WALDEN UNIVERSITY

A higher degree. A higher purpose.

The Doctoral Study Guidebook
March 2011

The Doctoral Study Guidebook

WALDEN UNIVERSITY

www.WaldenU.edu

THE
DOCTORAL STUDY
GUIDEBOOK

Revised March 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Doctoral Study

The doctoral study is the capstone for Walden's Ed.D. program. It is a scholarly response to a local problem of practice. If you entered the Ed.D. program *before* January 2009, with the exception of the Higher Education and Adult Learning (HEAL) specialization, you may respond to the problem through either a research* or project option. If you entered the Ed.D. program *after* January 2009, or are in the HEAL specialization, you will respond to the problem through the project option only.

The doctoral study has a purpose and is a process. The purpose of the doctoral study is to demonstrate mastery of the knowledge and skills necessary to serve as educational leaders. To create a doctoral project study, you must first define a local educational problem, the topic of investigation. There must be evidence from your local situation and professional literature that there is indeed a problem. Thus, the project study involves a critical review of the relevant research and theoretical literature related to a problem and possible solutions to the problem.

The doctoral study project requires two components. One component is the development of a project in response to a local problem you have identified. The second component is a scholarly paper, framing, explaining, justifying, and analyzing the project. The scholarly paper is composed of four sections that focus, respectively, on the problem, the methodology, the project genre or type and project content, and reflections. The actual project is included in the appendix of the final paper.

*Note to students completing the research option: This document is constructed relative to requirements for the project study option. While some of the information in this guide is useful for all Ed.D. doctoral students, you should refer to the *Walden University Student Handbook* for guidelines specific to the research option. (Go to the *Walden University Student Handbook*; choose the "Learning and Research Resources" tab from the left navigation bar; select "Capstone Research: Dissertation or Doctoral Study"; select "Doctoral Capstone Completion Process.") You will, however, find links to the research-option template and rubric later in this guidebook.

Benefits of a Project Study

The skills and proficiencies developed and exhibited during the project study process will prepare you for becoming an effective leader in the educational field.

By conducting a project study and writing the scholarly paper, you will:

- Develop a comparative analysis of key theories in the field and synthesize the findings for guiding and investigating classroom and leadership practice as well as educational policy or evaluation of educational programs.
- Build a foundation of historical and theoretical knowledge as you explore how the concepts, constructs, and principles are interrelated in a field of study about which you are passionate.
- Develop scholarship, research, and academic-writing skills.
- Refine critical-thinking processes as you analyze current research studies.

- Gain a perspective of how to look at the scholarship and research of others in the field of education.
- Become familiar with significant resources (journals, databases, reports, texts, and Web-based sources) in your chosen field.
- Refine your depth of understanding in an area of your passion.
- Determine the relationship between intent of inquiry, types of data-gathering instruments, and analysis procedures used in various types of research investigations.
- Discover practices to enhance the delivery of instruction or leadership practices, and formulation, implementation, and evaluation of educational policy and programs.
- Develop a more critical perspective in reflecting upon classroom or leadership practices, and formulation, implementation, and evaluation of educational policy and programs.
- Provide inquiry-generated, research-based theories and practices for the enhancement of learning, teaching, and leading in the classroom, school, or community learning environments.

How This Guidebook Is Organized

The Doctoral Study Guidebook complements other important resources during this phase of your graduate career, including your doctoral supervisory committee, your faculty chair, the academic advisors and other university staff members, the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA style manual), and the Walden Writing Center.

Part 1 of this guidebook describes the doctoral study process, including information on your doctoral study committee. This section also explains the policies and procedures related to ethical standards, IRB, and URR review.

Part 2 provides guiding principles to help you achieve the doctoral study mindset, including information on developing an investigative stance through inquiry and how to develop opinions into arguments. This section also provides useful tips on how to approach research literature and manage your findings.

Part 3 includes information on the doctoral study timeline, the Walden Transition Points Model for Assessment, and paper guidelines, including a detailed explanation of the four main sections of the study paper.

Part 4 includes form and style guidelines as an introduction and a supplement to the APA style manual. The sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA style manual) is your main source of form and style information when writing your doctoral study. References to APA style reflect the sixth edition of the APA style manual. When the university has style preferences for the doctoral study that supersede APA guidelines, those preferences are indicated in green boxes in this guide.

Part 5 of this guidebook includes a series of frequently asked questions regarding the doctoral study, process, and common form and style issues.

Resources at the end of this guidebook include a list of phone numbers, e-mail addresses, websites, and literature that you may find helpful as you complete your doctoral study.

PART 1. THE DOCTORAL STUDY PROCESS

A detailed explanation of steps in the doctoral study process, including the various stages of review and submission, are provided in this part of the guidebook. (**Note:** A shorter description is outlined in the Ed.D. Steps in the URR document found on the Office of Student Research Support website.)

Process Overview

Step	*Description*
Prospectus and Committee Assignment	The prospectus is a brief document that provides preliminary information about your doctoral study. The prospectus helps you organize, delineate, and make decisions regarding your doctoral study and appropriate research methodology. Upon submission of a brief draft of your prospectus and the *Prospectus/Doctoral Study Chair Assignment* form, your doctoral study supervisory committee will be assigned. You will construct the *full* prospectus in the doctoral study companion course under the supervision of your doctoral committee chair. Each committee member will assess the prospectus using a rubric thereby determining successful completion. More information on the prospectus and committee assignment process can be found in this guidebook.
Proposal Development	The proposal is the first two sections of a doctoral study; it establishes the rationale for conducting the study and identification of a local problem, including a review and analysis of relevant literature and a description of the design and methodology used in the study. You will work with your committee chair and the other members of your committee to develop your proposal, consulting the specific university-approved rubric indicators that will be used to evaluate the doctoral study. When your committee decides that your proposal is within 1 month of completion, you must submit a *University Research Reviewer Request* form along with your prospectus to doctoralstudy@waldenu.edu. The Ed.D. doctoral study rubric and *University Research Reviewer Request* form can be found in on the Center for Research Support website.
Proposal University Research Review	Once your committee is satisfied that the proposal meets all the requirements specified in the rubric, the chair will submit the proposal and completed formative rubrics from each committee member and a Turnitin report document to your assigned committee reviewer. The reviewer will assess the Turnitin report document and proposal using the University Research Reviewer (URR) checklist (project study rubric), including items relevant to content, methodology, form and style, and ethical procedures. The reviewer will either approve the proposal and documents, which enables you to set up an oral conference, or return the proposal and documents with a set of required revisions. You will work with your committee to make any requested revisions and resubmit them for approval.

Step	Description
Proposal Oral Defense Presentation	Following URR approval, you will present the proposal to your committee via a teleconference scheduled with the Office of Student Research Support (OSRS). A consensus rubric constructed by committee members will be submitted to the OSRS by the chair following the successful completion of the proposal. More information about the proposal approval and presentation processes can be found in this guidebook and on the OSRS website.
IRB Approval	Walden's Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviews each study conducted by Walden students to determine if the anticipated benefits of the study outweigh risks associated with participation in it. While developing your proposal, draft the IRB application and submit it to your chair for feedback. Once your proposal has received final approval, you will receive a notice from the OSRS to submit your formal *IRB Application*. Your committee chair and second member must review, approve, and sign your application. Please remember that no data may be collected until IRB approval is granted. More information about IRB processes and forms can be found in this guidebook and on the OSRS and Office of Research Integrity and Compliance websites.
Doctoral Study Completion	Following IRB approval notification, you can collect, analyze, and report your findings, complete the remaining chapters of your doctoral study, the project, and prepare the final abstract. You will complete a self-evaluation of the Turnitin report and submit it to your doctoral study chair. Your doctoral study chair will complete a separate Turnitin report, which will be submitted to the URR for review along with your doctoral study. More information about doctoral study completion and Turnitin processes can be found throughout this guidebook and on the OSRS and Writing Center websites.
Doctoral Study University Research Review	When your committee is satisfied that your full doctoral study draft and abstract meet all the requirements specified in the rubric, the chair will submit the doctoral study, completed rubrics for each committee member, and Turnitin report to the URR for review. The URR will complete the URR checklist. You will work with your committee to make any requested revisions until the final documents meet URR approval and an approved URR checklist is submitted. More information about URR review can be found throughout this guidebook and on the OSRS website.
Form and Style Review	Upon URR approval of the doctoral study, abstract, and Turnitin report, the final project study document will be submitted by the doctoral study office to a Writing Center editor for a Form and Style Review and a final check for errors in APA style, spelling, grammar, punctuation, and related issues. More information about Form and Style Review can be found in this guidebook and on the Writing Center website.
Oral Defense Teleconference	After receipt of the Form and Style Review, you will present your doctoral study via a teleconference scheduled with the OSRS. The oral defense is a formal discussion of the scholarly content of the doctoral study followed by a summative evaluation (Ed.D. consensus rubric) of your doctoral study. At this point, you may need to revise your doctoral study based on feedback during the teleconference as well as from the Form and Style Review. More information about the oral defense teleconference can be found in this guidebook and on the OSRS website.

Step	Description
Final University Research Review	After successful completion of the oral defense and committee approval of the doctoral study, the chair forwards the final doctoral study and abstract along with the consensus rubric to the URR for a final review and approval to make sure all methodological, content, and writing issues identified through the Form and Style Review have been addressed. In addition, the URR reviews the abstract to make sure it meets university guidelines. More information about the final research review process and university abstract guidelines can be found in this guidebook and on the OSRS website.
Chief Academic Officer Review	After final URR approval, the abstract is sent to the university's chief academic officer (CAO) or designee. Revisions may be required by the reviewer; these will be facilitated through consultation with your chair and the assigned URR. Upon CAO approval, the doctoral study is officially completed. More information about CAO approval can be found in this guidebook and in the Ed.D. Steps in the URR document found on the OSRS website.
ProQuest UMI Submission	To graduate from Walden University, you must submit your doctoral study to ProQuest UMI for publishing. Once this submission has been approved, you have completed all the graduation requirements for the doctoral study and your degree can be validated. More information about the ProQuest UMI process can be found in this guidebook.

Prospectus and Supervisory Committee Assignment Process

Prospectus

The prospectus is a brief document (approximately 1,000 words) that provides preliminary information about your doctoral study. It will help you organize, delineate, and make decisions regarding your doctoral study and appropriate research methodology.

You will work on a draft of the prospectus as part of your course requirements and submit a short draft to your course instructor for feedback. Once revised, you must submit the *Ed.D. Doctoral Study Prospectus and Chair Assignment* form along with your draft prospectus to your course instructor. (**Note:** You should save your file in the format of Lastname_Firstname_Specialization.doc or .docx.) Your instructor submits all requests for committee assignments to the doctoral committee and the OSRS. This process is part of Transitions Point 2. You will revise the prospectus draft in EDAD/EDUC 8080; the formal prospectus is assessed with a rubric as part of Transitions Point 3. Thus, the prospectus is submitted twice, once as a short draft to guide your committee assignments, and then completed in full and submitted formally for assessment with a rubric in the EDAD/EDUC 8080 Doctoral Study Companion course.

Supervisory Committee Assignment

The members of your doctoral study supervisory committee are selected and invited by core faculty Ed.D. program coordinators to serve on your committee based on content or methodological expertise.

You may request a particular chair or second member from a list of faculty found in the Faculty Expertise Directory, which you can access through the eCampus portal by following these steps:

1. Log into the eCampus portal directly or go to it after logging into the myWalden university portal.

2. Select the "Campus Life" tab.

3. Once you are in the "Campus Life" view, select "Directory" from the top navigation tab.

4. Once you are in the "Directory" view, select "Faculty Expertise Directory."

Committee requests are granted based on faculty availability, agreement to serve, and match of content or methodology to your prospectus. In the Ed.D. program, the doctoral study committee is assigned during the fifth semester (Transition Point 3) and becomes effective at the start of the sixth semester. You must first complete your doctoral development plan (DDP) and prospectus before the supervisory committee can be assigned.

When members of the faculty in a graduate education program accept the duty of serving as a committee to advise you through the doctoral proposal and study requirements to earn a doctorate, they assume a dual responsibility of high importance. One part is service to you; the other is service to the academic practice and the discipline and professional field to which the doctoral study is related. For the first part, expectations concerning the faculty service to be performed are determined by your needs and university academic policy pertaining to how these are to be addressed. For the second, expectations are set both by university academic policy and by policies and practices that frame acceptable work in the discipline and professional field at large; view Walden's published statement describing the outcome of these expectations as applied in the university (go to the *Walden University Student Handbook*; choose the "Introduction and Legal Information" tab on the left navigation bar; select "University Outcomes ").

The doctoral committee includes three faculty members: the chair and a second member, who are assigned to assist you with the proposal and final study development, and a University Research Reviewer, who is assigned when your proposal is ready for review and is responsible for reviewing and approving your proposal and final study documents.

Role of the Doctoral Study Supervisory Committee Chair

The individual faculty member who serves as chair of the doctoral study supervisory committee is the key person in the process of your production of an acceptable doctoral study. The chair has the primary responsibility of assuring that the work of the committee effectively fulfills both the expectations of service to you and service to the academic discipline(s) and professional field(s) of practice involved. While the doctoral study must be your work, the committee is expected to offer full support from their experiences and backgrounds and related resources of the university at large. The committee chair's duty is to lead, monitor, coordinate, and assess the progress of your study from start to finish.

Role of the Second Doctoral Study Supervisory Committee Member

The second committee member is led by the chair of your committee. If not already known, the second committee member informs the chair of his or her expertise or any special knowledge that may be contributed to your doctoral study. Guidance provided to you will reflect "team advice." Written dialogue between you and a member is shared. Committee members recognize that issues may be controversial, divide opinions, or otherwise cause disagreement. When conflicts arise, the committee member is obligated to restrict the discussion only to the chair to avoid involving you in disputes or disagreements among the committee members. The chair will act as an arbitrator to resolve the situation and obtain a

consensus. If a consensus cannot be achieved, the chair may need to seek advice from the research coordinator.

Both the committee member and the chair are engaged with you throughout the entirety of the doctoral study process. Their duties are outlined below:

- Provide feedback regarding the problem statement, conceptualizing the research issues and identifying the breadth and magnitude of the literature review. Feedback may include accurately focusing on an issue, identifying all variables and potential relationships, making the research intent clear, establishing topic importance, and clarifying the proposed research.
- Offer feedback on proposed research design, indicating the appropriateness for addressing the problem statement and research questions or for testing stated hypotheses.
- Provide feedback regarding the selection of specific methodology, suggesting alternative methodology when appropriate and critically assessing the methodology with respect to the research question. The committee members also question the actual implementation of the selected methodology, assuring that program norms are followed and that generally-accepted ethical and moral principles regarding human subjects are respected. The selection of correct research instruments and the proper use of those instruments are crucial to a successful doctoral study. The need for pilot studies or "testing" of research instruments is with you.
- Present constructive criticism about data collection and analysis, presentation of the data, statistical analyses, and conclusions that are drawn from the analysis. The committee, as a team, discusses and provides feedback about the validity of the conclusions. Committee members discuss how assumptions and limitations that were previously identified in the doctoral study affect the research conclusions.
- Examine the doctoral study and find evidence of critical thinking, including a discussion of how research outcomes may affect social behavior or change. The members provide feedback about the overall significance of the research findings or outcomes and how the findings may contribute to new knowledge and be beneficial to the profession.
- Offer overall guidance about the acceptability of the doctoral study, taking into account program norms, form, and style.

Role of the University Research Reviewer (URR)

A URR is assigned to you as a member of your committee when your proposal is ready for review. The URR is responsible for reviewing and approving your proposal and final study documents. Refer to the Gaining URR Approval of the Proposal and Gaining URR Approval of the Doctoral Study sections of this guidebook for more information on the role of the URR.

Developing the Proposal

The proposal consists of a draft abstract, sections 1 and 2 of your doctoral study paper, and an APA-style reference list. It presents a detailed plan of your proposed research for the doctoral study and describes a specific idea, the related literature, and the intended research methodology.

You should submit your doctoral study proposal when your committee determines it is ready in the Doctoral Study Intensive Course (EDAD/EDUC 8090); it must be approved using an assessment rubric by your doctoral committee *prior to* initiating work on the doctoral study.

You should consult with your committee chair early and frequently when developing your proposal. With guidance from your committee chair and other members of your committee, you conceptualize a topic, organize and synthesize the literature, and determine a research methodology appropriate to the subject matter.

Consult the Doctoral Study Rubric

Each committee member completes the rubric for the pre-oral draft of the proposal. The proposal and committee members' rubrics (not necessarily consensus) are forwarded to the URR along with the draft proposal and an initial Turnitin report for review.

The rubric is designed to assist you, supervisory committees, and the university's academic leadership to determine whether a doctoral study meets Walden's standards. Download the doctoral study rubric found on the OSRS website when your prospectus is approved and your committee is assigned. Use the rubric to guide the construction of your proposal.

Committee Review

To help you clarify the research framework for your project, your committee chair reviews drafts of your proposal, along with a preliminary draft of your IRB application (see the Getting Approval for Research section for more about the IRB). When satisfied that the documents meet university criteria, the chair authorizes you to submit the proposal and draft IRB application to the other committee members for review.

The committee members have 14 calendar days to review the proposal draft and preliminary IRB application. Committee members use the doctoral study rubric to evaluate the proposal and share evaluations with the committee chair. Committee members may assist the chair in providing feedback to you on revisions requested; an additional 14 calendar days are allotted to committee members for *each* subsequent round of revisions. Once each member of your committee completes a rubric that reflects that no further changes are necessary, the proposal is ready for review by the URR. Your chair will forward the proposal along with a copy of each committee member's rubric and the initial Turnitin report to the reviewer, copying the doctoral study office (doctoralstudy@waldenu.edu).

Gaining URR Approval of the Proposal

The URR completes initial review of your proposal using a URR checklist (rubric), which includes items relevant to content, methodology, form and style, abstract, and ethical procedures. The URR reviews the Turnitin report for ethical concerns. The URR forwards the review to the committee chair, you, and second committee member. URRs are obligated to make IRB/Writing Center referrals should they note significant ethical or writing concerns.

When changes have been requested by the URR, the committee will work with you to make the requested revisions. When the chair feels that the necessary revisions have been made, he or she will forward the revised proposal along with the completed rubric, detailing the revisions that have been made, to the URR, copying the doctoral study office. The URR will then review the revised materials. This process will continue until the URR approves the proposal. The URR will send an e-mail to the doctoral study office, the committee chair, you, and the second committee member indicating approval to proceed with the proposal oral presentation.

Pre-Oral Conference (Optional)

At the request of the URR or committee chair, an optional pre-oral conference may be scheduled to include you, the URR, and committee to discuss recommendations of the URR and reach agreement about changes that are necessary before the proposal oral presentation. It is recommended that the pre-oral conference be held when there are serious concerns raised by the URR and/or when the committee requests opportunity for discussion and clarification. The purpose of the pre-oral is to prevent multiple submissions and reviews thus facilitating the process of completion.

This is an opportunity for the URR and the committee to reach contractual agreement with you about required changes in the proposal. Walden recommends recording of the pre-oral conference.

Proposal Oral Presentation

You will present your proposal via teleconference with your committee members. The URR will not partake in the proposal oral presentation unless requested to do so by committee members. The oral presentation is a formal discussion of the proposal to identify any concerns that need to be addressed in the final version of your proposal or issues that may arise as you move forward with your doctoral study. The teleconference, which is paid for by Walden University, will be led by your committee chair. The oral presentation may commence only after the URR has approved your proposal and has notified the doctoral study office.

The proposal oral presentation must be recorded. Instructions are provided to the committee chair for starting and terminating the recording. Teleconferences are made public within the Walden University community; the e-mailed reservation includes instructions regarding a privacy option. Walden University will maintain a copy of the recording for its records. The research service specialist will e-mail you a recording of your conference within 72 hours of the call.

Scheduling the Proposal Oral Teleconference

To schedule the teleconference, identify several commonly available dates and times among those participating in the teleconference (you and the committee members). Forward that information to the committee chair, who will then use the *Conference Call Reservation* form to submit the request to reserve the date and time that is convenient for you and all committee members. **Reservation forms must be submitted at least 1 week prior to the teleconference date requested.**

A confirmation of the request will be sent to all participants with instructions for calling in at the appointed date and time. Before the call, please ask your chairperson to clarify any expectations of the content of the conference call, if necessary.

Proposal Oral Presentation Outcome

If the committee determines that your proposal needs revision, the committee chair will supervise your modifications. When you have made all the requested changes, the chair authorizes you to forward the updated proposal to all committee members for review. Your chairperson will forward the revised version to the URR for approval along with a consensus rubric from the committee. Following URR approval, the chair will then submit the approved proposal, consensus rubric, and a *Proposal Approval* form to the doctoral study office.

The OSRS will send you a formal approval notice via e-mail and request that you submit your IRB application.

Getting Approval for Research

All students, faculty, and staff members who undertake research studies, including a doctoral study, that grow out of their affiliation with the university or that involve interviewing, surveying, testing, treating, and/or experimentally manipulating human participants or archival data on human subjects are required to gain approval from the IRB *prior* to beginning the research.

The IRB reviews your application and determines if your proposed research complies with accepted ethical standards. Walden University does not accept responsibility or liability for research conducted without the IRB's approval, and the university will not accept or grant credit for your work if you have failed to comply with the policies and procedures related to ethical standards in research. A repeat of the proposal URR review process may be required by the committee, the IRB, or the CAO at any time if ethical or pragmatic concerns necessitate substantial revisions to a URR-approved proposal.

IRB Application Process

Download the current version of the *IRB Application* and instructions from the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance website. While developing your proposal, submit a **draft** application to your chairperson to obtain his or her feedback as well as input from other committee members regarding the design and methods used in the study; completing a draft application may accelerate review and revision time later in the process. During this stage, be sure to complete the application in its entirety, attach supporting documentation (e.g., copies of consent forms, surveys, other instruments) and submit all materials to your committee chair. Make revisions based on the chair's feedback. Note that changes in the proposal during the approval process must be made on the application. The application is not complete until the proposal has been approved.

The committee chair and second member reviews, electronically signs, and returns the application to you. Once your proposal has received final approval, you will receive a notice from the OSRS to submit your **formal** *IRB Application*. Submit the application, along with all supplemental materials, to irb@waldenu.edu, copying your chair. Be sure to use the checklist at the end of the application to ensure that you have included all materials. Review of your materials will begin when your application is complete.

The IRB has the authority to require revision of your request to ensure compliance with the university's policy on ethical standards in research. If the IRB requires revision of your application, the IRB chair, your committee, and the URR will work with you to revise and resubmit your application.

After your application has been approved, you can conduct your research. You may not initiate data collection until you receive written notification that your application has been approved via the *Notification of Approval to Conduct Research* form. This prohibition includes recruitment of subjects; advertising, mailing, or distributing consent forms; interviewing; surveying; data gathering; and so on.

(**Note:** Data collected without IRB review and approval cannot be included in the doctoral study. Prohibited activities conducted prior to IRB approval do not fall under the legal protection of the university.)

Completing the Doctoral Study

After your *IRB Application* has been approved, you can conduct your research, collect and analyze the data, report your findings, and draw your conclusions. With the guidance of your committee, add your data analysis and results to section 2, write sections 3 and 4, add the completed project to Appendix A, and complete the final doctoral study abstract.

Required Data Storage

You are required to maintain all raw data—interview tapes, spreadsheets, questionnaire results, and so forth—for no less than 5 years upon completion of your doctoral study. For safekeeping, store copies of data in two different locations.

Reporting Your Findings

Committee guidance and requirements can vary in regard to the best way to report your findings. For example, some committees ask students to place lengthy portions of interviews—raw data—into section 2 of the doctoral study. Others request that interview transcripts appear in an appendix; others do not require raw data to be included in the doctoral study at all, but ask that interview notes and tapes be kept in a secure location for later review, if necessary. You should follow your committee members' suggestions and requirements in presenting and analyzing the data.

As is often the case in scholarship—and most forms of writing—you must first weigh the needs of the audience and publisher with your own because no two situations are alike. Thus, when reporting your research, you should be concerned less with prescribed rules and more with accuracy and integrity, protection of confidential sources, and ease of reading. Several common issues related to confidentiality, interviews, and participant/observer notes bear mentioning in the following sections, Confidentiality of Sources and Integrity and Accuracy.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF SOURCES

Your sources may or may not wish to be identified in your doctoral study. You are obligated to notify participants and managers of research sites that all Walden doctoral studies enter the public arena.

How you refer to anonymous locales and participants can vary. You should introduce any pseudonym used for an organization with a sentence such as the following: *To ensure confidentiality, the facility will be referred to as XYZ Medical Clinic throughout this doctoral study*.

You may refer to participants who wish to remain anonymous as *Participant 1* or *P1*, by an initial, by any other logical abbreviation, or by a pseudonym. You should inform your reader in the narrative if pseudonyms will be used throughout.

Consider whether your curriculum vitae (CV) offers an astute reader of your doctoral study the chance to surmise where the research took place. To protect research sites or sources, it may be necessary to disguise or delete the names of current or past places of employment. You may also redact the names by highlighting them in black.

For more information about maintaining confidentiality, contact IRB@waldenu.edu.

INTEGRITY AND ACCURACY

A predetermined bias leads almost invariably to selective use of quotations. However, as a scholarly researcher, you are obligated to report findings as completely, accurately, and objectively as possible, lest the integrity of the narrative be compromised. Your reader expects that the speaker's actual words are reported and portrayed in an honest context, including judicious use of blatant grammatical errors and vulgar language. Be prepared to negotiate with the committee, study participants, stakeholders what the word *judicious* implies.

Use an ellipsis to show that some words have been deleted or brackets to indicate that words have been changed or added. If a substantial portion of an interview is deleted or changed, paraphrase that section of the interview. See pages 172–173 of the APA 6th edition style manual for more details about maintaining the accuracy of quotations.

Committee Review

Your committee chair reviews preliminary drafts of your complete doctoral study manuscript. When satisfied that the manuscript sufficiently meets university criteria, the chair authorizes you to submit the doctoral study, including abstract, to the other committee members for review.

The committee members have 14 calendar days to evaluate the doctoral study. Using the doctoral study rubric, committee members share their evaluations with the committee chair. Committee members may assist the chair in providing feedback to you on further revisions requested; an additional 14 calendar days are allotted to committee members for *each* subsequent round of revisions.

Once the chair has deemed that the doctoral study is ready, he or she will submit it for a final Turnitin review. At the same time, you will complete and submit a Turnitin self-evaluation to the chair, with a plan for revisions if warranted. After the chair has determined Turnitin compliance and believes the doctoral study is ready, he or she will forward the doctoral study and abstract, each committee member's rubric, and a copy of the formal, final Turnitin report, to the URR, copying the doctoral study office.

Gaining URR Approval of the Doctoral Study

The assigned URR will review the Turnitin report and the full doctoral study and abstract documents using the URR checklist (rubric) including items relevant to content, methodology, form and style, abstract, and ethical procedures. Once the URR has completed the review, he or she will send the outcome of the review to the doctoral study office, copying you and your committee. Again, the URR can require revisions or refer you for mandatory consultation with the IRB office and/or the Writing Center to address ethical or writing concerns, respectively.

When changes have been requested by the URR, the committee will work with you to make the requested revisions. When the chair believes that the necessary revisions have been made, he or she will forward the revised doctoral study along with the completed rubric, detailing the revisions that have been made, to the URR, copying the doctoral study office. The URR will then review the revised materials. This process will continue until the URR approves the doctoral study.

Once the URR deems the doctoral study ready for Form and Style Review, an e-mail will be sent to the doctoral study office indicating this information, along with the URR-approved doctoral study, rubric, and Turnitin report review.

Optional Pre-Oral Teleconference

At the request of the URR or committee chair, an optional pre-oral conference can be scheduled to discuss recommendations of the URR and reach agreement about changes that are necessary before the oral defense of the doctoral study. It is recommended that the pre-oral conference be held if there are serious concerns raised by the URR and/or if the committee requests the opportunity for discussion and clarification. The purpose of the pre-oral conference is to prevent multiple submissions and reviews of the doctoral study and thus facilitate the process of completion.

Scheduling the Pre-Oral Teleconference

To schedule the teleconference, identify several commonly available dates and times among those participating in the teleconference. Forward that information to the committee chair, who will then use the *Conference Call Reservation* form to submit the request to reserve the date and time that is convenient for you and all committee members. **Reservation forms must be submitted at least 1 week prior to the teleconference date requested.**

A confirmation of the request will be sent to all participants with instructions for calling in at the appointed date and time. Before the call, ask your chairperson to clarify any expectations of the content of the conference call, if necessary. The pre-oral conference will not be recorded.

Form and Style Review

Once the doctoral study has been submitted for the Form and Style Review, you may work with your chair to schedule your oral defense (see the Oral Defense Conference section below). You may collect convenient dates and times for your doctoral study teleconference while your paper is being reviewed; however, the teleconference may not be held until *after* your paper has been received back from the Form and Style Review.

Upon your receipt of the completed Form and Style Review, and in consultation with your committee chair, you will need to address the editor's recommended revisions. The revisions are sent by the chair to the doctoral study office and to the URR for final approval.

If questions concerning academic integrity arise as a result of the review, the Form and Style editor will contact your committee chair, URR, and program director with the concerns. Please refer to the guidelines in the student handbook concerning academic integrity.

Oral Defense Conference

The oral defense is a formal discussion of the scholarly content of the doctoral study and an evaluation of your final study documents. You present your full doctoral study via a required teleconference with your committee members. The teleconference, which is paid for by Walden University, will be led by your committee chair. All committee members except the URR (unless requested) are required to participate in the oral presentation.

The oral defense may commence only after the committee members have reviewed the current draft of your doctoral study and have reached consensus as to its level of development by using the guidelines of the rubric. The teleconference may not be held until after your paper has been received back from the

Form and Style Review; however, edits suggested during the Form and Style Review do not have to be made before the teleconference. These revisions should be made before the documents are sent to the URR for final review. Walden University asks that all your committee members, including your chairperson, receive a copy of the most recent version of your doctoral study at least 3 days before the teleconference takes place.

The oral defense of the doctoral study must be recorded. Instructions are provided to the committee chair for starting and terminating the recording. Teleconferences are made public within the Walden University community; the e-mailed reservation includes instructions regarding a privacy option. The university will e-mail you a copy of the recording. Walden University will also maintain a copy of your teleconference.

Scheduling the Oral Defense Teleconference

Identify several commonly available dates and times among those participating in the teleconference. Forward that information to the committee chair, who will then use the *Conference Call Reservation* form to submit the request to reserve the date and time that is convenient for you and all committee members. **Reservation forms must be submitted at least 1 week prior to the first teleconference date requested.**

A confirmation of the request will be sent to all participants with instructions for calling in at the appointed date and time. The call's reservation will be confirmed again 48 hours before the call. Prior to the call, ask your chairperson to clarify any expectations of the content of the conference call, if necessary.

Oral Defense Conference Outcome

During the oral defense conference, the committee may determine that revisions to the doctoral study are needed. In such an event, the committee chair will supervise you in making the stipulated changes. When all requested changes have been made, the chair authorizes you to forward the revised manuscript and approval forms to all committee members for a final review.

Committee members determine if the revisions have been made to their satisfaction by indicating on the consensus rubric and forwarding the forms to the committee chair. The chair will then amass the rubric scores onto one consensus doctoral study rubric and submit the final version of your doctoral study manuscript to the URR copying the doctoral study office.

Final Approval and Submission

Following the successful completion of the oral defense conference and committee approval of the final doctoral study, the chair forwards the doctoral study, abstract, and consensus rubric to the URR for a final review, copying the doctoral study office. At this time, the URR conducts a final review to make sure all methodological, content, and writing issues have been addressed. In addition, the URR reviews the abstract to make sure it meets university guidelines. The URR conducts any additional reviews that are necessary until the final copy, including abstract, meets full approval.

After approval from the URR has been received, the research service specialist will send the abstract of the doctoral study to the CAO, or the CAO's designee. The CAO review will take 14 calendar days. The results of the review will be communicated to the research service specialist, who will then forward the results to you, the URR, and your committee chair. If changes are necessary and a resubmission to the

CAO is required for approval, an additional 14 calendar days are allotted to the CAO for *each* subsequent review.

The CAO, or designee, will approve the doctoral study and notify the research service specialist. The research service specialist will send you a congratulatory letter and copy your committee. CAO approval of your doctoral study must be received by the close of business (5 p.m. Central time) on the last business day of your intended term of graduation. You will graduate in the following term if approval is received after this deadline. Refer to the Degree Validation section of this guidebook for more on graduation.

ProQuest UMI

After approval from the CAO has been communicated via e-mail, you will receive instructions for online submission of your doctoral study to ProQuest UMI. ProQuest UMI produces microfilms of doctoral study manuscripts and publishes the abstracts online and in its monthly publication, *Doctoral Study Abstracts International*. **To be validated for graduation from Walden University, you must submit your doctoral study to ProQuest UMI.**

The research service specialist will complete one last form and style check on the submitted document to ensure it conforms to APA formatting. Your doctoral study may be sent back to you for requested revisions if errors are found.

Here are some aspects of the ProQuest UMI process to keep in mind:

- You may opt to have ProQuest UMI file an application for copyright on your behalf. If you choose this option, you must note it when completing the electronic submission form.
- Fees for abstract publication and copyright application are included in the graduation and commencement fee.
- For an additional fee, you may request bound copies of your doctoral study from ProQuest UMI. Publication may take 3 to 6 months.

When the OSRS formally accepts your submission to ProQuest UMI, you will be notified of this acceptance.

Degree Validation

Once your ProQuest UMI submission is accepted, a request will be sent to the Office of the Registrar (graduation@waldenu.edu) to complete your final audit and validate your degree. You will know the audit is complete when you receive your final bill from the bursar's office.

Your tuition charges will stop as of the date you receive CAO approval of your doctoral study. If you receive CAO approval within the first 7 days of a term, you are not charged tuition for that term. If you receive approval later in the term, you will be charged prorated tuition.

If you want to participate in the summer commencement ceremony, you must have your doctoral study approved no later than the last business day of the spring term. If you want to participate in the winter commencement ceremony, you must have your doctoral study approved no later than the last business day of the fall term. Based upon your time line, you must file an *Intent to Graduate* form 13 months prior to the last day of the graduation semester. Extensions may be granted if requested in writing to the faculty chair.

(**Note:** You are not automatically registered for commencement. If you want to attend a commencement ceremony, you can register online.)

Survey of Earned Doctorates

Upon acceptance of your ProQuest UMI submission by the OSRS, you will receive a *Survey of Earned Doctorates.* Please complete and return this survey to the Minneapolis office of Walden University.

The National Science Foundation and four other agencies sponsor the *Survey of Earned Doctorates.* The purpose of this survey is to evaluate graduate education programs at federal, state, and university levels. By submitting the completed survey to Walden, you add to the university's visibility among national graduate institutions. Completion of the survey is not required, but it is encouraged strongly.

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

Walden University regards academic honesty to be essential to the entire academic enterprise and will not tolerate any violation. No student shall claim credit for another's work or accomplishments or use another's ideas in a written paper or presentation without appropriate attribution through proper documentation. The consequences of plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty include non-acceptance of work submitted, a grade of *NC* or *F* filed for the course in which the violation occurs, written reprimands, and dismissal from the university.

Walden uses a service provided by Turnitin.com to check manuscripts for plagiarism. Submission to this service is handled and determined by the committee chairperson. Any instance of suspicion will be expressed to you and your committee members and will slow completion of the doctoral study process.

See the Crediting Sources section of this guidebook for more information regarding plagiarism. To review Walden's official policy on plagiarism, refer to the student handbook. For a detailed discussion of the ethics of scholarly writing, see chapter 1 of the APA style manual.

PART 2. GETTING STARTED ON THE DOCTORAL STUDY

Investigative Inquiry

The project study is a recursive, investigative process that begins with a problem that initiates an inquiry in the form of a guiding and/or research question, leading to the best solution to the problem through data collection and analysis and resulting in a project or product that will ameliorate the problem.

Once you formulate an inquiry, you will:

- Investigate current research related to your problem to gain knowledge of recent studies, developing a thorough understanding of your problem from several points of view.
- Critically examine the basic concepts and ideas that form the historical and theoretical foundation of this problem. In so doing, you will compare, contrast, and analyze the work of key theorists and read other research studies that support and provide evidence for each of the theories. This scholarship will assist you in identifying the issues and their legitimacy, soundness, and logic.
- Determine what research or guiding question will help establish the solution or project you will undertake: a practical application of the field of study in a school setting. (**Note:** You are not required to implement this project.)
- Look for evidence in current research that supports and/or refutes the precepts of the theories you analyze and data that supports an idea or response to your original perspective or question.
- Promote **positive social change**—refer to Walden's Commitment to Social Change web page to learn more.

Effecting change to improve and to enhance some corner of your professional world begins with a passion, however small. This passion may be set off by something that you find disturbing and that you want to change, or by something that really excites you. Your passion is what you want to think about— what you find yourself attracted to, and what you want to learn more about. To have the stamina to complete the doctoral study, you will have to determine, to discover, or to create your passion; the sooner the better. Once you know what it is, you can begin asking questions and tackling ideas in the appropriate context.

There are no pre-established steps for either creating your passion or finding ways to express and explore it progressively in the doctoral study. This is a journey for the imagination, another talent that improves with practice. Give yourself permission to think creatively as you work your way through the program. Use your school environment as your investigative laboratory. Examine it critically and decide what you are passionate about. What more than anything else piques your curiosity? What would you like to spend the next several years thinking about? What is your life's work and what would you like to initiate or continue as a lifelong inquiry? What questions do you want to answer about your passion?

Example of Investigative Inquiry

The following example illustrates how a teacher's professional interest generated an investigative inquiry. (**Note:** The following illustration is only an example of classroom-related inquiry; other types of project studies include curriculum development, program development or implementation, assessments,

formative or summative evaluations, policy analyses, and historical analyses.)

A 6th-grade teacher (a doctoral student with a master's degree in reading) who is required to implement a directed, scripted reading program with her students has concerns that the program may not be in her students' best interests. The students have been using the program throughout elementary school and appear bored with it. In fact, they are not progressing because they are not engaging in the content, and she has been frustrated in her attempts to pique their interest while still using the program. She has seen her students' achievement affected by disinterest and wants to investigate what she can do about it.

She believes that her students would achieve if she were to integrate pieces of the program with other concepts, such as literature circles, grand conversations, and the use of high-interest texts in lieu of the basal anthologies provided.

Hoping to support her belief with research-based evidence, and ultimately, influence the curriculum committee, she decides to investigate through the project study process.

The teacher begins by focusing her inquiry: *"In what ways do below-grade-level 5th-or 6th-grade students who have been taught through directed, scripted reading programs for several years benefit from a change of instruction that includes concepts such as literature circles and the introduction of high-interest texts?"*

Having formulated her inquiry, the teacher begins looking at current research on the subject to identify studies conducted in the last 3 to 5 years that can inform her search for relevant data. As she gathers this information, she also investigates the theoretical, philosophical, and historical importance of directed, scripted reading programs, carefully gathering different perspectives on other reading instructional approaches. By comparing, contrasting, and critically analyzing the precepts of her focused inquiry, she begins to formulate some ideas that she wants to consider.

As her investigation proceeds, she continues to examine current research, looking for evidence that supports and/or refutes the principles of the theories analyzed. She tests some issues in her practice, collects data that may or may not answer her investigative questions, organizes and analyzes the data, and determines what has been found out and what more needs investigating.

Eventually, based on her investigation of theories and current research, the teacher will review her original inquiry and make informed decisions that will help guide her instructional practice.

The project study is designed to strengthen the connection between theory and practice. As demonstrated above, it allows you to structure and shape your research to reflect your own interests and purposes. Each completed project study is as unique as your professional responsibilities, hopes, and dreams.

Approaching Research Literature

Identifying and obtaining scholarly material is a significant part of your doctoral program. Identifying resources is a basic skill you will need to refine during the creation of your doctoral study. Explore online library catalogs, scholarly citation indexes (also known as databases), and scholarly websites to identify theoretical works and research that match the requirements of the doctoral study and your professional and research interests. The material you use might be books, journals, reports, Internet documents, historical documents, policy documents, and other resources.

Once you have identified material you wish to use, you will need to obtain it. If you are affiliated with a local university or college, you will probably be able to use its resources and services. If you are not affiliated with a local university or college, explore its library website or contact the librarians to determine if they extend services to unaffiliated patrons. You can also contact the Walden Library for guidance on obtaining resource materials. The role of Walden librarians is to help you learn how to identify relevant literature, obtain resource materials, and evaluate information resources. You can visit the [Walden Library](#) website for general information or by e-mail or phone as needed.

Primary Sources

Primary sources are original works or actual published studies done by the author. You should plan to read the original works of the major theorists you will study rather than focusing on responses others have made to these works. Historical, theoretical, and philosophical works related to your passion may be found in the bibliographies of your sources.

By reading key theorists' own words, you will gain a better sense of the total picture they have developed. You will find the nuances of thought, the evidence for the claims, the logical development of arguments, and possibly, the underlying assumptions and values that guide scholars' thinking. If an original work is not available in a language you can read fluently, read a direct translation. Commentators who respond to another's work are making their own interpretation based on a particular perspective that you may or may not share or find appropriate to your study. Developing your own interpretation and response to seminal thinkers in a knowledge area is an important part of being an independent, practicing scholar.

Secondary Sources

Secondary sources are commentaries on the original writings of others and may be useful in identifying critiques or analyses that have already been made. The Walden librarians can show you how to locate secondary sources using databases and other reference materials. Do not let secondary sources do your higher-order thinking for you; subject them to the same kinds of critique and analysis as you would primary sources.

Consider the following questions when addressing the work of key theorists in secondary sources:

- What critical perspectives have you identified in these writings, and how does each scholar deal uniquely with the issues under investigation?
- What are the critical theories in the area and how does each theory address the concerns of the field?
- What insights for instructional practice can you draw from comparative analysis of different theories on the topic?

Contemporary Research Studies

Draw upon a wide variety of peer-reviewed journals published within the past 5 years. Conducting a search in an appropriate database will be valuable. Finding relevant articles in a number of different journals is likely to expand the variety of conceptual perspectives and research approaches that have been taken on the topic. It is a good idea to locate more than the required number of articles and to include in your reference list only the most relevant and instructive.

You will need to reach saturation in your literature review, meaning that you must have addressed all scholarship relevant to your project. For some it will take fewer articles and for others it will take more. It is up to your committee to decide if saturation has taken place. University Research Reviewers are likely

to question a study that includes fewer than 50–75 current (published in the past 5 years) peer-reviewed articles, unless an explanation is provided. If there is no explanation or the explanation is not considered valid, you will be asked to include more articles. The University Research Reviewer may also question excessive citation of a single article.

SELECT SCHOLARLY ARTICLES

The articles you select must meet the quality standards of scholarship, although a pertinent newspaper editorial or other non-scholarly piece may be used to supplement the bibliography with your instructor or committee's approval.

Journals use a variety of methods for evaluating and selecting which submitted manuscripts will be published. The most demanding method is the referee process. Refereed journals send submitted manuscripts for evaluation to more than one expert in the field of study. Because of the rigorous nature of this process, articles appearing in refereed journals are considered to be high-quality scholarly material. Other peer-review processes may not be as rigorous, but still meet scholarly standards and are generally acceptable for doctoral-level work. In all peer-review processes, submitted manuscripts are evaluated by at least one expert in the field of study before they are published.

The most reliable method of identifying scholarly articles is to search scholarly databases that cover your discipline. These databases select only scholarly material for indexing, so it is more likely that they'll meet the standards of doctoral scholarship. This does not mean that you should assume every piece of research in these databases is without flaws. In all situations, you must critically analyze any material you use.

Developing an Investigative Stance

Look for weaknesses or oversights in proclaimed theories, demand evidence to support claims, question the way things are usually done, and avoid taking anything for granted. Ask questions about the findings and connections between the theoretical perspective and the conducted study. Ask questions about the theory's application to your practice. Focus on the intent, process, and findings in each of the research studies you read. In the theoretical, philosophical, and historical readings, focus on meaning and argument.

Consider the following questions as you read and reflect upon the literature:

- What is meant by the context-specific terminology used in the study?
- Through what lens do other researchers and theorists approach the issue(s)?
- What conclusions are drawn?
- In what ways does the data support the conclusions? How would that influence the findings?
- What was the purpose of the research?
- Was the research methodology choice appropriate for the questions asked?
- What questions do the research and/or theory leave unanswered?
- How might you investigate your questions?
- What questions did the research and/or theory not address that disturb you?
- How do the theoretical, philosophical, and historical underpinnings answer questions related to curriculum? To instructional practice? To attributes of the learner? To the relationship among curriculum, instruction, and assessment? To the purpose of education?
- How well was the research designed as it relates to the existing body of knowledge?
- What is your assessment of the researcher's ability to communicate clearly and fully?

- What other approaches could be used to investigate the research question? (This might be a reason to share your ideas and writing with colleagues.)
- In what ways was the sample size sufficient or insufficient?
- In your opinion, were the controls on research bias adequate?
- In what ways is the research replicable?
- What were the limitations in this study?
- What is the extent of the generalizability of the study?
- How was data collected, organized, and analyzed?
- What validity was there for instrumentation/process?
- How were reliability and validity issues handled?
- What were the processes/procedures for triangulation of data findings?

You may question your qualifications to criticize well-respected, published theorists or researchers, especially when you are new to their domain of knowledge. Remember that no theorist has all the knowledge and no one is without blind spots. Many theorists' writings preceded the full testing of their ideas in authentic situations and the corrective influence of alternative points of view. Theorists do not have the advantage of what you know from your experience or from advances made since they and others last investigated. You have at your disposal an array of methodologies and new perspectives in research not available to previous generations of scholars.

Compared with earlier thinkers, scholars today are much more sensitive to how gender and ethnicity influence one's approach to meaning. Contemporary writers are more hesitant to make claims for all people for all times. They increasingly realize that their own cultural contexts and personal value systems help determine what they study, how they study it, and what conclusions they draw. On these grounds, not only may you criticize the ideas of others, you must do so if the collective knowledge is to continue to grow and be trustworthy.

Developing Opinion Into Scholarly Argument

After you have read the theories and perhaps dipped into some related secondary commentaries, and after you have applied current research to theories or conceptual models, challenge yourself with this simple question: "What is my opinion of this theory or conceptual model and research within the parameters I have set for this study?" This will give you a starting place. Now you must expand those original opinions and hunches into a scholarly argument.

Here is how an original intuition might develop into a scholarly argument:

1. Original hunch: "Lawrence Kohlberg's theory of moral development seems right when I read it, but it doesn't seem to explain what my clients do."

2. Getting to the bottom of your hunch by asking some questions: "What do I mean when I say a theory is 'right?' What do I mean when I say that my clients don't fit the theory?"

3. Formalizing the hunch: "What makes Kohlberg's theory convincing? For what does Kohlberg's theory fail to account?"

4. Making a list of answers for each question: "Kohlberg's theory was built on a longitudinal study over many years and in many different cultural settings; it was built on the established philosophical foundation of Platonic idealism; his studies were replicated and his findings confirmed by others; etc. On the other hand, my clients do not always approach a moral choice so reasonably—their choices are often more intuitive, and making the right choice seems less

important to them than pleasing others; they are easily persuaded to change their decisions; etc. Gilligan's work illustrates these same discontinuities."

Building the Story

If you think of writing the paper as telling a story, you know you need to follow that story line from beginning to end. Or, to put it another way, in the paper you make a case, building it point-by-point from the beginning. Some tips for building the story are provided here:

1. *Organize by topic, not by book.* A common mistake is organizing content as a series of book summaries of each of the key theorists followed by a few pages that deal with the higher-order objectives of synthesizing, comparing, contrasting, evaluating, and integrating, and then adding the current research. This approach fails to tell the story or make the case throughout. Furthermore, it fills the paper with a recapitulation of somebody else's thinking—that is low-order thinking. Consider scholarly writing as an account that involves comparing, contrasting, evaluating, synthesizing, or integrating the ideas of many theorists and/or authors topic-by-topic, not book-by-book.

2. *Do not include anything that does not relate to the case you are building.* Some of the theories and research you study will be fascinating in any number of ways and will tempt you to explore them in all their ramifications, but resist this temptation. You have a task to do, a destination to reach, an inquiry to answer. In the end, you will probably know more about the topic than appears in your paper because you will have selected only those points that relate to your story line. This does not mean, of course, that you will leave out anything a theorist or researcher might say that would undermine your inquiry—that you must deal with—but leave out what is unrelated to your topic. Faithfully represent the complexity of the author's ideas, but do not attempt to reproduce the theory in all its details—the author has already done that for us!

3. *Use direct quotes where pivotal or fundamental points are made by the author.* These quotes should be brief, properly cited, and accurately reproduced. Also, they should be woven into your storyline to make a point. Most often, you will need to make connecting and interpreting comments to capitalize on a quote's significance to your argument.

4. *Use paraphrases when large sections of an author's work are needed to establish your case.* A succinct summary of a theorist's ideas is sometimes needed as a foundation for your argument. Again, these should be properly referenced and used to some purpose. Phrases directly quoted from the writer can be woven into the paraphrase, in which case they should be denoted by quotation marks and referenced separately. Refer to Part 4 for more on referencing sources.

5. *Use prewriting techniques.* When the reading and planning are complete, you may find yourself staring at a blank computer screen, not sure how to craft that first sentence. The most effective preparation for writing is to outline and organize your paper before you begin. Familiar techniques such as concept mapping, webbing, or clustering can help you see connections between ideas. Even listing information can help you "get it all down."

   Another way to jump-start your thinking is free-writing, a prewriting technique in which you simply let thoughts flow as you write. You may find it helpful to skip the opening and write a portion of the paper that flows more easily for you. The text of your paper does not have to be written in the order in which it is presented.

Whether or not these or other strategies work for you, ultimately you will need to just write. Sooner or later, the ideas will begin to take shape and whole paragraphs will start to appear. Getting something down in writing gives you ideas about how to improve what you have said and where to go from there.

Doctoral Study Best Practices

Self-Study Your Scholarship, Research, and Practice

Be the first friendly critic of your own work. As an independent scholar, you are responsible for correct spelling and grammar, the application of the conventions of scholarly writing, and the clarity and persuasiveness of your ideas. Polished writing is the end result of multiple drafts and fine-tunings. It is not unusual for the refining and editing of a scholarly paper to take as long as writing the first draft. A good rule is to leave an iteration of your work untouched for a day or two and then reread it with a fresh set of eyes. Reading your work out loud to yourself will also reveal where continuity of ideas or development of an argument might need some adjustment.

Keep thinking about your topic and maintain reflective journals. When you think of an idea, write it down. This is the recursive process of the educational researcher, scholar, and leader. Your doctoral study will most likely serve as the foundation of your professional life. How you present yourself, how you think, how you say what you say, how you write, and how well you investigate your passion will establish your credibility as a learner, scholar, practitioner, and leader.

Collegial Dialog and Scholarship Review

There are two important learning methods of which we do not take sufficient advantage. The first is collegial dialogue. When you talk with your colleagues about your ideas, those ideas tend to grow and develop through critical, thoughtful, and rigorous questioning. You are highly encouraged to share ideas with others, especially in the formation of your research questions and methods.

The second professional learning method of which you should take advantage is scholarship review, commonly referred to as peer review, in which a colleague critiques your work in progress. Share your thinking and writing with other members of your collegial study group in EDUC/EDAD 8080 and/or 8090. Form writing and critique groups with your colleagues to attain different perspectives and ways of expressing ideas and processes. This requires a great deal of courage and patient reflection, along with a measure of common sense that grows out of experience. Use this opportunity to develop strong scholarship-review skills. Giving and providing feedback, asking important and sometimes tough questions, and attaining the insights of as many people as possible is a healthy attitude to have in the doctoral program and as a leader in education.

Iterations as Learning Opportunities

A request by a committee member for further iterations (or rewrites) is not an indication of failure, but an opportunity to strengthen your work by extending your ideas or reaching a higher standard of thinking or communicating. More than one iteration is normal, and several are not unusual. The review of your doctoral study by your committee members is similar to the review process for other scholarly endeavors. A research project, such as a journal article or book chapter, is not only carefully reviewed by the writer, but undergoes further review by peers, colleagues, and editors before it is published. The goal of the review process in each case is to make the final product stronger and clearer.

Using your colleagues as part of the review process reinforces critical aspects of the conceptual framework for the Walden doctoral study program. Collegiality and collaboration are the foundations of creative, communal dialogue that may yield answers for today's questions that tomorrow's researchers—in different contexts—will question.

Managing Research

Maintain Accurate Records

As you read, record:
- The author's key ideas.
- The exact page(s) where you found these ideas.
- Pivotal quotes in the work you might want to use.
- Questions, criticisms, and other observations that come to mind.

Make your reading an active, creative exercise—and keep a record of it. Good record-keeping will also help keep your writing honest; if an idea is already credited to another writer in your notes, you will not inadvertently claim it as your own.

Develop a Filing System

Developing a filing and retrieval system is an important step in mastering resources. Some students use computer software filing systems. Software packages, such as ProCite and EndNotes, allow you to store and manage bibliographic references. They also permit you to collect references from online and Web-based databases, create instant bibliographies and reference lists, and import text files from online sources. Other students use annotated notes and card files. Whatever system you choose, you will probably need to adapt it along the way to suit your own needs. The primary objective is that you maintain accurate and complete records of the information you have discovered, the research strategy you used to locate the information, and where you found it so that you can relocate it and have full details for citing it in your work.

Creating a sheet with the following information for each article you read is an important filing tool you can use throughout your project:

Review of Research Literature

Title:
Date:
Author(s):
Journal:
Volume: XX, number: XX, pages: XX
Statement of the problem:
Hypotheses:
Research sample:
Number of subjects:
Age level:
SES:
Geographical area:
Method of selection:
Procedures:
Instrument(s):
Reliability and how established:
Validity and how established:
Time span of treatment:
Method of data analysis:
Findings:
Interpretation of the findings:
Conclusions of the author(s):
Recommendations made by the author(s):

Create an Annotated Bibliography

An annotated bibliography is a bibliography that provides information about each entry; it briefly describes the essence of each work, its genre (research, theory proposal, theory analysis, theory comparison, conceptual model, policy analysis, etc.), and pertinent details about its content.

For example, research article entries include the purpose of the research, the population studied, the basic research design, and major findings. Theory comparison article entries include the purpose of the article, the primary works and/or theories being compared, and the major conclusions. Book entries include their major focus, their organizational format, and a summary of their main points.

The following example of an annotated entry uses APA format for the journal citation (refer to Part 4 of this guide for more on formatting references in APA style):

"Goldschneider, F. K., Waite, L. J., & Witsberger, C. (1986). Nonfamily living and the erosion of traditional family orientations among young adults. American Sociological Review, 51, 541–554.

The authors, researchers at the Rand Corporation and Brown University, use data from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Young Women and Young Men to test their hypothesis that non-family living by

young adults alters their attitudes, values, plans, and expectations, moving them away from their belief in traditional sex roles. They find their hypothesis strongly supported in young females, while the effects were fewer in studies of young males. Increasing the time away from parents before marrying increased individualism, self-sufficiency, and changes in attitudes about families. In contrast, an earlier study by Williams cited below shows no significant gender differences in sex role attitudes as a result of living."

You will build an annotated bibliography throughout your journey in the Ed.D. program. By the time you reach the point of preparing your doctoral study, you will have assembled a sufficiently extensive bibliography of sources to form the core of the doctoral study literature review. Annotating helps you provide important information about each bibliographic entry. It is also a useful activity in critical thinking and writing because it forces you to distill scholarly information in a clear and concise manner.

PART 3. GUIDELINES AND TIMELINE

Paper and Project Guidelines

Project studies consist of both a scholarly paper and the project itself. The project is divided into four sections. **Sections 1 and 2 must be completed for the proposal; sections 3 and 4, in addition to the project itself (to be attached in your paper's appendices), are completed for the final capstone.** The final oral meeting is based upon the completed scholarly paper, the project, and accompanying artifacts. All papers must meet the same criteria (see outline in next section), whereas the project itself differs greatly based on what genre you use.

Refer to the following documents housed on the Center for Research Support website for further guidelines and methods of evaluation:

- Project Study Flowchart
- Rubric (Project Option)
- Rubric (Research Option)

The outline that follows lists components for each section of the doctoral study paper. Information on style as well as links to the project and research study **templates** can be found in Part 4 of this guidebook.

Paper Outline for the Project Study

Section 1: The Problem

- Introduction including an overview of the doctoral project study and the contents of section 1.
- Definition of the problem includes:
  - Description of the local problem that prompted your study.
  - Description of how the problem unfolds in the local context.
  - Description of how the problem unfolds in the larger population or education situation.
- Rationale for choosing the problem (i.e., why you chose this particular problem) includes:
  - Evidence of the problem from the professional literature (i.e., what does the research literature say about this issue?) Clearly demonstrate that the problem exists in a larger context.
  - Evidence of the problem at the local level (i.e., what do school, district, community, state, nation, and/or international data indicate about this issue?).
- Definition and citation of special terms associated with the problem.
- Discussion of the significance of the problem.
- Clear statement of the problem in the form of a guiding or research question includes:

- Summary (1–2 paragraphs) of past research on the topic (no references needed), specifying the local problem, a gap in past research if applicable, and the type of research needed to address the local problem.

- Review of literature addressing the problem includes:

  - The theoretical base and/or conceptual framework related to the problem discussed in a manner that justifies the investigation of this problem as a worthwhile scholarly endeavor.
  - Critical review that documents the broader problem associated with the local problem addressed in the study drawn primarily from recent articles published in acceptable peer-reviewed journals or sound academic journals and texts, or justification for using other sources. Literature from diverse perspectives, cultures, gender, etc. (Included as appropriate).
  - Explanation of saturation reached in the literature review including efforts to find terms (including Booleans) and related research.
  - Discussion of all relevant public data.

- Discussion of implications for possible project directions based on anticipated findings of the data collection and analysis.
- Summary of the most important points of section 1 and an overview of the content of the remaining sections.

Section 2: The Methodology

Section 2 (A) refers to the content of the *Methodology* section to be included in the **project proposal**. Section 2 (B) refers to the content of the *Methodology* section to be included in the **final capstone document**.

SECTION 2 (A) METHODOLOGY

The content in this section will be included in your proposal.

- Introduction including an overview of the doctoral project study and of the contents of this section.
- Description of the chosen research design that best suits or helps answer your guiding or research question—quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods (outlined below).

QUANTITATIVE DESIGN

- Description of research design and approach includes:

  - Introduction describing the research or evaluation design and approach.
  - Justification for using the design and approach and an explanation showing how the design derives logically from the problem.
  - If the research question involves an evaluation, the research design and approach should include the following:
    - Description of the type of evaluation that will be conducted (goal-based, outcomes-based, formative or summative).
    - Justification for using this type of evaluation.
    - Overall goal(s) for a goal-based evaluation.
    - Outcomes and performance measures that will be used as indicators (for an outcomes-based evaluation).
    - Overall evaluation goals.

- Description and defense of the setting and sample includes:
    - Population from which the sample will be or was drawn.
    - Sampling method used (random, purposive, convenience, etc.).
    - Sample size (support by using a power analysis or a reference to a statistical text).
    - Eligibility criteria for study participants.
    - Characteristics of the selected sample.

- Descriptions of instrumentation or data collection tools includes:
    - Name of instrument.
    - Type of instrument.
    - Concepts measured by instrument.
    - How scores are calculated and their meaning.
    - Processes for assessment of reliability and validity of the instrument(s) and the results of those processes published in previous studies (test-retest reliability, internal consistency, validity).
    - Processes needed to complete instruments by participants (full version of multi-item instrument included as an appendix; single-item measures included in the body of this section.)
    - Explanation of where raw data are or will be available (appendices, tables, or by request from the researcher).
    - Explanation of the data used to measure each variable in the study.

- Data collection and analysis includes an explanation of descriptive and/or inferential analyses to be used in the study includes:
    - Description of data collection processes.
    - Nature of the scale for each variable (nominal, ordinal, interval).
    - Statement of hypotheses related to the research and/or guiding question and description of parametric, nonparametric, or descriptive statistics.

- Assumptions, limitations, scope, and delimitations includes:
    - Facts assumed to be true but not actually verified (assumptions).
    - Potential limitations of the study (weaknesses).
    - Variables (scope) and the boundaries of the study (delimitations).
    (**Note**: These can be presented as a numbered list or in paragraph format.)
- Limitations of the evaluation (if project is an evaluation).
- Summary of measures taken for protection of participants' rights, including issues of confidentiality, informed consent, and protection from harm.

QUALITATIVE DESIGN

- Qualitative research design and approach includes:
    - Introduction describing how the research or evaluation design derives logically from the problem and research (guiding) question.
    - Description of the qualitative tradition or research design that will be used.
    - Justification of the choice of research design, with explanations why other likely choices would be less effective.
    - Design and approach (if project is an evaluation) includes:
        - Description of the type of evaluation that will be conducted.
        - Justification for using this type of evaluation.
        - Overall goal(s) (for a goal-based evaluation).

- Outcomes and performance measures that will be used as indicators (for an outcomes-based evaluation).
- Overall evaluation goals.

- Description and justification of participants includes:

    o Criteria for selecting participants.
    o Justification for the number of participants, balanced with depth of inquiry (in general, the fewer the participants, the deeper the inquiry per individual).
    o Procedures for gaining access to participants.
    o Methods of establishing a researcher-participant working relationship.
    o Measures for ethical protection of participants: summary of measures taken for protection of participants' rights including issues of confidentiality, informed consent, and protection from harm.

- Description and justification of the data collection includes:

    o Justification for choices about which data to collect.
    o Data collected appropriate to the type of evaluation and to the qualitative tradition chosen.
    o A specific plan around the number and anticipated duration of interviews, observations, and/or focus group sessions.
    o Explanation of how and when the data are collected and recorded.
    o Process by which the data are generated, gathered, and recorded.
    o Systems for keeping track of data and emerging understandings (research logs, reflective journals, cataloging systems).
    o Procedures for gaining access to participants.
    o Role of the researcher (including past/current professional roles at the setting, past and/or current professional relationships with the participants, how these past and/or current roles and relationships are likely to affect data collection, and the researcher's experiences or biases that are related to the topic).

- Discussion and description of data analysis includes:

    o Explanation of how and when the data will be analyzed.
        - Software program used in the analysis (if any).
        - Coding procedure for reducing information into categories and themes.
    o Evidence of quality and procedures to assure the best possible accuracy and credibility of the findings (e.g., member checks, triangulation, peer debriefing, clarifying researcher bias, etc.).
    o Procedures for dealing with discrepant cases.

- Discussion of limitations of the evaluation (if this is an evaluation).

MIXED-METHODS DESIGN

- Explanation for the mixed-method research design and approach includes:

    o Introduction that describes the intent of mixing qualitative and quantitative data in a single study and identifies the qualitative and quantitative components.
    o Strategy for data collection (concurrent or sequential).
    o Multiple forms of data collection and analysis that are used.
    o Justification for using the design and approach.
    o Description of when and where (data collection, analysis, interpretation) the integration of the approaches will occur.

- o Mixed-method design and approach (if this is an evaluation) also include:
  - Overall goal(s) for a goal-based evaluation.
  - Outcomes and performance measures that will be used as indicators (for an outcomes-based evaluation).
  - Overall evaluation goals.

- Description and justification of the setting and sample includes:
  - o Population from which the sample will be or was drawn.
  - o Sampling method and the sampling frame used.
  - o Sample size.
  - o Eligibility criteria for study participants.
  - o Characteristics of the selected sample.

- Description of strategies for the context and sequential or concurrent strategies includes:
  - o Qualitative sequence.
    - Procedures for gaining access to participants.
    - Specific plan around the number and anticipated duration of interviews, observations, and/or focus group sessions.
    - Methods of establishing a researcher-participant working relationship.
    - Data triangulation built into the data collection and analysis.
    - Role of the researcher in the data collection process (including past and/or current professional roles at the setting, past and/or current professional relationships with the participants, how these past and/or current roles and relationships are likely to affect data collection, and the researcher's experiences or biases that are related to the topic).
  - o Quantitative sequence of the design.
    - Descriptions of instrumentation or data collection tools.
      - Name of instrument and/or data to be collected.
      - Type of instrument and/or data to be collected.
      - Concepts measured by instrument and/or data to be collected.
      - Explanation of how scores and/or responses are calculated or rated and their meaning.
      - Processes for assessment of reliability and validity of the instrument(s).
      - Processes needed to complete instruments by participants.
      - Explanation of where raw data are or will be available (e.g., appendices, tables, questions, or by request from the researcher).
    - Explanation of the data used to measure each variable in the study.

- Description and explanation of data analysis and validation procedures includes:
  - o Analysis procedures within the design.
  - o Analysis that occurs within the quantitative approach and the qualitative approach, and/or between the two approaches.
  - o Validity and trustworthiness of quantitative data and the qualitative findings.
  - o Procedures for integration of qualitative and quantitative data.
  - o Integration of the findings from the two approaches.

- Summary of measures taken for protection of participants' rights includes issues of confidentiality, informed consent, and protection from harm.
- Limitations of the evaluation clearly reported (if project is an evaluation).

SECTION 2 (B): THE METHODOLOGY

The content in this section includes data analysis and results; it will be added to the previous methodology section that was completed for the proposal. The content is presented for all three designs; choose the design that matches the one you used in the proposal.

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

- Measures reported clearly and follow standard procedures.
- Presentation, interpretation, and explanation of the data analyses including content consistent with the project and its underlying theoretical and/or conceptual framework. (**Note:** Evident statistical errors should not be presented.)
- Tables and figures follow these guidelines:

  - Self-descriptive, informative, and conform to APA format.
  - Referred to within the text included in the section with comments immediately adjacent to the table or figure.
  - Properly titled (APA).
  - Show copyright permission if not in public domain.

- Logical and systematic summary and interpretation of outcomes in relation to the problem and research (guiding) question.
- Description of the project as an outcome.

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

- Description of process by which the data were generated, gathered, and recorded.
- Presentation, interpretation, and explanation of the data analyses including:

  - Clear description of the systems used for keeping track of data and emerging understandings (research logs, reflective journals, cataloging systems).
  - Findings built logically from the problem and/or the project.
  - Patterns, relationships, and themes supported by the data.
  - All salient data accounted for in the findings including an explanation of any outlying or disconfirming data.
  - Discussion on evidence of quality showing how the study followed procedures to address accuracy of the data (e.g., member checks, triangulation, etc.).
  - Appropriate evidence included in the appendixes (sample transcripts, researcher logs, field notes, etc.).

- Logical and systematic summary and interpretation of outcomes in relation to the problem and research (guiding) question.
- Description of project as an outcome.

MIXED-METHODS RESULTS

- Description of process by which the data were generated, gathered, and recorded.
- Presentation, interpretation, and explanation of the findings includes:

  - Structural approach that is appropriate and consistent with the chosen strategy (sequential, concurrent, or transformative).
  - A clear description of the systems used for keeping track of data and emerging understandings.

- o Findings that build logically from the problem and/or project and are presented in a manner that addresses the problem or project.
  - o Discussion of findings that is consistent with the problem or project and the underlying theoretical and/or conceptual framework of the project.
  - o Findings reported clearly and supported by the data.
  - o No evident statistical errors.

- Tables and figures follow these guidelines:

  - o Self-descriptive, informative, and conform to APA format.
  - o Referred to within the text included in the section with comments immediately adjacent to the table or figure.
  - o Properly identified (APA).
  - o Show copyright permission if not in public domain.

- Discussion on evidence of quality showing how the study followed procedures to assure accuracy of the data (member checks, triangulation, etc.) and appropriate evidence occurring in the appendices (sample transcripts, researcher logs, field notes, etc.).
- A logical and systematic summary and interpretation of outcomes in relation to the problem and research (guiding) question.
- Description of project outcome.

Section 3: The Project

This section includes a detailed explanation of the project. (**Note:** The actual project is placed in Appendix A and product artifacts may be placed in other appendices).

- Introduction (overview of the contents of this section) includes:

  - o Brief description of the project.
  - o Goals of the project.
  - o Scholarly rationale of why the project genre was chosen including considerations of the data analysis in section 2.
  - o Scholarly rationale of how the problem will be addressed through the content of the project.

- Review of the literature (addressing the project) includes:

  - o Analysis of research and/or theory, explaining how the genre is appropriate to the problem and criteria from the research and/or theory used to guide development of the project.
  - o A thorough, critical, interconnected analysis of how theory and research support the content of the project, including discussion of findings from section 2.
  - o Literature from diverse perspectives, cultures, gender, etc., as appropriate.

- Implementation includes:

  - o Discussion of your project including a thorough description of:
    - ▪ Needed resources, existing supports, and potential barriers.
    - ▪ Proposal for implementation, including timetable.
    - ▪ Your roles and responsibilities and any others involved.

- Discussion of a project evaluation plan including design and approach (unless the project was evaluation) includes:

    o Description of the type of evaluation conducted (goal-based, outcomes-based, formative or summative).
    o Justification for using this type of evaluation.
    o Overall goal(s) of the project (for a goal-based evaluation) or outcomes and performance measures used as indicators (for an outcomes-based evaluation).
    o Overall evaluation goals.
    o Inclusion of key stakeholders.

- Discussion of project implications includes:

    o Possible implications for social change.
    o Importance of the project to local stakeholders and in a larger context.

Section 4: Reflections and/or Conclusions

- Introduction
- Discussion of project strengths and limitations in addressing the problem (to be addressed in a scholarly manner and grounded in the appropriate literature.)
- Recommendations for ways to address the problem differently based upon work of the study.
- Discussion of analysis on what was learned includes:

    o Scholarship (i.e., what did you learn about research?).
    o Project development and evaluation (i.e., what did you learn about planning and design?).
    o Leadership and change (i.e., how would you approach this project differently if you were to plan and/or do it again?).

- Discussion including an analysis of what was learned about yourself as a:

    o Scholar (i.e., what did you learn about yourself as a scholar during the project planning?).
    o Practitioner (i.e., what did you learn about yourself as a practitioner during the project planning?).
    o Project developer (i.e., what surprised you as you developed the project?).

- Discussion including an overall reflection on the importance of the work and what was learned.
- Discussion including implications, applications, and directions for future research.
- Conclusion and summary includes:

    o Summary of important points in section 4.
    o Key message from work.

References

Refer to the Crediting Sources section of this guide for information on how to list your references in APA style.

Appendices

Include the project in Appendix A. Place all related artifacts, including assessment tools, in subsequent appendices. You may also include raw data as appropriate to the study.

Doctoral Study Timeline

You should begin planning for program completion at least 13 months in advance of your graduation date. If you wish to graduate in a specific semester, you must plan your program carefully and follow the transition points guidelines (outlined in the sections that follow), adhere to the <u>doctoral study process</u>, and meet all scheduled deadlines. Each of the four transition points requires you to complete and submit specific items associated with the doctoral study comprehensive paper and approval processes.

Ed.D. Program Transition Points

You must complete all four transition points **(see chart below)**, which are specific points during the program when you must meet certain requirements in order to graduate. The requirements for each transition point helps to ensure that your acquisition of knowledge, skills, and performance is of high caliber. Completion of each transition point makes you eligible to move ahead in the program to the next transition point. If you do not meet the requirements of a transition point, you will not be allowed to advance in the program. It is your responsibility to manage your own progress through these transition points and to submit all required documents in the appropriate courses. You should contact the Academic Advising Team at any point for help and support.

Transition Points Model of Assessment

Transition Point 1	Transition Point 2	Transition Point 3	Transition Point 4
• A minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale in master's degree coursework • Three years of professional/academic experience related to the program for which application is made *(preferred)* • Completed application • Official transcript(s) of a master's degree, or equivalent • Goal statement	• Program GPA of 3.0 or higher • Successful completion of Foundations course • Rubric score of 4 or higher on a 6-point scale on the writing assessment • Rubric score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale on the major assessments • Completion of residency by end of year 2 • Completion of the draft prospectus for doctoral chair and committee assignment	• Program GPA of 3.0 or higher • Rubric score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale on the major assessments • Completed prospectus with a score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale • University Research Review (URR) assignment and completion of proposal with a score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale	• Program GPA of 3.0 or higher • Rubric score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale on the major assessments • Completion of proposal oral with a score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale • Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to include completion of IRB training and certification • Completion of a final capstone with a score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale • Approved URR checklist (rubric) • Oral defense with a score of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale • Approved Form and Style Review • Final URR approval • Abstract approved by the CAO

(**Note:** Transition points are cumulative in effect. That is, you must complete *all* requirements in one transition point *before* you are eligible to move on to the next transition point. A listing of courses and course descriptions for Ed.D. specializations can be found in the catalog; a listing of transition points can be found in the student handbook.)

Academic Policies Regarding Transition Points

- University protocol for warning or dismissal will be followed if you do not meet the minimum GPA.
- If you do not successfully complete the Foundations course you must retake the course immediately.
- If you fail the writing assessment you must take the mandatory writing course(s). You are allowed two attempts (first and additional) to pass the writing course(s). If you do not pass the writing course(s) after the second attempt, you will be dismissed from the university. If you fail to register and complete the writing course(s) by the end of the third semester of the program, an academic progress hold will be placed on your record. This hold will prevent future registration until you complete the writing course(s).
- If you do not successfully pass the major assessments, you will be allowed one additional attempt to pass the major assessment. If you do not pass the major assessment after two attempts (first and additional), you will meet with the program director or associate dean to discuss progress and options.
- If you do not complete the residency by the end of the second year you will receive a notice from the Student Support Team. Failure to attend a residency may result in a registration hold. In addition, failure to attend a residency may prevent you from graduating.
- You must follow university protocol and procedures for all doctoral studies.

Factors Affecting Doctoral Study Timeline

If you have a timeline in mind for completing your doctoral work and graduating, you can increase the chance of staying on track by anticipating issues that might slow down the process. Keep the following factors in mind:

- Data collected *before* IRB approval is not allowed and cannot be used in the doctoral study.
- Turnaround time will require up to 14 calendar days on the part of your committee for *each* draft submitted; IRB approval takes 4–6 weeks. To compensate for this, you are encouraged to have several parts of the project underway at the same time. For instance, while the doctoral study is in Form and Style Review, you can revise your CV, which is required as part of the final document.
- Quantitative doctoral studies require time for the following:
  - Developing and/or validating instruments or for obtaining permission to use an existing instrument.
  - Scheduling and administering the instrument; e.g., if the first administration of a survey does not yield adequate return, allow time for follow-up.

- Qualitative doctoral studies require time for the following:
  - Gaining access to a site.
  - Scheduling and conducting interviews/observations (e.g., participants often wish to cancel or reschedule interviews and/or observation sessions).
  - Transcribing audio or video data.
  - Coding data and member checking.
  - Peer review.

- Project studies can take time for obtaining various levels of permission and cooperation, or for analyzing existing data, and determining and collecting data. Various artifacts related to the project will take different amounts of time to develop.
- Necessary changes to drafts based on oral conferences require additional time.
- The Walden writing assessment is required during the first semester. The Walden writing assessment is an evaluation of your writing to help determine if additional writing courses or support is needed to aid your success.

PART 4. STYLE: APA AND WALDEN UNIVERSITY

You must use the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA style manual). Additional specific requirements for Walden doctoral studies, above and beyond APA style, are included in this guidebook. In rare instances where Walden University's requirements conflict with the APA manual, the university style standards prevail. These items are indicated in this guidebook by green boxes.

Overall Structure

> - The Walden doctoral study consists of the following sections, in this order:Abstract title page.
> - Abstract.
> - Title page.
> - Dedication page (optional).
> - Acknowledgments page (optional).
> - Table of Contents, including List of Tables and List of Figures pages, if necessary (begin the pagination of the preliminary pages with i centered in the footer of the first page of the Table of Contents).
> - Body of the paper (begin the pagination with 1 in the upper right corner of the first page of section 1; paginate consecutively on every page to the last page of the curriculum vitae).
> - Reference list.
> - Appendices.
> - Curriculum vitae (CV).
> -

Abstract

Concise and well-written abstracts highlight the richness of your research. A complete abstract primer can be found on the [OSRS](#) website. The following summary outlines important points to keep in mind:

Abstract Content
- In the first couple of sentences of the abstract, describe the overall research problem being addressed and indicate why it is important (i.e., who would care if the problem is solved). (**Note:** You can include a general introduction of the issue in the first sentence, but you need to quickly move to a clear statement of the research problem being addressed.)
- Identify the purpose and theoretical foundations, if appropriate.

- Summarize the key research question(s).
- Concisely describe the overall research design and methods.
- Identify the key results, one or two conclusions, and recommendations that capture the heart of the research.
- Conclude with a statement on the implications for positive social change.

Form and Style Tips

- The abstract must be a single paragraph, with no indentation, contained on one page.
- Maintain the scholarly language used throughout the doctoral study.
- Keep the abstract concise, accurate, and readable. Use correct English.
- Ensure each sentence adds value to the reader's understanding of the research.
- Use the full name of any acronym and include the acronym in parentheses; you can thereafter refer to the acronym.
- Do not include references or citations in the abstract.

- The abstract title page is the cover page of the Walden doctoral study. It is identical to the main title page, except the word *Abstract* appears at the top of the page, centered.
- The Walden abstract cannot exceed one page.
- It is double-spaced in the same font size and style of the body, is one block paragraph, and has the same margins as the body.
- It does not have a page number.

Common Abstract Problems

The following issues could delay the approval of your abstract:

- There are grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors.
- You have not identified abbreviations used in the abstract.
- The research problem, research question, or purpose of the study is unclear.
- You have not answered the question "So what?" You need to indicate why the research is important. Who would care if the problem is solved?
- Social change implications are inadequate or missing.
- The abstract exceeds one page.

Appendices

The APA style manual addresses appendices and supplemental materials in section 2.13 and on page 230. The appendices follow the reference list. They are lettered A, B, C, and so forth. Figures and tables in the appendices are labeled A1, A2, B1, and so forth, according to the appendix in which they appear. (**Note:** If there is only one appendix, it receives no letter.)

A blank divider page is unnecessary between appendices unless it lends to readability or if a heading cannot be placed on the first page of an appendix. (Typically this could happen when you insert a scanned document that takes up an entire page.) The materials in the appendix must not extend beyond the margins of the rest of the doctoral study: Reduce the appendix materials as needed.

Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae (CV) is the final item listed in the Table of Contents. A copy of the author's CV must be included at the end of the doctoral study. The CV may be formatted in either basic outline form, as a résumé, or in full-sentence form. The CV must conform to the same margin specifications as the doctoral study and be included in the pagination. For privacy reasons, do not include personal addresses or phone numbers in the CV.

Definitions of Terms and Glossaries

Many doctoral studies include a brief listing of key terms that the author interprets and clarifies for the reader's benefit. List only ambiguous, controversial, or operational terms used throughout the doctoral study. Technical terms are usually defined in the text, if necessary. Definitions must be explicit, specific, and scholarly. See below for more information on defining terms and further instruction on words used as words.

If defining a term, you need to determine whether the definition belongs in a list or in the text. Walden suggests the following three options for defining key terms. Consult your committee chair about what is most appropriate for the reader's comprehension.

- List key words or phrases in a section called *Definition of Terms,* in the first section.
- List all key terms in a glossary, in an appendix.
- Define more common terms, particularly acronyms and technical terms with only immediate application for the reader, upon first usage. (Per APA 4.21, remember to italicize key terms on first usage.)

Definition Examples

Note that it is important to give proper credit to the originator of the definition.

1. The following examples illustrate different approaches to this issue. The first two examples might well appear in a section called *Definition of Terms*.

    Dialects: Language varieties that initially and basically represent various geographic origins (Fishman, 1972, p. 5).

2. This writer might have chosen an entirely different definition, depending on how it was employed in the project.

    Dialects: Differences between kinds of language that are differences of vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation (Trudgill, 1974, p. 17).

3. Or the writer might have decided, for purposes of this paper, that the reader is best served by defining the term in the text, as below.

Fishman (1972) used the term *dialects* to mean "varieties of language that initially and basically represent divergent geographic origins" (p. 5).

Words Defined and Words Used as Words

To emphasize a word or highlight a word used as a word, set it in italic type on first reference. Be consistent throughout the document. This most often occurs in the context of defining a word, term, or phrase:

The term *networking* refers to creating relationships and saving contact information for a specific situation, usually a job search.

Copyrights and Permission To Use

Copyrighting Your Doctoral Study

A statement of copyright ownership to a doctoral study is not necessary because, by federal law, a copyright exists once a work is "fixed in tangible form" (APA 1.15). If a copyright notice is added, place this wording at the bottom of the acknowledgments page, or if there is no acknowledgments page, on a blank page after the main title page: © [year] by [author's name]. All rights reserved.

Permission To Use Copyrighted Material

As discussed in APA 6.10, if previously copyrighted material is used in the doctoral study beyond "fair use," written permission to reproduce the material by the copyright owner is required. To determine if something is within or beyond fair use, consider these four issues:

- The purpose and character of the use.
- The nature of the copyrighted work.
- The amount and substantiality of the portion used.
- The effect of the use upon the potential market for, or value of, the copyrighted work.

Kenneth D. Crews (1992), whose booklet *Copyright Law and the Doctoral Study* was published by ProQuest UMI, advised authors to seek permission if any of the following criteria exists:

- Long quotations. Crews' rule is 1½ pages, but some publishers use 500 words. There is no legal requirement.
- Reproduced publications. This includes standard survey instruments or questionnaires and articles, such as newspaper or magazine articles, included in an appendix.
- Music or lyrics.
- Graphic or pictorial works. "Reproducing a picture, chart, graph, drawing, or cartoon often constitutes copying the owner's entire work; thus the right of fair use is narrowly applied" (p. 17).

In general, permission to reproduce tables and figures reproduced or modified from published works not in the public domain must be demonstrated, most often by a copy of a letter of permission in an appendix (see APA 5.06). Permission to reprint is usually indicated on the first page of a copyrighted document, following the wording requested by the copyright holder.

Copying test instruments, surveys, and questionnaires

Gaining permission to reproduce a survey instrument for participants in a study is necessary when such a document is not in the public domain. Still, that is not the same as permission to reproduce it in the doctoral study. If the committee asks you to include a published document outside the public domain in the doctoral study itself, specific authorization must be obtained from the copyright holder.

For more information on copyright law and the doctoral study, visit the ProQuest UMI website.

Crediting Sources

In-Text Citations

APA requires the parenthetical referencing (author–date) system. Authors' names and dates of publication are given in parentheses within the text or at the end of block quotations. These parenthetical citations are reflections of items in a reference list placed at the end of the paper and arranged alphabetically by the authors' last names and chronologically within lists of works by a single author.

Consult APA chapter 6 for detailed instructions on how to properly credit your sources.

BLOCK QUOTATIONS

Quotations of 40 or more words must appear in a free-standing block, indented 0.5 in. from the left margin (in the same position as a new paragraph). The right margin remains the same as the rest of the text, with a ragged border. The final punctuation is at the end of the final sentence; no punctuation follows the citation at the end of the block quotation (APA 6.03).

> Note in this example of a block quote that the left margin is indented about five spaces.
>
> There are no quotation marks, although you would use them to quote words within a
>
> block quote, such as the "hyperbolic tendencies" of a speaker. The right margin is flush
>
> with the rest of the manuscript. The first word can be capitalized even if the original is
>
> not. It is double spaced per APA 6th edition. (Taylor & Fife, 2009, p. 46)

WHEN TO CITE PAGE NUMBERS

When directly quoting an original source, use quotation marks to set off the quoted text or format it as a block quotation, as described above. Per APA 6.04, Walden strongly encourages you to provide page numbers when citing an idea or when paraphrasing. The reader will appreciate knowing the exact location of all references, and it will clarify the origination of the ideas, whether they are the author's or from another source.

PLAGIARISM

As discussed in the section on Academic Integrity and Plagiarism, Walden University does not tolerate plagiarism and uses a service to detect plagiarism in student work.

In *The Craft of Research* (University of Chicago Press, 1995), Booth, Colomb, and Williams offered a useful definition of plagiarism:

> You plagiarize even when you do credit the author but use his exact words without so indicating with quotation marks or block indentation. You also plagiarize when you use words so close to those in your source, that if your work were placed next to the source, it would be obvious that you could not have written what you did without the source at your elbow. (p. 167)

The following excerpts, based on *The St. Martin's Guide to Writing* by Axelrod and Cooper (St. Martin's Press, 2010), show the difference between plagiarism and paraphrasing.

Original **Page 172 of Guterson (2008)** Bruner (1968) and the discovery theorists have also illuminated conditions that apparently pave the way for learning. It is significant that these conditions are unique to each learner, so unique, in fact, that in many cases classrooms cannot provide them.	**Plagiarism Example 1** [per Axelrod and Cooper] Apparently, some conditions, which have been illuminated by Bruner (1968) and other discovery theorists, pave the way for people to learn. **Plagiarism Example 2** According to Guterson (2008), Bruner (1968) and other researchers have also identified circumstances that seem to ease the path to learning (p. 172).	**Acceptable Paraphrase** [per Axelrod and Cooper] Guterson (2008) wrote that the "discovery theorists" have found that certain conditions may help learning to take place. Because each individual requires different conditions, not all children can learn in the classroom (p. 172).

In plagiarism example 1, the student changed Guterson's (2008) original material slightly, but there is no mention of Guterson—just Bruner (1968), whom the student did not even read firsthand.

In example 2, Guterson is credited and so is Bruner; however, the student did not read Bruner. And again, the wording is almost identical to the original. Because of the conventions of documenting sources, the reader cannot distinguish who originated the ideas and words.

In the acceptable paraphrase, the student attributes the point to Guterson (2008) and changes the language more substantially. The student did not read Bruner firsthand and does not mention Bruner, so the source is clear.

Reference Lists

Note that a *reference lists* cite works that specifically support the doctoral study. A *bibliography* cites works for further reading. As such, the doctoral study requires reference lists but not bibliographies. The following information regarding references is taken from chapters 6 and 7 of the APA style manual. Review both of these chapters thoroughly before developing a reference list. Pages 198–215 provide examples by the specific type of source and can be a helpful resource after you've read the chapters.

Some general guidance for creating a reference list is provided below:

- The reference list must be paginated.

- Use the first and middle (if any) initials of all authors; do not write out the first name. There should be a space between the initials. With two or more authors, use *&* rather than *and* before the last author. Separate the names with a comma: Foyt, A. J., & Andretti, M. P. (APA 6.27)
- When a reference has up to seven authors, spell out all authors' names. When a reference has more than seven authors, spell out the first six, then put an ellipsis and the last author's name: Zuckerman, J., King, M., Cook, A., Wold, K., Patterson, J., Marshall, H., . . . Walsh, L. (2009).
- If two or more of the works by a single author or set of authors have the same publication date, the dates are assigned the letters *a*, *b*, *c*, and so on.
- For the titles of books and journal articles, capitalize only the first word of the title, the first word of the subtitle (if any), and any proper nouns. The titles of journals are capitalized in the "normal" title case manner (APA 4.15). Italicize titles of books and journals. Quotation marks should not be used around titles of journal articles.
- The abbreviations *Vol.* and *No.* are not used in reference to journals. The volume number should be italicized. The issue number is indicated if the journal is paginated separately by issue. Follow the volume with a comma and the page numbers:
  American Political Science Review, 37(2), 117–132.
- Page numbers of journal articles should not be preceded by *p.* or *pp.*
- In reference lists, use U.S. postal code abbreviations for all state names.

ELECTRONIC SOURCES

The APA manual (6.31–6.32) provides extensive guidance on citing sources from databases and other electronic publishers, including a discussion of the DOI system used for journal articles on the Internet. If there is a DOI provided, you will find it somewhere on the first page of the journal article. It might appear hidden behind a database button. References to various electronic materials are included in the Examples by Type section (pp. 198–215). See also the APA or the Walden Writing Center website for additional rules.

Footnotes

APA does not allow for endnotes or source footnotes. Content footnotes, used sparingly, may assist the reader. In general, however, something important enough to appear in a content footnote is important enough to appear in the text.

Point of View

Appropriate use of first person is acceptable (APA p. 69), as discussed on the Writing Center website.

Verb Tense

A significant portion of the doctoral study **proposal** will be written in future tense, as shown here:

> The study will address the following four questions.

One hundred nurses will be surveyed.

Once the study has been completed, the **doctoral study** will appear in present and past tense as appropriate.

As a general rule for social science writing, ongoing issues and current realities should be reported in present tense. What has occurred, what has been reported, and what the writer and sources have accomplished should be reported in past tense. For example, writing the statement "There were 50 states in the country" is ungrammatical and illogical since there are now 50 states in the United States. Similarly, do not write in the problem statement that "Managing healthcare costs was a big problem in the United States" unless the problem no longer exists. If healthcare costs no longer are a problem, past tense works; otherwise, as an ongoing reality, this example should be described in present tense.

In the review of literature, use the past tense when reporting past research. "Jenkins (2008) observed three reasons why victims of abuse do poorly in school." Note here that what Jenkins observed is a present tense clause. Of course, if Jenkins reported a historical fact, the entire sentence would appear in past tense: "Jenkins (2008) found four reasons that AIDS spread through the gay population in the 1980s."

Some writers refer to past research in present tense. "Jenkins (2008) reports that there are three main reasons that victims of abuse do poorly in school." But if this same writer decides to refer to Merton (1950) or Watson (1920), he or she will have difficulty staying consistent: "Watson (1920) argues that . . . ." Watson is long dead and, therefore, it is awkward to report his 90-year-old research in the present tense. In fact, APA specifically requires that the literature be presented in the past tense: "Watson argued that . . . ."

Inclusive Language

Language used in scholarly writing should be inclusive. By now, most writers know the gender-restrictive nature of words like policeman, mailman, or fireman. Accordingly, you should employ words that are not sexist and more accurately describe American society.

Some ethnicity and nationality titles require sensitivity due to historically racist usage: Oriental, American Indian, and Eskimo, for example. The APA manual, in chapter 3, offers an informative discussion of this issue at length (pp. 70–77). Check any of several dictionaries devoted to this subject to learn more. The director of the Walden Writing Center suggests the University of New Hampshire's *Guidelines for the Use of Nonsexist Language*.

One of the most troublesome issues related to sexist language for writers revolves around the pronouns *he* and *she*. The combination *he or she* is common if cumbersome; some readers resent if *he* always precedes *she*. Some writers choose as a matter of course to only use the word *he* and then add a note of apology at the beginning of a manuscript. This is dated and seen as a poor solution by many readers. Some writers go back and forth between *he* and *she*—also cumbersome, but effective in certain instances.

One frequent solution is changing the singular third-person pronoun to the plural *they*. Thus, replace "A junior high school teacher spends much of her day just maintaining order" with "Junior high teachers spend much of their day just maintaining order." In this example, another solution is to use the passive voice: "A junior high school teacher's day is spent, to a large extent, maintaining order."

> Walden University's preferred usage for groups of people whose ancestors can be traced to Africa is *African American*. The usage should be consistent:
>
> African Americans make up the largest minority in America, while European Americans compose the majority.
>
> Above all, students are asked to be sensitive to the terminology of racial, ethnic, and religious groups.

Type

A serif font such as Palatino, Century Schoolbook, Book Antiqua, or Times New Roman is required. Do not use `Courier` or `New Courier`. All text copy must be printed in the same point size: 12-point is preferred. A sans serif font may be used for tables and figures if its use improves readability and format. The font size used in tables and figures may be smaller than that used in the text; however, to ensure legibility, use fonts no smaller than 8 points and no larger than 12 points.

The title of the doctoral study should not include chemical or mathematical formulas, symbols, superscripts, subscripts, Greek letters, or other nonstandard characters. Words must be substituted for any such characters.

Highlighted words, such as words being defined on first reference, and titles of books, journals, newspapers, and magazines, must appear in *italics.*

Line Spacing

- Double-space between all text lines throughout the manuscript, including the Table of Contents, block quotations, and the reference list.
- Acknowledgments and dedications must be double-spaced and use regular paragraph indents.
- Do not use single-spacing or one-and-a-half spacing except in tables or figures.
- Begin each section on a new page.
- Do not begin each subsection on a new page. Subsections should follow one another immediately in order to avoid large blank spaces.
- One-line "widows" and "orphans" are acceptable at the top and bottom of a page; however, for increased readability, two lines are preferred. Do not leave a heading "floating" at the bottom of a page without accompanying text.

> - Double-space or triple-space lines between tables and figures and subsequent and preceding text. Be consistent. (See the Tables and Figures section for more information.)
> - End-of-line hyphenation is acceptable in the Walden doctoral study. For improved readability, avoid two consecutive end-of-line hyphenations.

Margins and Page Numbers

The Walden doctoral project study template is preformatted with correct margins, as follows:

- Left margin: 1.5 in. – to allow for binding
- Right margin: 1 in. (**Note:** Text at the right margin must be ragged—not justified—throughout the doctoral study.)
- Top margin: 1.3 in. – to allow for page numbering (see below)
- Bottom margin: 1 in.
- Header and footer: 1 in.

The margins of the project study must conform to these guidelines—this includes the appendices, tables and figures, and the curriculum vitae (CV). (**Note:** If you chose the **research option** prior to January 2009, you should refer to guidelines established in the basic doctoral study (6th ed.) template.)

On Table of Contents pages (including List of Tables and List of Figures pages), page numbers are indicated in lowercase Roman numerals placed 1 in. from the bottom of the page, centered, beginning with *i* on the first page of the Table of Contents.

Starting with the first page of section 1, an Arabic page number must appear 1 in. from the top edge of the page and 1 in. from the right edge. The first line of text appears 0.3 in. under the page number, or 1.3 in. from the top edge of the paper. To accomplish this, set the top margin to 1.3 in. and the header to 1 in.

(**Note:** Some versions of Microsoft Word are defaulted to set the page number at 0.5 in. from the top edge of the paper. The margin must be changed for the Walden doctoral study.)

Although manuscripts submitted to the American Psychological Association for publication must contain a brief manuscript running head, the Walden doctoral study does not have a running head.

Pages containing tables and figures may be formatted in landscape page setup. The bound margin must still be 1.5 in. Page numbers should be placed consistently with the rest of the manuscript.

Nothing can appear in the margins. All page numbers, text, tables, figures, and so forth must be contained completely inside the area bounded by the margins.

Headings

Headings must be worded identically in the Table of Contents and the text. Do not strand a heading at the bottom of a page. Headings should not be labeled with letters or numbers.

Per APA, double-space between a subheading and the preceding text.

The sixth edition of the APA manual does not show specifically how to format chapter headings. Walden has incorporated a plain centered Level 0 heading for chapter headings, in title case (mixed uppercase and lowercase), like this:

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study (Level 0)

The Problem (Level 1)

APA's heading levels, positions, and formats for a doctoral study with five heading levels are listed below, with the addition of Walden's chapter heading (Level 0).

Centered Uppercase and Lowercase Chapter Heading (Level 0)

Centered Uppercase and Lowercase Heading, Bold (Level 1)

Flush Left, Uppercase and Lowercase Heading, Bold (Level 2)

 Indented, bold, lowercase. (Level 3)

 Indented, bold, lowercase, italics. (Level 4)

 Indented, plain, lowercase, italics. (Level 5)

Lists: Seriation

Seriation refers to lists of items (APA 3.04). Two of the most important aspects of formatting lists are readability and consistency: The reader needs to keep track of the listing.

Formatting Lists in Text

For listed items within a paragraph like this (a) use letters, not numbers, in parentheses; (b) separate each item with a comma; or (c) separate each item with a semicolon, as shown in this example, if there is already a comma in one or more of the items.
When listing items vertically, use the numbered format below:

1. When listing items vertically, or breaking them out of the paragraph format, use 1.,

   2., 3., and so forth, and continue to double-space.

2. Indent the number the same as for a paragraph, usually 0.5 in.

Bulleted lists are formatted the same as a numbered lists. Use a bulleted list when you do not need to indicate a certain order or chronology.

Formatting Lists in Block Quotations

If copying from text that already appears in list form in the original source, determine if the entire quotation needs to be included. The text may be better served with a paraphrase. If the quotation of a list is required, indent the entire set of items in the list. By properly punctuating at the end of the text, the reader will identify this as a block quotation. Further instructions on block quotations are provided in the Crediting Sources section of this guidebook. See the example below:

> Hosmer (1982) offered four statements typical of psychological egoism:
>
> 1. People always look out for No. 1 first.
>
> 2. People act so as to benefit themselves, whether or not they also benefit others.
>
> 3. People always do what they want to do, or if that is impossible, what they dislike
>
> doing the least. (p. 70)

Punctuating Lists

Properly punctuating lists is a bit of an art and a bit of a science. APA allows the use of periods at the end of items in lists, even if the item is not a complete sentence. To determine the proper punctuation, you must consider the syntax of the introductory phrase.

> Sometimes writers introduce lists with a phrase just like this:
>
> 1. End each item in a list like this with a period, even if it is not a complete sentence.
>
> 2. Item 2 in a list per APA.
>
> 3. Item 3 in a list per APA.

In the above example, the phrase that introduces the list ends as if it were the end of a sentence. That is, the items in the list do not complete the introductory phrase. In this case, per APA, capitalize the first word in each clause, and use periods at the end of the items.

On the other hand, see this example:

> Sometimes, however, writers introduce lists with a clause that concludes with
>
> 1. item 1 in a list per APA that completes the introductory clause,
>
> 2. item 2 in a list per APA that completes the introductory clause, and
>
> 3. item 3 in a list per APA that completes the introductory clause.

In this case, the three items in the list complete the introductory clause. Per APA, separate the items with commas if there are no other commas in the items or with semicolons if there are. Start each clause with a lowercase letter.

Tables and Figures

In the body, information that does not appear in textual form must be formatted and labeled as either a table or figure. APA does not allow for the words *graph*, *illustration,* or *chart.* Refer to them as either a *table* or a *figure*. To learn how to correctly display data in tables and figures, carefully review the text and examples in APA chapter 5. Below are a few helpful tips:

- Ensure that all tables and figures fit within the margin specifications.
- Do not separate a title or caption from the table or figure it identifies.
- Number all tables and figures without a suffix or indicator of the section in which they appear: Table 1, Table 2, Table 3; Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3; and so on. In the appendices, tables are called Table A1, Table B1, Figure A1, Figure B1, and so forth.
- In the text, capitalize the word *table* or *figure* when referring to the data (e.g., see Table 12). Refer to the specific table number, not to the page number on which the table appears or to the table below.

Tables

Place the word *Table* and the table number **above** the table, flush left. The title of the table appears double-spaced below the table number, flush left in italics, in title case. If the title runs over one line, single-space the two lines of the title, leaving the double-space between the table number and the first line of the title. Double-space or triple-space before and after the table—be consistent. Use the same font and point size for table numbers and titles as the narrative text.

Information regarding abbreviations or symbols used in a table, copyright information, and probability must be located in a note below the table. See APA 5.16 for information about formatting table notes.

Figures

Place the word *Figure* and the figure number **under** the figure, flush left in italics. The title of the figure (which APA includes in the figure's "caption") goes next to the number in sentence case. Use the same font and point size for figure numbers and captions as the narrative text. If the figure caption exceeds one line of type, single-space the continuing line(s). In the doctoral study, do not type captions on a separate page. See APA 5.23 for more information about figure captions.

- In the doctoral study, tables and figures are inserted into the narrative as close to the text that introduces them as is practical.
- Do not split a table unless it is too large to fit on one entire page. Placing a table on its own landscape-oriented page is permissible. Do not place any other text on a page if a table or figure takes up three-fourths of the page or more.
- The font size used in tables and figures may be smaller than that used in the text; however, to ensure a professional appearance and legibility, type should be no smaller than 8 points and no larger than 12 points.
- Grayscale (shading) and color used in figures is acceptable; however, they often will not reproduce well. Instead, consider using crosshatching, broken lines, and so forth.

Numbers and Percentages

The APA manual has an extensive section (4.31–4.38) dealing with the nuances of presenting numbers. Always check the manual if unsure of the proper style. Examples of APA style for numbers can be found on the Writing Center website.

Abbreviations

Here are some tips regarding commonly used abbreviations:

- Lowercase should be used for Latin abbreviations, such as *a.m., p.m., i.e.,* and *e.g.*
- Latin abbreviations such as *e.g.*, *etc.*, *i.e.*, and *cf.* should be used only in parenthetical materials. Use the English translation of these abbreviations in nonparenthetical material (APA 4.26). Roman, not italic, type should be used for these abbreviations. An exception is made for the term [*sic*], which is always italicized and set in square brackets, as shown here.
- The plural of the abbreviation *p.* is *pp.* Such abbreviations are rarely used when not within parenthetical elements.
- In text copy, spell out the names of states and countries. (See APA pp. 88 and 187 to learn when and how to abbreviate locations.)
- *United States* should be written out when referred to in noun form. It is abbreviated with periods when used as an adjective: *U.S.* (p. 88)

APA has many additional rules regarding abbreviations. See APA 4.22–4.30 and consult the index of the style manual for more information.

Spelling, Grammar, and Punctuation

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2005) is the authority for matters of spelling in the Walden doctoral study. APA has some additional conventions regarding spelling and hyphenation (4.12–4.13) and provides guidance regarding grammar (3.18–3.23) and punctuation (4.01–4.11). Carefully reviewing these sections of the APA manual and applying the rules to your study will help you proceed through doctoral study reviews more smoothly.

Following are some items to supplement the APA manual and highlight some common errors:

1. Only standard American English is acceptable in Walden doctoral studies. Naturally, cited material from previously published sources should be left in the original form, including British or archaic spelling and excessive punctuation or lack of punctuation.

2. Do not use contractions. For example, write *cannot* rather than *can't* and *I will* rather than *I'll*.

3. In most cases, make the possessive form of proper names ending in *s* by adding an apostrophe and *s*: Jones's, Grimes's, Wilks's, Sanchez's. *The Chicago Manual of Style* notes several exceptions: Moses', Jesus', Xerxes.'

4. Do not add an apostrophe when making the plural form of a number:

   Most of you scored 1s and 2s.
   The 1950s was a decade of great social homogenization.

5. If a compound adjective cannot be misread or if its meaning is established, a hyphen is not necessary:

   covert learning conditions
   day treatment program
   sex role differences
   grade point average

6. In general, compound adjectives that end in *-ed* are hyphenated when they precede the noun they are modifying:

   client-centered service
   group-oriented process
   self-described phenomena

   but

   Billie is quick tempered.

7. Check the style manual for the appropriate hyphenation of combinations of words like *long term* and *well being* and the spelling of such words as *appendices.*

8. Many prefixes do not require hyphens, including *anti*, *non*, *inter*, *intra*, *semi*, *mini*, *pseudo*, and *under*. (See APA 4.13 for detailed guidance regarding hyphenation.)

9. Academic degrees are spelled as follows in lowercase, unless following a person's name:

   doctorate
   doctoral degree
   bachelor's degree
   master of science
   master's degree
   Sam Beam, MFA

Laurel Walsh, Ed.D.

10. As discussed in APA 3.19, the subject and verb must agree in number (i.e., singular or plural). *Data* and *media* are plural nouns. ("The data were misleading, but the media were reporting the erroneous information anyway.") *Datum* and *medium* are singular nouns.

11. Pronouns must agree in number and gender with the nouns they replace.

12. A comma must be used between items (including before *and* and *or*) in a series of three or more items (e.g., trains, planes, and automobiles).

13. No comma appears between the month and year when used alone (without an exact date)—for example, December 1957.

14. Use *double* quotation marks for quotations. Use *single* quotation marks within double quotation marks only. For a quotation within a block quotation, the internal quotation gets double quotation marks. (APA 4.08)

15. Quotation marks nearly always go outside the final punctuation.

> The title of the article was "A Day in High School." One respondent noted, "My boss is a source of great joy at my job."

> **but**

> As Hernandez (2008) observed, "Nothing is more important than financial integrity in higher education" (p. 26).

16. Use a single space after end punctuation (e.g., periods, colons).

17. The proper format for a dash (4.06) is an "em dash" or two hyphens with no space between them or on either side: like this—or--like that. This is automatic in some software programs. Other programs leave spaces around a hyphen, requiring adjustment or an override of that function: In Microsoft Word, use *Tools/AutoCorrect/AutoFormat as You Type.* Consult the APA manual (p. 97) for extensive help with dashes and hyphens.

Capitalization

The following items supplement the APA manual's coverage of capitalization (4.14–4.20):

1. Do not capitalize the names of job titles unless they immediately precede a person's name.

> The vice president of the United States is the second in command.

> Vice President Nelson Rockefeller came from a wealthy family.

2. Do not capitalize words related to schools when they are used generically. Capitalize such words when used with the name of a school.

> the junior high school
> Churchill Area Senior High
> this university
> Walden University

Terms designating academic years are lowercase: freshman, junior.

3. Proper names associated with topographical features, geographical locations, and names of organizations are not discussed at length in APA. Walden recommends *The Chicago Manual of Style's* extensive sections on such terms. In general, follow these examples:

> the state of Washington; Washington State; New York State
> the East Coast; the West Coast
> the South; the southeastern United States
> the Columbia River; the Columbia River valley
> the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers; Mediterranean and Caspian Seas
> a senator; Senator Barbara Mikulski
> the Congress; congressional; the Senate, the House
> the Court (as Supreme Court of the United States); juvenile court
> the Democratic Party; a democrat; communism

Templates

Download the Ed.D. project study (6th ed.) template from the Walden Writing Center's website (or the basic doctoral study (6th ed.) template if you are working on the **research option only**).

PART 5. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Questions About the Doctoral Study

What are some examples of project studies?

All project studies include both a project and a scholarly paper. All projects culminate in a product. Examples of products include the following:

- Curriculum design (e.g., for district-wide character education, integrating transfer students into a university, first-year nursing program).
- Program development (e.g., of a professional learning community in your school system, support program at community college for high school dropouts, career exploration in a juvenile prison).
- Evaluation (e.g., of a literacy curriculum, technology charter school, faculty development program, community arts initiative).
- Other options include developing strategic or assessment plans or policy analyses.

What is evaluation?

Evaluation is the systematic gathering and analysis of data to make decisions regarding the effectiveness of a product or program for the purposes of decision making. The decision might involve the choice of the best program to use in the future or whether a program is performing as expected or needed. Evaluation can use quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods research. An evaluation would determine the effectiveness of a program by completing a formative or summative evaluation by deciding to look at outcomes or goals and objectives.

The product will most likely be a white paper on the evaluation to the administration or school board. To get you started, review the evaluation-specific resources provided at the end of this guide.

Can you say more about the scholarly paper component of the project study?

As appropriate to the capstone of a doctoral program, the project is informed both by wider educational scholarship—research and theory—and by data collection and analysis. You will address the background and other aspects of the project in the scholarly paper. The paper is composed of four sections: problem, methodology, project description, and reflections. Refer to the outline provided in Part 3 of this guide and the doctoral study templates in Part 4 of this guide.

How do I judge whether my study is "doctoral level"?

Walden University and The Richard W. Riley College of Education and Leadership have developed standards to determine the appropriateness of your study. Your committee will guide you in proposing a doctoral-level study. They, along with the instructor of 8102/8470/8745 and reviewers at other points in the process will help to ensure that you produce a doctoral-level capstone. You can also get a feel for the

writing and scope of doctoral-level work by accessing the ProQuest UMI database through the [Walden Library](#), to read other doctoral capstones. The [Writing Center](#) is an additional source of valuable feedback.

Questions About the Doctoral Study Process

How do I set up a teleconference? How much does it cost?

You should work with your committee to identify possible dates and times for your conference. Several alternatives should be requested in case your first choice is not available. Your committee chair will submit the scheduling form to the research service specialist; instructions for the phone call are sent to you and the committee members via e-mail. The conference line and recording service are provided for you free of charge. International toll-free phone numbers may be available.

At what point does tuition stop?

Tuition stops when your doctoral study is approved by the CAO (or designee). If you receive approval within the first 7 days of a term, you are not charged tuition for that term. If you receive approval later in the term, you will be charged prorated tuition.

My doctoral study has been approved. When is my official graduation date?

Graduation dates fall at the end of the term. Your official graduation date will be the end of the term in which you finish your degree. You are finished when all prerequisites are met; your doctoral study is written, approved, and accepted by ProQuest UMI for publishing; and your tuition is paid in full.

When can I use the title Dr. or Ed.D.?

You may use the doctoral title only after your degree has been validated.

If I want to participate in the commencement ceremony, when do I need to finish?

Your doctoral study must be approved by the CAO (or designee) no later than the last business day of the spring term to participate in the summer commencement ceremony or the last business day of the fall term to participate in the winter commencement ceremony. You are not automatically registered for commencement; to attend a commencement ceremony, [register online](#).

Questions About Form and Style

What is the correct style to use? Is there a manual that explains it?

Walden University endorses and uses APA style, as explained in the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. The APA manual is your primary source for style

guidance. Walden style preferences that supplement APA recommendations are indicated in green boxes in Part 4 of this guide.

What font should I use to type my doctoral study paper? What point size?

A serif font such as Palatino, Times Roman, Century Schoolbook, Book Antiqua, or Garamond is required. Do not use Courier or New Courier. Tables and figures can use a sans serif font to help improve readability and appearance. Particularly for Times Roman, 12-point font size is preferred. (See APA pp. 228–229 for more information.)

Which is right: italics or underlines? Can I use bold?

Italics are correct, rather than underlines. Use bold only in heading levels (APA 4.45) and in tables and figures, sparingly, to improve readability.

How do I format citations of electronic sources?

APA changed its rules for electronic citations in 2009. See APA 6.31–6.32 for overall guidance and review examples of references to electronic sources (pp. 198–215). For up-to-date information about proper formatting of Web references and other online documentation, visit the Walden Writing Center or the APA website.

Can I single-space block quotations and reference lists?

No. The sixth edition of the APA manual specifies double-spacing for block quotations (p. 171) and reference lists (p. 229).

How far down should the page number and first line of text appear?

The page number must appear 1 in. from the top edge of the page and 1 in. from the right edge. The first line of text appears about 0.3 in. under the page number, or 1.3 in. from the top edge of the paper. **Caution:** Students have run into problems with Microsoft Word's page number placement. Be sure your page layout is adjusted correctly. Set the top margin to 1.3 in. and the header to 1 in.

Do all the tables and figures come at the end of the doctoral study paper? What about table titles and figure captions?

Tables and figures (and their titles and captions) are inserted in the text as close to where they are referred to as possible. If you plan to publish your doctoral study results in a journal, please see APA's many requirements for papers submitted for publication (chapter 8).

What do I do if a table goes longer than one page?

Always try to fit the table on one page. If the table must run over onto the subsequent page, type the phrase *table continues* in parentheses flush right at the bottom of the table on the first page. Repeat the column headings, but not the table number or title, at the top of the subsequent page.

If including a long table or figure, can I format it in landscape instead of portrait?

Yes. The "top" of the page needs to have a margin of 1.5 in. to allow for binding. The page number is placed in the same spot as the rest of the manuscript. This can be accomplished electronically in Microsoft Word.

Do I need a running header on my doctoral study?

No. Walden does not use running headers in doctoral study papers.

Does it matter if I write Section Two, Section II, Section 2, or CHAPTER 2?

Yes, it matters. Per APA, only the form *Section 2* is correct in chapter headings. Note that in the narrative text, *section* is not capitalized when followed by a number (e.g., In section 2, . . .).

Do I need to get permission from the copyright holder to reprint a table, figure, or certain text in my proposal?

For the proposal, it is unnecessary, although you might want to proceed in obtaining permission because you will need that permission for your doctoral study—unless the item you wish to use is in the public domain or under the rules of fair use (APA 6.10). Contact ProQuest UMI at 1-800-521-0600, ext. 7020, for more specific information than what is provided in the Copyrights and Permission to Use section of this guidebook.

Should the references or the appendices come first? When should page 1 start? Should preliminary pages (such as acknowledgments, abstract, etc.) be numbered with small Roman numerals?

Per APA (pp. 229–230), the references come before the appendices. For the preliminary pages starting with the first page of the Table of Contents, use lowercase Roman numerals, centered, at the bottom of the page. (Any pages before the Table of Contents are not counted in the pagination.) The first page of section 1 is page 1—using Arabic numerals, not Roman. (**Note:** For project studies, Appendix A is the actual project document.)

May I use British spelling of English in my doctoral study paper?

Walden follows APA style, which allows only standard American English. Most word-processing software programs have spell-check features that convert British English to American English.

Do the key terms go in a glossary?

You and your committee chair should decide how the reader is best served by placement of a Definition of Terms section. For project studies, the Definition of Terms section is included in section 1.

Am I supposed to use one or two spaces after periods and colons?

Use a single space after periods and colons (APA 4.01).

What is the format for my curriculum vitae (CV)?

A copy of your CV must be included at the very end of your doctoral study. The CV may be formatted in either basic outline form, as a résumé, or in full-sentence form. Most students limit the CV to one or two pages.

Can editors in the Walden Writing Center review my proposal? Can they look at my doctoral study when I'm starting out?

Yes, you may make a reservation with one of the editors to review early drafts of your proposal sections or your final sections. Follow the instructions on the Writing Center website for making a reservation to have your work reviewed.

Should I hire an editor to help me? Where do I find one? Do the Writing Center editors do all that for me?

The Writing Center editors will point out patterns of errors and offer instructions and suggestions on improving your narrative, but they will not indicate every mistake. The Walden Writing Center has information on editors for hire who are familiar with APA style. You and your committee members (or Writing Center staff members) can decide whether you need additional editing help.

Is there software that can do the APA formatting for me?

Yes. Check the Walden Writing Center for information on APA software that automatically formats reference lists in APA style, as well as set up pages, maintain a running database of references, and offer other useful features.

RESOURCES

Walden University Resources

Commencement

Office of Student Research Support

Office of the Registrar

Walden Library

Walden Writing Center

Academic Advising Team: 1-800-925-3368, Monday through Friday, 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Central time

Bursar: 1-800-444-6795 or bursar@waldenu.edu

Institutional Review Board: irb@waldenu.edu

Research Service Specialist: doctoralstudy@waldenu.edu

Documents and Forms

Doctoral Study Rubric (project option)

Doctoral Study Rubric (research option)

Institutional Review Board Application

Prospectus and Chair Assignment

Other Resources

American Psychological Association (APA) website

Inclusive (Nonsexist) Language Resources:
University of Minnesota
University of New Hampshire

Evaluation-Specific Resources

Online Resources

The following resource includes descriptions of goals-based evaluation, outcomes-based evaluation, an overview of methods to collect information, four levels of evaluation, and contents of an evaluation plan:

McNamara, C. (n.d.). *Basic Guide to Program Evaluation*.
www.managementhelp.org/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm#anchor1585345

The following resources will help you to develop an effective evaluation:

Evaluation Tools:
www.evaluation.wmich.edu/resources/schooleval

Basic Guide to Program Evaluation:
www.managementhelp.org/evaluatn/fnl_eval.htm

Quality School Library Programs Evaluation:
www.cde.state.co.us/litstandards/evaluation.htm

Program Evaluation:
www.horizon-research.com/publications/stock.pdf

NSF, *The 2002 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation*:
www.nsf.gov/pubs/2002/nsf02057/nsf02057_1.pdf

NSF, *User-Friendly Handbook for Mixed Method Evaluations*:
http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1997/nsf97153/start.htm

Books

Berk, R. A., & Rossi, F. H. (1999). *Thinking about program evaluation* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publications, Inc.

Davidson, J. E. (2005). *Evaluation methodology basics (The nuts and bolts of sound evaluation).*

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Fitz-Gibbon, C. T., & Morris, L. L. (1987). *How to design a program evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publications, Inc.

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Fitzpatrick, K. A. (1998). *Program evaluation handbook*. Schaumburg, IL: National Study of School Evaluation.

Fleischman, H. L., & Williams, L. (1996). *An introduction to program evaluation for classroom teachers*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.

Holden, D. J., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2008). *Practical guide to program evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Jaeger, R. M. published a series of books in 1993 (ISBN: 0-80349-6035) called "Essential Tools for Educators: The Program Evaluation Guides for Schools." Corwin Press.

   Titles in the series include:

- *Special education programs: A guide to evaluation* by Vellecorsa, deBetterncourt, and Garriss.

- *Counseling programs: A guide to evaluation* by Borders and Dury.

- *Reading and language arts programs: A guide to evaluation* by Olson and Miller.

- *Programs for at-risk students: A guide to evaluation* by O'Sullivan and Tennant.

- *Mathematics programs: A guide to evaluation* by Bright, Uprichard, and Jetton.

Mills, Geoffrey E. (2003). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987). *How to communicate evaluation findings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (200l). *Evaluation models: New directions for evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-
Bass.

Weiss, C. (1997). *Evaluation* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Walden University
Academic Offices
155 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 100
Minneapolis, MN 55401
1-800- 925-3368

Walden University is accredited by The Higher Learning Commission and a member of the North Central Association, www.ncahlc.org; 1-312-263-0456.

© 2011 Walden University, LLC.

Ed.D. Project Study Flow Chart

Final Prospectus Approval

Proposal

Problem (section 1) → **Methodology (section 2)**

Problem (section 1) branch:

- Definition
- Rationale
- Significance
- Research Question (guiding question)
- Literature Review
- Implications

Methodology (section 2) branch:

- Research Design and Approach
- Setting and Sample/ Participants
- Data Collection/ Instrumentation and Materials
- Data Analysis
- Assumptions, Limitations, Scope, and Delimitations

Rubric from Each Committee Member/ Turnitin Report → URR Review → Pre-Oral Conference (optional) → URR Review (if changes are required) → Oral Defense → IRB Application and Review

Final

| **Methodology (added to methodology section 2 above)** | **Project Document (section 3 and Appendix A)** | **Reflections and Conclusions (section 4)** |

Data Analyses

Findings

Project as an Outcome

Description and Goals

Rationale

Review of Educational Research and Theory

Needed Resources and Implementation Plan

Project Evaluation Plan

Implications Including Social Change

Project Strengths and Limitations

Recommendations

Scholarship

Project Development and Evaluation

Leadership and Change

Analysis of Self as Scholar, Practitioner, and Project Developer

Implications, Applications, and Directions for Future Research

Rubric from Each Committee Member/ Turnitin Report

URR Review

Pre-Oral Conference (optional)

URR, Turnitin, and Form and Style Review

Oral Defense

URR Review and Committee Consensus Rubric

CAO Approval