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

Hunter McEwan and Helen Slaughter[1]

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

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

The PhD in Educational Psychology

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Making a case to the vice president for academic affairs for a new Department of Counseling and Guidance, the vice-chancellor, Geoffrey Ashton, pointed to the distinct missions of both groups: "counseling and guidance is interested in producing effective professionals…while educational psychology is interested in producing researchers and theorists." Faculty in counseling and guidance tried to retain their own version of the PhD but their request was denied. Thus, the move cost counseling and guidance faculty a role in doctoral education. However, the strain of the division and the events leading up to it also raised issues about the capacity of the educational psychology department to offer the PhD. In 1974 the dean of Graduate Division declared a moratorium on admissions. On June 25, 1975, Howard McKaughan, commenting on this situation from his perspective as dean of Graduate Division, referred to the creative role of educational psychology as a "spawning ground" for other programs. Nevertheless, he was concerned that there were adequate resources in the department, and he questioned its capacity to maintain a research-oriented doctoral degree. He wanted to be sure that "what remains is not merely viable but retains real strength." His review of the department left him in no doubt that it should continue to offer MEd and PhD degrees if they concentrated on learning, measurement, and research. He recommended restoration of the program and in fall 1976 the PhD in educational psychology was back in business.

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

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

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

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

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

The PhD in Education

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

Preparation for the launch of the new degree lasted over a decade. Fred Braun of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Ralph Stueber of the Department of Educational Foundations stated in a memo to the chancellor on June 5 1972 that work to gain approval of the EdD had been the result of 8 years of effort. Over this period the college had worked to develop the appropriate level of coursework and to hire qualified staff. Four of these years had been required to develop the proposal "as it stands today." The first proposal was produced by a nine-member committee composed of faculty from across the college: Shiro Amioka and Ralph K. Stueber of educational foundations, Frederick G. Braun of curriculum and instruction, Edward F. Chui of health and physical education, John B. Crossley of educational administration, Donald Leton and Ian E. Reid of educational psychology, Gerry B. Mendelson of educational communications, and Associate Dean Andrew W.S. In. The proposal did not have an easy ride and had to go through several revisions before it was acceptable to Graduate Division. Initially, the degree was expected to begin in the fall of 1971, but several obstacles had to be overcome before full approval was granted—especially in meeting standards and requirements set by Graduate Division. The final version, *Proposal for the Degree of Doctor of Education (EdD) with Areas of Specialization in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Foundations*, was submitted by Dean Hubert Everly to the Board of Regents on December 28, 1973 and obtained their approval on February 15, 1974.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Currently, the PhD in Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, provides students with a strong interdisciplinary program emphasizing a college-wide inquiry core that includes qualitative and quantitative research methods, a course in multiple perspectives on research, and at least one advanced research course in the student's dissertation research area. Students are able to select from among several course options within each inquiry area. Ultimately, students select an approach to research that best addresses the problem area and research questions addressed in their dissertation. All students are required to do either a field study, or an internship in college teaching.

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

References

Ralph Stueber, (1988). *Some Retrospection, Moods, Visions, and Modest Proposals on the Idea of an All-College EdD*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawai'i College of Education, Honolulu.

The Stiles Report. (1966). Preparation of teachers and other educational personnel in Hawai'i. A study authorized by the third legislature of the state of Hawai'i. January 17, 1966.

Proposal for a program of graduate studies for the degree of doctor of education (EdD) with areas of specialization in curriculum and instruction and educational foundations. College of Education, University of Hawai'i, March 8, 1971.

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

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