities and challenges as revealed by educational models utilized in other countries. It is through comparison with others that we learn and make progress. Towards this goal, numerous doctoral programs across the United States have been designed to train doctoral candidates to be well versed in international education. With this advanced preparation in international education, these doctoral candidates can work not only in the United States, but also can join the global workforce to make a positive change in other countries where expertise in international education is greatly needed. The reality is some of our doctoral mentors may not have the desired international background and they are not well versed in different philosophical/theoretical and cultural models that are currently and historically employed in other major economies. Doctoral candidates often do not have a choice but to select these faculty as their dissertation chairs due to the fact faculty with international experience are marginalized. Because of this “misalignment” in doctoral education programs, many courses are poorly designed, let alone serve the needs of these doctoral candidates. Ultimately, the quality of doctoral education in international education is often comprised. If we need to embrace the concept of globalization, we must do
the right things and do things right by recruiting doctoral mentors with the right expertise.