An Initiative to Facilitate practitioner Doctoral Students to Present at AERA

Mark J. Fenster

Western Kentucky University

Author's note: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, April, 2009. Address correspondence to, Mark Fenster, Dept. EALR, College of Education, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY 42101-1031, or e-mail, mjfenster@gamil.com, or fenster_21stcentury@hotmail.com.

Abstract

The education doctorate is the most commonly awarded doctorate in academia. In preparation for developing and executing a piece of original research like a dissertation, doctoral students are required to take coursework in research and statistics. These courses can be considered part of a core set of competencies that doctoral students are required to master. Getting students started in their own research is a challenging goal, especially if students see the education doctorate in career enhancing, not publishing terms. We discuss an initiative launched at the University of Massachusetts Lowell to get doctoral students started on their own research early in their programs and to present papers at AERA. In the two years of the initiative, 14 doctoral students out of 28 were successful at getting acceptances at AERA. Students were surveyed regarding their impressions of the going through the AERA review process. We found that 90% students thought the review process was fair.

An Initiative to Facilitate practitioner Doctoral Students to Present at AERA

Once enrolled in a doctoral program, students are required to take coursework in research and statistics. These courses can be considered part of a core set of competencies that doctoral students are required to master. Minimally, students have to build up a repertoire of skills necessary to execute the work of a dissertation (if a dissertation is required to complete the degree), so coursework in descriptive and inferential statistics, qualitative and mixed methods are part of students' required programs.

As professors of educational research, we have a captive audience of students who have to take our required courses, even if their orientation and professional socialization is not aligned with publication for knowledge creation, perhaps the orientation of many of us who teach these courses. This paper discusses an initiative developed to reduce the discordance between the instructors of required research courses and practitioner oriented doctoral students in education by getting students oriented towards conducting their own research early in their doctoral program.

Why focus on AERA acceptances?

An acceptance from AERA is a recognized disciplinary achievement. There is a competitive peer review process that mirrors journal submissions and with 12,000 to 14,000 proposals a year, program committees have to make decisions regarding which proposal to slot for a spot on the program. Experienced and beginning researchers compete for spots in the conference. Regional conferences are not as competitive, and are not similarly recognized as a disciplinary achievement.

Additionally, since students from multiple programs take these required research courses, the outcome measure to evaluate this initiative had to be sufficiently broad base to include a substantial component of what can be called education research in a diverse set of substantive subfields. AERA is also a very broad based conference, consisting of 12 divisions and 150+ special interest groups, meaning that all developed proposals could be sent to a division or special interest group pertinent to the topic.

Theoretical Perspectives

Mentoring

There are a number of theoretical perspectives that would be pertinent to an initiative to get doctoral students involved in their own research early in their programs. Mentoring is one perspective (Harris, Freeman & Aerni, 2009). Where doctoral programs are small, exclusive, and focused on scholarship/professionalism, mentoring may explain help explain research productivity of graduate students. The student's major advisor, the mentor, suggests that a graduate student submit a proposal to a national conference, and, to protect against possible rejection, also suggests submitting a proposal to a regional conference. In some situations, especially when the advisor is funding a graduate student as a research assistant on a grant, the advisor is in an especially strong position to provide a mentoring relationship with a graduate student. However, in practitioner based doctoral programs, when students pay for their own education and don't establish a close relationship with any member of the faculty, a mentor will not have the same opportunity to impact a graduate student's decision to become research active. The mentoring component is reduced (but not eliminated) in the situation where students deal with faculty when taking a course, then not interact with that faculty

member, perhaps for a number of years. The mentoring relationship that develops in a situation where a graduate student is a research assistant is going to more consistent and deeper than a situation where students interact with faculty when taking a course, but not afterward. Additionally, students in practitioner programs are not around outside class time and interacting with faculty. Practitioner students are at their jobs for many hours in a week. In a research assistantship environment, a graduate student might be in a position to be mentored by a faculty member every workday, or multiple times a week, something that is not likely in a practitioner doctoral program.

Cognitive apprenticeship

Cognitive apprenticeship (Bandura, 1977a) is a second theoretical component of this initiative. Bandura's theory of modeling behavior has shown how strong modeling experiences promote confidence, or self-efficacy, to use Bandura's term (1977b, 1997). The one major source of behavioral/cognitive/ and attitudinal information or models that a novice or initiate will pay attention to and (try to) imitate are adults who they consider or perceive to be "authorities ", people who to have personal and earned authority not delegated or institutional authority, (thus the power of sports stars and Jaime Escalante [teacher in Garfield High, Los Angeles, CA who taught calculus to inner city students]) those who do the work and have earned their credentials.

The initiative's architect was a live adult and professional role model for these students (Ding, 2008). In Bandura's framework, the role model was a new source of information and a new model to try to imitate. The adult model wasn't some place far away of on the TV or web, it was right in front of them; someone who had been to AERA and knew what it was about, and who had succeeded and failed when submitting

proposals, and knew the agony of creating a work of scholarship. It is the person in authority, the "real deal" standing in front of the class every week.

Acquisition of Expertise

The third theoretical perspective deals with acquisition of expertise. There are a number of hypothesized steps people take as they acquire expertise. One taxonomy starts with cognition, progresses to associative and tops off at automaticity (Fitts & Posner, 1967). At the cognition step, people learn from instruction or observation what knowledge and actions are appropriate. At the associative step, people practice (with feedback) allowing smooth and accurate performance. At the final step, autoaticity expertise, performance and associative sequences can be done without large amounts of cognitive resources. The students in this study were assumed to be operating at the cognition step when it came to developing research ideas that could be presented at a national conference, although on other dimensions of their work, they may have achieved autoaticity expertise, especially if they have been on the same job for a number of years.

The initiative did essentially do what the military does in boot camp, and fraternities and sororities do with new inductees. The initiative's architect provided a different and higher standard and higher aspirations to new inductees, graduate students beginning doctoral work. The initiative's architect told this beginning graduate students (raw recruits, to use a term from the military) that an AERA acceptance was something of value that should be strived for as it would improve how they thought about things as a professional and give them a road to greater acceptance and respect as scholars.

The AERA initiative

The paper is intended to demonstrate your competence in applying statistics/research designs to a specific research problem of your own formulation. You will be expected to devise a **concise and non-trivial** hypothesis that can be tested with data available for analysis (if conducting a quantitative study). You must state briefly the source of your research problem or question, formulate it as a hypothesis for testing with available data (more on this later), execute the appropriate test, and draw a conclusion about the truth or falsity of the hypothesis- within a **constrained** maximum of 2000 words (title, abstract and references don't factor into the word count). Evaluation of this exercise will be based mainly on clarity of presentation and statistical craftsmanship rather than on the substantive or theoretical importance of the problem.

The expected form and style of the paper can be likened to AERA proposals. We will look at some examples of such proposals, some that got accepted and presented at the best education conference in the world, and others that were rejected for presentation. I will give you a handout of nine submitted AERA proposals on the first day of class. Some of these proposals were accepted at AERA (accepted for presentation as a paper, roundtable or poster session). Other proposals in this handout were rejected for presentation at AERA. One proposal (#4) was rejected a couple of years ago, but strengthened, resubmitted and accepted in the next AERA submission cycle. Your paper will not be due until July 25,

2007 (at 11:59 P.M, EDT, USA.) but a one-page progress report stating the hypothesis and data to be used is due June 26, 2007. Your paper will be submitted by the instructor to AERA for potential presentation at the 2008 conference to be held in the Big Apple in the last week in March, 2008 (March 24-28, to be precise).

Information on the Paper: The paper will demonstrate your ability to integrate statistical theory with data. The skills learned throughout the course will build up to the paper, but only three sections of the paper explicitly deal with course material. Students will bring in expertise from outside the course for the other three sections of the paper.

The paper should have the following six headings and be organized **explicitly** around these headings

Sections for the paper---

Objectives or purposes;

Perspective(s) or theoretical framework;

Methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry;

Data sources or evidence;

Results and/or conclusions/point of view; and

Educational or scientific importance of the study.

1. Objectives or purposes. [What do you hope to achieve by studying this topic.]

2. Perspective(s) or theoretical framework. [What have others said about this topic?]

3. Methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry. [How did you go about analyzing this topic?]

4. Data sources or evidence. [What data or evidence did you use to analyze this topic?]

5. Results and/or conclusions/point of view. [What did you find? Were your hypotheses supported, if conducting a quantitative analysis? What did you conclude?

6. Educational or scientific importance of the study. [What does your study mean in the grand scheme of things? Can you answer the "so what" question that a skeptic might have with your study? Why would others want to know the results of your study?

An abstract of 100-120 words to the paper will be required.

I expect that your hypotheses will be well grounded into prior literature. The methodology section should be as well grounded into the literature as possible. I expect that you will draw on course work outside 702, literature searches in the library and on the Internet, and any other materials needed to write the early sections of the paper well.

Additionally, AERA reviewers will also be evaluating your paper (during August-November, 2007, long after the course is complete) and they can use whatever criteria they wish!

Source: The author's syllabus for RSCH 702.

Methodology

The setting, The University of Massachusetts Lowell

The University of Massachusetts Lowell's Graduate School of Education is a practitioner based program leading to master's degree and the education doctorate (Ed.D.). This study is exclusively focused on the doctoral program. Students entering the doctoral program are predominately employed full time in k-12 schools districts in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Some have administrative responsibilities at the building level (assistant principal, principal, curriculum supervisor), and a smaller percentage have positions in the central office of school districts (assistant superintendents). About 25% of the doctoral students are employed in higher education, with positions in community colleges or four year institutions. Whether employed in instructional positions, or administrative roles, the vast majority of doctoral students enrolled in the Graduate School of Education are full time employed somewhere else. The academic credentials of these students are not outstanding typically (i.e., midrange GRE scores and undergraduate grade point averages below 3.5)

The institution, the 10th (and final) normal school established in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a Carnegie classification of Doctoral Research University, the lowest Carnegie classification for doctoral granting institutions. In 2009, The Graduate School of Education at University of Massachusetts Lowell was ranked 119 out of 119, sharing the bottom ranking with seven other institutions of higher education according to *U.S. News and World Report,* when *U.S. News and World Report* had sufficient information to rank a particular institution. (Best Education Schools, 2009).

We can see from the Carnegie classification and the *U.S. News and World Report* ranking that the University of Massachusetts Lowell is not an elite institution.

Measuring the effectiveness of the initiative

Effectiveness was measured by the number and percentages of AERA proposals accepted for presentation at the most recent annual conferences.

All submitted proposals were sent to a particular special interest group (SIG) or division within AERA. The program officers for the SIGs or divisions assign a minimum of two, but preferably three peer reviewers to each proposal. The anonymous peer reviewers are scholars with substantive expertise and interest in the division or SIG receiving the proposal. Additionally, all reviewers are members of AERA. The student proposals were competing for spots against established researchers and freshly minted doctoral students in one of the most, if not the most prestigious education conference in the world.

It is important to note that the instructor's role in the proposal *development phase* ends with the submission of the work to AERA. The instructor has no role in the selection of peer reviewers and cannot influence the AERA proposal selection process. The AERA peer reviewers and program officers evaluate the quality of submitted proposals, *completely* independent of the knowledge of the initiative's architect. One criterion of effectiveness is straightforward, direct and unambiguous; whether or not the proposal was accepted for presentation by AERA. Alternative criteria of effectiveness will also be assessed through a survey of the initiative's participants.

Student reaction survey

A survey was developed to provide an opportunity for the 28 students involved in the initiative to provide their reactions to the peer review process and perceptions concerning their proposal's acceptance or rejection from AERA. The survey was approved by University of Massachusetts Lowell's institutional review board.

A uniform resource locator (URL) was sent to each of the 28 students, explaining the purpose of the survey and inviting them to participate. Students responded on-line. After an initial request to participate in the survey and two follow-ups, 21 out of the 28 students (75%) responded to the survey. We note here that the response rate was higher from those receiving acceptances from AERA (86%) than those receiving rejections (64%). A copy of the survey can be found in the appendix.

Results

Percentage of students receiving acceptances from AERA

Over the last two years, 28 students submitted proposals to AERA. Fourteen students received acceptances from AERA. Thus, at the student level, the percentage of students receiving acceptances from AERA was 50%. Eight acceptances were for paper presentations (57%), four acceptances were for panel discussions (roundtables) 29%, and two acceptances were for poster sessions (14%).

It was the first time in the institution's history that doctoral students were presenting at AERA so early in their program. One student completed only one course in her program. Most students completed two or three courses at the time of submission to AERA. We note here that there was a considerable diversity of successful topics, at least one proposal was accepted in three different AERA divisions (Division C [learning],

Division E (Counseling and Human Development) and Division G (Social Context of Education, Multicultural) In addition, students received acceptances from AERA in six special interest groups (SIGs). We also note here that three students submitted proposals in year one and year two of the initiative. Looking at the proposal as the unit of analysis, the acceptance rate for AERA proposals was 42%.

Student Reaction Survey

Questions concerning expectations of research productivity and fairness of the review process

A majority of respondents (71%) did not know what the initials AERA stood for; 85% did not think they would present at a major conference; 57% did not think they would publish a paper during (or just after) completing doctoral studies.

Participants thought the reviewers comments were fair (81%), appropriate (86%), and the review process itself was fair (90%). Interestingly, nobody participating in the initiative felt the reviewers' comments were not fair, or the comments were inappropriate. For 86%, it was the first time their work was evaluated by anonymous peer reviewers. Fifty-seven percent of the participants reported receiving an acceptance from AERA.

Of those who presented in at AERA 2008 in New York City

1. *80% (4/5) felt* the experience of presenting at AERA made them feel more connected to the field of educational research.

2. 100% (5/5) felt more able to contribute to the field of educational research after the AERA presentation.

3. 100% (5/5) felt more willing to contribute to the field of educational research after the AERA presentation.

4. 83% (5/6) felt more confident that they could complete their dissertation.

5. 100% (6/6) felt more confident that they that their dissertation can meet professional standards of acceptable quality.

6. 100% (6/6) thought that presenting at AERA was worth it.

Of those presenting at AERA 2009 in San Diego

7. 100% (7/7) expected to feel the experience of presenting at AERA made them feel more connected to the field of educational research.

8. 100% (7/7) felt more able to contribute to the field of educational research after the AERA acceptance.

9. 100% (6/6) felt more willing to contribute to the field of educational research after the AERA acceptance.

10. 100% (5/5) felt more confident that they could complete their dissertation after receiving the AERA acceptance.

11. 100% (6/6) expected to feel more confident that they that their dissertation can meet professional standards of acceptable quality after receiving the AERA acceptance.

12. 83% (5/6) expected to think that presenting at AERA was worth it.

Of those did not did receive acceptances from AERA

There was greater diversity in opinions from those who did not get their proposals accepted from AERA, compared to those who received acceptances from the conference.

13. Would you say that due to your experience of NOT getting accepted at AERA
    a. 37% (3/8) felt more connected to the field of educational research.
    b. 50% (4/8) felt as connected to the field of educational research.
    c. 12% (1/8) felt less connected to the field of educational research.

14. Would you say that due to your experience of NOT getting accepted at AERA
    43% (3/7) felt more able to contribute to the field of educational research?
    29% (2/7) felt less able to contribute to the field of educational research?
    29% (2/7) felt no difference in your ability to contribute to the field of educational research?

15. Would you say that due to your experience of NOT getting accepted at AERA
a. 12% (1/8) made you more willing to contribute to the field of educational research?
b. 25% (2/8) made you less willing to contribute to the field of educational research?
c. 62% (5/8) made no difference in your willingness to contribute to the field of educational research?

16. After not getting accepted at AERA, did you feel less confident that you can complete your dissertation?
75% (6/8) responded NO

17. After not getting accepted at AERA, did you feel less confident that your dissertation can meet professional standards of acceptable quality?
75% (6/8) responded NO

18. Do you think you missed out on a professional development opportunity by NOT presenting at AERA?

62% (5/8) responded Yes

Student Reaction Survey, open ended items

Students participating in the survey had a number of open-ended items, where they could provide their own comments. In response to question 5, one participant said:

> The reviewers had helpful comments for me. I did not think my study was going to be accepted because it dealt with a very broad topic (the nature of science) with a very small-scale survey. Also, my review of the literature was almost non-existent. I was not surprised (but still a little disappointed) when I found that my study was not accepted. I was also very happy for my classmates who had their studies accepted. The comments helped me think like a reviewer. Before reading the comments, my thinking was along the line of, "my study was small, they probably won't like it." After

reading their comments, I had a much better understanding of the specific changes I would need to make to improve my research program. In total, it was a positive experience.

But, in general, participant reviews about opinions about the review process was generally positive. Five comments are presented here:

- They were objective. They acknowledged the theoretical framework of my research and were interested in the translation of the theories into practice.
- I thought the comments were fair. The data probably didn't justify the strong conclusion I drew.
- I thought they were fair. There was some difference of opinion of the quality of the paper and the research that was being written about as being narrow.
- Reviewer's comments reflected their understanding of the nature of the study. According to how well the reviewers understood the subject area of the study, the reviewers were accordingly positive.
- The reviewers' comments were actually quite positive so I was surprised by that.

Open ended comments of those whose AERA proposals were not accepted for presentation

Participants not receiving acceptances from AERA still thought well of the process. In response to Q19, participants were asked, “Would you say that due to your experience of NOT getting accepted at AERA”, the following three responses highlighted the learning process of the initiative.

- It was absolutely worth the experience - whether my paper was accepted or not.
- Although my last paper was rejected, I feel confident that I could write a better one that would be accepted. Either way, I would like to attend a meeting at some point.
- I learned something about the threshold for good educational research

Discussion

The AERA initiative showed the changed the norms of the department. Instead of viewing the research courses as hoops to jump over and a steppingstone to completing a dissertation, students had the opportunity to show that they could successfully compete against their graduate peers and experienced researchers for spots on the AERA program. Acceptances at AERA are an achievable goal for doctoral students early in their program. We note here that there was skepticism from some of the first group of students regarding whether anybody from the class would get an acceptance from AERA. However, after there were six acceptances in year one, the skepticism articulated by year one students was not repeated by year two students.

We were surprised at the high rate of acceptance for papers (57%). Our expectation going into the initiative was that proposed seminar topics would receive acceptances from AERA, but for presentation types lower than paper on the academic hierarchy. We expected most acceptances would be for presentations at panel discussions (roundtables) or poster sessions.

Using the Fitts and Posner (1967) taxonomy, students began the process of moving from cognition to associative expertise. Our assumption that students participating in the AERA initiative started out at the cognition step was supported by the

results of the student reaction survey; 86% reported that this was their first attempt to present a piece of work using the peer review process. Using Bandura's (1997) social modeling theory, the initiative helped create more confident students, a result found in a number of answers provided by the student reaction survey. Additionally, the outcome of more confident students was not limited to those who received acceptances from AERA. Even students receiving rejections from AERA reported more confidence and a greater understanding of the research process, a result consistent with Fitts and Posner's (1967) acquisition of expertise and Bandura's (1997) social modeling theory.

The AERA initiative shows the powerful effects of modeling behavior (Bandura, 1977b; Bandura, 1997). When students see their instructors developing proposals, challenging themselves to produce disciplinary credible research, students will be more energized to model that behavior and attempt to do the same thing. Even students whose proposals were rejected had positive comments about the review and research process and that the review and research process was more understandable to them. And this is not an initiative that ends with an acceptance or rejection at AERA. Students rejected at one AERA conference can retry the next year (and, indeed, two students rejected in year one of the initiative received acceptances in year two), or try to present at regional conferences. The initiative's architect had a small grade incentive for students to submit proposals to one of the regional education conferences near The University of Massachusetts Lowell, the Northeastern Educational Research Association (NERA) or the New England Education Research Organization (NEERO), and five students, including some whose proposals were rejected at AERA received acceptances from these regional conferences.

Lastly, this paper only deals with short term impacts of the AERA initiative. The hope of this action researcher is that students going through the AERA initiative will start on a long term process, culminating with that attainment of Bandura's (1997) construct of confidence (or self-efficacy) and Fitts and Posner's (1967) second step, associative expertise. Knowing what needs to go into a research project and completing such a project in a reasonable time frame may help students choose dissertation topics they have greater confidence in completing at a higher cognitive level than students without this knowledge. Longer term impacts, confidence in completing a dissertation, dissertation completion, quality of the dissertation, and publication rates of dissertation completers can be assessed in three to five years.

References

Bandura, A. (1977a). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1977b). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Best Education Schools. (2009). Retrieved April 23, 2009 from http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-education-schools/rankings/

Ding, H. (2008). The Use of Cognitive and Social Apprenticeship to Teach a Disciplinary Genre: Initiation of Students into NIH Grant Writing. *Written Communication, 25* n1 p3-52.

Fitts, P. & Posner, M. (1967). *Human Performance*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Harris, J. B.; Freeman, T. L.; & Aerni, P. W. (2009). On Becoming Educational Researchers: The Importance of Cogenerative Mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *17* n1 p 23-39.

Appendix

The survey attempts to ascertain your knowledge of the discipline of education, attitudes and expectations of writing a scholarly paper pre-dissertation, and your perceptions of the fairness of the peer review process used by a the national conference in education (The American Education Research Association, or AERA) to vet proposals for presentation at that conference.

Completion of this survey is voluntary. You can drop out at any time. Results from this survey will be used for research purposes only. No individual level data will ever be released. Your completion of the survey will constitute implied consent. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Mark Fenster ((V) 978-934-4633, or e-mail mark_fenster@uml.edu). The survey was approved by UMASS Lowell's IRB.

Think back to the time your entered the doctoral program.

Q1. Did you know what the initials AERA stood for?

a. YES
b. NO

Q2. Did you think you would present a paper you wrote at a major national conference like AERA?

a. YES
b. NO

Q2a. Did you think that you would write a scholarly paper or write up a formal research study before you did your dissertation?

a. YES
b. NO

Q3. Did you think you would publish a paper during (or just after completing) your doctoral studies?

a. YES
b. NO

Regarding your proposal to AERA

Q4. Was your proposal accepted for presentation at AERA?

a. YES
b. NO (please skip to question 5)

Q4a. If yes, was your paper accepted for presentation the first time it was submitted, or the second?

a. FIRST TIME
b. SECOND TIME

Q5. What were your impressions of the reviewer's comments? If you don't remember the reviewer's comment, please try to remember your reaction to the comments).

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____.

Q6. Was this the first time your work was evaluated by anonymous peer reviewers?

a. YES
b. NO

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Q7. Did you think the reviewers' comments were a fair evaluation of your work?

a. Yes, very fair
b. Yes, fair
c. Sometimes fair, sometimes not fair.
d. No, not fair
e. No, not very fair.

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Q8. Did you think the reviewers' comments were appropriate?

a. Yes, very appropriate
b. Yes, appropriate
c. Sometimes appropriate, sometimes not appropriate
d. No, not appropriate
e. No, not very appropriate.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q8a. Did you find the reviewer's comment helpful to you in writing the paper you actually presented?

a. Yes, very helpful.
b. Yes, somewhat helpful.
c. No, not helpful.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q8c. What did you think of the review process. Did you think the review process was

a. fair.
b. not fair.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

For those who presented at AERA in 2008 (New York City)

[If you did not present at AERA in New York City, please skip to Q14 if you will present at AERA this year, or skip to Q19 if your AERA proposal was not accepted for presentation.]

Q9. I presented

a. a paper on a panel.
b. at a roundtable (now called panel discussions)
c. a poster session

Q10. Describe your overall experience presenting at AERA. Would you say the experience was

a. very favorable.
b. favorable.
c. somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable.
d. unfavorable.
e. very unfavorable.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q11. Would you say your experience of presenting at AERA made you feel
a. more connected to the field of educational research.
b. as connected to the field of educational research.
c. less connected to the field of educational research.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q12. After the AERA presentation, did you feel
a. more able to contribute to the field of educational research?
b. less able to contribute to the field of educational research?

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q13 After the AERA presentation, did you feel
a. more willing to contribute to the field of educational research?
b. less willing to contribute to the field of educational research?

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q13a. After the AERA presentation, did you feel more confident that you can complete your dissertation?
a. YES
b. NO

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q13b. After the AERA presentation, did you do feel more confident that your dissertation can meet professional standards of acceptable quality?

a. YES
b. NO

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q13c. Did you think that presenting at AERA was worth it?

a. Yes.
b. Not sure.
c. No.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

For those who will present at AERA in 2009 (San Diego)

Q14. I will present

a. a paper on a panel.
b. at a roundtable (now called panel discussions)
c. a poster session

Q15. Describe your expectation regarding your upcoming presentation. Do you expect the overall experience will be

a. very favorable.
b. favorable.
c. somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable.
d. unfavorable.
e. very unfavorable.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q16. On the basis of presenting at AERA, do you expect

d. to feel more connected to the field of educational research.
e. to feel as connected to the field of educational research.
f. to feel less connected to the field of educational research.

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q17. After receiving the AERA acceptance, did you feel
a. more able to contribute to the field of educational research?
b. less able to contribute to the field of educational research?

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q18. After receiving the AERA acceptance, did you feel
a. more willing to contribute to the field of educational research?
b. less willing to contribute to the field of educational research?

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q18a. After receiving AERA acceptance, did you feel more confident that you can complete your dissertation?

a. YES
b. NO

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q18b. After receiving AERA acceptance, did you do feel more confident that your dissertation can meet professional standards of acceptable quality?

a. YES
b. NO

Comment:
_____
_____
_____.

Q18c. Do you expect to think that presenting at AERA was worth it?

d. Yes.
e. Not sure.
f. No.

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

For those whose AERA proposals were not accepted for presentation

Q19. Would you say that due to your experience of NOT getting accepted at AERA

d. you feel more connected to the field of educational research.
e. you feel as connected to the field of educational research.
f. you feel less connected to the field of educational research.

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Q20. Would you say that due to your experience of NOT getting accepted at AERA

c. you feel more able to contribute to the field of educational research?
b. you feel less able to contribute to the field of educational research?
c. you feel no difference in your ability to contribute to the field of educational research?

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Q21. Would you say that due to your experience of NOT getting accepted at AERA

d. made you more willing to contribute to the field of educational research?
e. made you less willing to contribute to the field of educational research?
f. made no difference in your willingness to contribute to the field of educational research?

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Q21a. After not getting accepted at AERA, did you feel less confident that you can complete your dissertation?

a. YES
b. NO

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Q21b. After not getting accepted at AERA, did you feel less confident that your dissertation can meet professional standards of acceptable quality?

a. YES
b. NO

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Q22. Do you think you missed out on a professional development opportunity by NOT presenting at AERA?

a. Yes
b. No

Comment:

_____
_____
_____.

Thanks for your time. Good luck with the rest of your program.