

REPORT

Education Research as a Contested Enterprise: the deliberations of the SSRC–NAE Joint Committee on Education Research

SHERI H. RANIS

Social Science Research Council, New York, USA

PAMELA BARNHOUSE WALTERS

Indiana University at Bloomington, USA

ABSTRACT The SSRC–NAE Joint Committee on Education Research, a multidisciplinary group formed in 2001, initiated an investigation of the complex and sprawling field of American education research organized into three general domains of inquiry: the social organization of education research, an assessment of the quality of education research, and a consideration of the politics and policy implications of education research. This article describes the organization of this effort, summarizes the major themes discussed, and describes the resources gathered and research projects suggested by these deliberations.

Background: the education research reform movement

The start of the new millennium saw the education research community in the United States vociferously criticized from within and without. The accusations, among others, included insularity from real-world problems in education practice, unscientific and unreliable findings, and a lack of the talismans of disciplinary cumulation such as the formation of a canon of acknowledged key literatures and a core of suppositions, methods and vocabulary that would allow the scientific enterprise to flourish (Labaree, 1998; Ravitch; 1998; Schoenfeld, 1999; Lagemann & Shulman, 1999b; Shavelson & Towne, 2002).

Unlike current European conversations about the organizational nature of and space taken up by the educational sciences, the American debates focused on reform of what was assumed to be a fully established research enterprise. American education research's institutionalization, the roots of which developed over the past century, accelerated in the past four decades and now constitutes a complex and multi-tiered set of advanced schools of training, multiple pedagogies, journals, prizes, academic associations and other organizational artifacts of field development (Lagemann, 2000).

Several efforts to explore the future of American education research gathered momentum at that time, including the National Research Council's Committee on Education Research, the Campbell Collaboration, and the then federally-sponsored Strategic Education Research Partnership (known by its acronym, SERP). In 2002, two national non-profit, non-governmental organizations, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the National Academy of Education (NAE), joined forces to examine the field of education research. Supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation, the major American private funder of research on education, the purpose of

this effort was to investigate the state of research on education with an eye toward its improvement.

The principal organizational feature of collaboration was the NAE–SSRC Joint Committee on Education Research. The committee, co-chaired by Larry Hedges (Departments of Sociology and Psychology and the Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, University of Chicago) and Pamela Walters (Department of Sociology, Indiana University), had 15 additional scholars as members. These individuals were chosen for their interest and expertise in the issues facing the education research field and also represented a range of disciplinary perspectives and analytic styles. The Committee included both senior and younger scholars (notably some former NAE/Spencer Postdoctoral Fellows), as well as members of disciplines and subdisciplines that have traditionally been underrepresented at the intersection of education research and the social sciences in the United States.[1]

The Social Science Research Council and the National Academy of Education

The Social Science Research Council is an independent, nongovernmental, not-for-profit organization that works to advance social science throughout the world and supports research, education, and scholarly exchange on every continent. Since 1923, the Council has helped to generate new knowledge on key social issues and to train generations of social scientists. The Council is committed to international, interdisciplinary social science that focuses on themes of public importance: from current transformations in higher education to global security, from the social and economic challenges of globalization to the impacts of information technology and the role of the arts in contemporary society.

For almost eighty years, the SSRC has linked universities, foundations, social science and humanities disciplines, area studies associations, and government and nongovernmental organizations in exploring new intellectual paths and testing theories and methods against the challenges of contemporary and historical problems. The Council creates and administers programs for scholars, practitioners, and graduate students worldwide through fellowship and grant programs, workshops and conferences, research networks, scholarly exchanges, training institutes, and publications.

Council programs rely on scholars, researchers, and practitioners drawn from universities, research institutions, and nongovernmental organizations around the world to serve on a voluntary basis as members of steering committees, screening panels, research networks, and working groups. Individuals are selected to participate on the basis of the distinction of their scholarly track records and expertise. The prestige associated with being invited to participate in Council activities has provided the SSRC with a flow of high-level international talent from almost every academic and research field. As many as 400 scholars and practitioners may be engaged at any one time in the Council's training and research planning activities. This system of pro bono service to the Council has functioned to support SSRC programs for many decades.

Collaboration between the SSRC and the National Academy of Education was established by the leadership of both organizations during 2000 when it was recognized that there was a deep mutual interest in the quality of American education research as well as high complementarity in terms of the two organizations' relative strengths and experiences. The NAE, an organization devoted to scholarly inquiry and discussion about education, consists of over one hundred members elected on the basis of outstanding scholarship on education or outstanding contributions to education. In addition to its membership, NAE administers in partnership with the Spencer Foundation for Education the NAE/Spencer post-doctoral fellowship competition. The NAE's mission is to explicitly encourage 'the advancement of the highest quality education research and its policy formation and practice' (NAE website, 2004).

The creation of the program followed previous NAE projects, such as the assessment of proposals to improve education research discussed in the publication *Next Steps: reflections on education research and ways the National Academy of Education might help to further strengthen it* (2001).[2] The NAE regarded it as crucial that further investigation not be limited to internal self-examination by education researchers but include a broad spectrum of social scientists. Thus, a partnership with the SSRC, a national organization dedicated to the promotion of rigorous

multidisciplinary and multi-method inquiry, was forged. The SSRC's leadership saw the establishment of the committee as a means of addressing a long-standing pattern on the part of mainstream social scientists to cede education research to colleagues in schools of education. This was considered a limitation impoverishing both education research and the social science disciplines themselves. The Council viewed collaboration with NAE as a significant step in helping to reverse such trends.

Core Areas of Inquiry

The Joint Committee's task was to deliberate on the key questions involved in better understanding the education research enterprise, focus on fuller and more complete conceptualizations and frameworks for analyzing that enterprise, pinpoint where weak data or evidence was driving common wisdom about the reputation of education research, and formulate research projects to address the uncovered gaps in knowledge about this line of social research.

Relatively quickly the committee narrowed the scope of its inquiry to three principal components: (1) an examination of the social organization of research on education, (2) an assessment of the scholarly quality and intellectual impact of education research, and (3) an analysis of the politics and policy use of research on education, including the degree to which it does or does not inform educational policy making. 'Education research' was defined quite broadly to include a wide range of scholarship dealing with educational processes both inside and outside of formally organized schools.

Fragmentation and Variation as Hallmarks of Education Research

The first in the series of questions that the committee considered was this: Can education research be considered to be a discipline, or a field of inquiry, or simply an academic enterprise clustered around a particular real world social practice? Clearly the organizational elements of a singular field of study were present, as noted above. Guided by Lakatosian standards of field health, the committee pondered the characteristics of education research membership, the nature of the intellectual exchange between members, and the presence or absence of that all-important feature of intellectual cumulation (Lakatos, 1970). As the committee considered the kinds of individuals considered to be education researchers, they recognized diversity in locations of their training and their locations as producers of research within and outside of the US academic circles, variation in key research questions and the pursuit of a multiplicity of methods, analytic frameworks and even publication and dissemination venues. Distinctive 'silos' of research production isolated behind disciplinary walls seemed to exist (Becher, 1998). Familiar divides seen in other social science research fields between applied and theoretical research streams, qualitative and quantitative methodologies, high prestige, university-based research products and the work of practitioners such as teacher/administrators or members of the consulting and policy research industry were present as well. The 'big tent' presented by education research seemed to be a fragmented enterprise at best (Labaree, 1998).

In order to move forward, the field of education research was defined as a community of scholars that investigates the political, social and cultural institutions and human dynamics associated with all aspects of teaching and learning, both inside of formal 'schools' and without. The committee acknowledged that such scholars are not all contained within easily identifiable departments or schools of universities or even within universities themselves. Education research in the United States is also comprised of a business industry serving schools, the by-product of political advocacy groups and organizations, the livelihood of specialist policy analysts and (not the least) the production of government agencies.

Indeed, the enormous diversity of institutional locations of education researchers is one of the reasons why attention to this field could advance understanding of the nature of scientific fields more generally. A comparison of findings about education research to findings of extant research on scientific fields would help us understand whether disciplinary divides represent the same obstacles to the integration of an interdisciplinary research community as field divides (e.g. the boundaries between the arts and sciences, on the one hand, and professional schools, on the other) do to the integration of cross-field research communities. Such findings could thus also shed light

on the scientific development of other highly important interdisciplinary fields that bridge the basic and applied sciences, such as public health, public policy, criminology, and social work.

Consideration of the membership of the education research community provoked further questions about the nature of the variation we understood to exist. The committee pondered whether or not the community of education researchers in the United States coheres into what can be considered a single field of study, represented by a well-connected set of elites, or if it is better characterized as a loosely coupled collection of several individual scientific fields represented by multiple distinct cores of elites.

A related and important line of conversation centered on university-based researchers. Did organizational barriers represented by disciplines and by academic units such as schools of education and public policy within the US university system serve as the key fault lines in the field's scientific networks? The committee wondered to what degree scholars who share research interests but are located in different organizational units within the academy cohere into distinct scholarly sub-networks, and how those networks are connected to other networks within the larger field. Here a key theme in the committee's deliberations came forth: the need for a comparative element in the analysis of education research. Interest was strong in comparing the organizational dimension of the field to both mainstream social science disciplines such as sociology, political science, anthropology and economics as well as applied fields such as law, social work and nursing.

Lack of Data and Analysis about the Education Research Enterprise

The committee felt certain that investigating the structural features and organization of research would provide meaningful information not only about education research but about the nature of the American academy itself. The problem with doing so, it was quickly discovered, was a distinctive lack of data. Mapping the education research enterprise called for a full description of the membership and their attributes, an accounting of locations of advanced training and research production, and a depiction of venues for research dissemination including online and print journals. The committee learned that no one had initiated this kind of evidence collection, either in terms of the historical record or as 'snapshots' of the current features of the field.[3]

Moreover, some potential sources of information proved to be limited in their use. A preliminary analysis of the data of the annual Survey of Earned Doctorates (a National Science Foundation data project that runs an annual national survey of all individuals who complete doctorates in all fields in the United States) revealed two problems that made comparison among fields in terms of doctoral production very tricky [4]: privacy laws protected individual responses, and the available data do not distinguish among various kinds of granted education doctorates and thus do not allow for more than very simple counts of the volume of doctorates in education produced annually.

The committee also moved to collect original data on its own. With support from the Spencer Foundation, the committee commissioned a database in early 2003 from Thomson ISI, the company that compiles the *Science Citation Index* and the *Social Science Citation Index*, to aid in the effort to map the social organization of educational research. The 'Education Research Publications Database' was constructed with the aid of the Joint Committee; members specified a list of 128 scholarly journals that publish education research. In addition to covering mainline education journals, the list covers a broad range of education sub-fields, including special education, educational statistics and measurement, and science education, as well as journals in the social sciences (and history). After the committee members selected these journals, Thomson ISI created a database containing information on each of the 125,658 'source items' published by those journals between 1981 and 2002. The great majority of source items are research articles, but other types include literature reviews, book reviews, bibliographies, etc. (Link to Education Research Publications Database Journal List).

The Formulation of an Agenda for Research

Discussion of the structural features and organization of research fed an overall concern with development of a better understanding of *the social organization of education research* which became a

primary domain of interest for the committee. The committee developed a set of priorities for research that included the following aspects:

- determination of where education research is conducted and by whom;
- identification of the range of problems addressed and the methods used to address them;
- study of changes in the organizational structure of sites of production of research (particularly, but not exclusively, universities);
- examination of the interface between universities and other sites of educational research;
- consideration of various types of typical career paths for those who engage in education research along with analysis of patterns of graduate training, paying particular attention to how that varies among social science disciplines, between social science disciplines and schools of education, and within schools of education.

Alongside these priorities was the sense that investigating the social organization of education research should be accompanied by comparative analyses. Possibilities include contrasting education research with scholarship in other domains of professional work – such as social work, public policy, medicine, nursing, and business. A second important comparative framework is between the types of research conducted in universities and research sites elsewhere, such as private research firms and think tanks, with particular attention to how the growth of these sites of research outside traditional university settings affects the overall research agenda and forms of research. A third contrast comes via a set of international comparisons. As other commentators have noted (Depaepe, 2002), our understanding of much of what comprises social organization of a research field, including the forces that shape education research, will be sharpened by placing the United States in international perspective.

The second domain, the assessment of *the quality of research on education*, overlaps the social organization inquiry in several ways as it requires review of the types of research questions most often posed, the research methods widely deployed, the kinds of research training provided, the sources of funding for research on education, and the intellectual infrastructure that supports and orients such research. Determining the intellectual strength and scientific rigor of the educational research enterprise, including its reception within the larger scholarly and scientific community, requires mapping the variation within that enterprise in standards of scientific rigor and quality. Assessing the general critique of the quality of education research is one important point of departure, since it prompts asking whether the critique is accurate and, more specifically, whether quality varies greatly among lines and forms of research (Berliner, 2002). A related question is whether the prominence of the critique itself is the only or primary factor affecting the prestige of education research in the academy.

From the multidisciplinary perspective of the committee, there was agreement that pursuing a single ‘gold standard’ for quality in research on education was a non-starter. Rather, it would be more interesting to determine how practicing researchers define quality research, how their location in the larger field of education research affects that standard, how much consensus exists within the research community on appropriate research methods and standards for assessing quality, and how that consensus (or lack thereof) affects the reception of education research within the scholarly community as well as the public at large. The National Research Council report, *Scientific Inquiry in Education*, responds to some extent to issues of baseline measures of quality (Shavelson & Towne, 2002). But the committee wished to push the inquiry further and ask the following questions:

- To what degree is there an accumulation of research findings on education?
- Do theories of education, in fact, build on each other?
- Do well-articulated long-term *programs* of research on education exist and, if so, how is that accomplished?
- Do individual scholars or communities of scholars pursue coherent long-term research agendas?
- How does the funding for research on education affect all of this?

An examination of graduate student training – including how that varies among academic settings (e.g. social science disciplines and schools of education) and how it has varied historically – would also prove useful to our investigation of scholarly standards and quality.

The third domain of attention, *the politics and policy use of research on education* (as distinct from the politics of education), asked how both government priorities and public perceptions of educational problems have shaped education research; how public attitudes toward education,

education research, and research findings affect the standing of education research and educational researchers; and how professionalization movements – both the professionalization of schools of education and the professionalization of educators – affect the education research agenda and the reception of such research.

The committee considered an examination of funding streams for research on education as one important indicator of the status and profile of education research. The growth of think tanks and private research organizations' involvement in education research was also an interesting feature of the intellectual landscape that could use closer examination. The reception by policy makers and the public at large of the research conducted in such non-academic settings and how research conducted in think tanks and private organizations affects the reception of traditional university-based educational research were questions deserving of empirical examination.

A very important part of this inquiry was thought to be the relationship between researchers and policymakers and the way in which research on education informs policy making. As one way of determining the impact of education research on policymakers, a comparison could be constructed of the influence on policy design and implementation by different types of research on education. The committee wondered if research that is explicitly framed as 'policy research' had a different impact on policymaking than research primarily framed in terms of theoretical questions originating in the various social sciences or if evaluation studies of existing educational programs had an impact that differed from that of policy research. Once again, comparison with other fields with explicit connections to the study and design of public policy, such as health sciences, social work and criminology, was thought to be necessary to place the public consumption of education research in proper perspective.

Acknowledging that the questions and issues arising from each of the three domains were intertwined to some extent, with respect to exploring the effect of education research on educational policy, it would be important to consider the extent to which the quality of research determines political/policy influence. Similarly, analysis of funding streams is important for describing the social organization of education research and is simultaneously an indicator of the political standing of questions about education to larger audiences. Questions about graduate training of students interested in education bear on questions of scholarly quality as well as the social organization of education research.

Research Projects and Data Resources

As a result of the Joint Committee on Education Research's deliberations, the agenda for future research outlined was developed. However, a number of specific resources and projects have also been launched by committee members and are currently under way. For example, the committee organized a series of papers on issues of quality in education, which were presented in preliminary form at the April 2004 annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. The plan is to produce a volume based on those papers. (See links for fuller description of the quality volume and a summary of the AERA panel.)

The quality project started with the premise that the quality of education research in the USA is extremely uneven; much of it simply does not meet minimum standards of rigor, use of logic, and the marshaling of appropriate evidence for the creation of valid and meaningful findings. But, there is also good research on education and there could be more. It is crucial to differentiate education research by field, methods and most importantly, by demonstrated quality. The evidence of quality needs to be clearly articulated, admitted, and analyzed, using serious but fair standards of judgment. Since the goal is less to understand the past for its own sake than to improve the future, the papers seek to identify what practices and organizational structures lead to excellent research. The volume is designed in sections that look at the intellectual history and political context behind quality debates, the various career markers such as publishing, tenure granting and awards that indicate quality scholarship, and consideration of the implications that decisions about the quality of the field hold for future scholarship.

Chairs Larry Hedges and Pamela Walters, along with Sheri Ranis and the staff of the National Opinion Research Council (NORC), have also designed a project on the social organization of education research. The premise of the study, which would take place over three years, is to

consider the social and intellectual ties among elites in the field of education research and to link those elites' positions within the social network (or networks) that defines (or define) the field with the predominant scientific theories and methods on which researchers base their research, the kinds of research questions they pose, and the related scholarly research on which they draw in their work.

Finally, the resource represented by the Education Research Publications Database is another tool for those interested in exploring the methodologies, approaches and topics found within education research. Co-citation analysis and related methods may be applied to the database to help truly map what education research looks like with all its varied topics of study, methodologies, paradigms and established intellectual leaders. The database could also illuminate whether or not specialties evolve by a more or less continuous recruitment and obsolescence process evident in the entrance and exit of highly cited papers or authors.

Preliminary analyses using the database have been suggestive of the potential of these data. For example, it seems clear from the manner in which the volume of citations flows within the publications represented in the database that child development and educational psychology have been the most influential subfields within the large and sprawling American education research enterprise. Particularly interesting with respect to the charges that education research is not generally based on scientific or rigorous methods, the second and third most frequently cited books or articles within the database are guides to qualitative research: see Glaser & Strauss (1967); Lincoln & Guba (1985). With the rich possibilities for analysis the publications data afford, we hope that resources will soon be available for researchers to address a wide range of questions about the structure of the field of education research.

Some Concluding Thoughts

All three domains of the committee's inquiry into the field of education research as it is conducted in the United States relate to the advancement and improvement of research on education in terms of intrinsic strength, impact and value. The agenda setting conducted by the committee was conceived primarily as a mapping exercise: a problem located within the history and sociology of knowledge literatures. However, the committee also hopes that the answers to the questions they have asked are useful to philanthropists, policy makers and others engaged in shaping new directions for American education research, as well as the broader international community of education researchers who are interested in building a cohesive research community within and across national boundaries.

The Joint Committee's discussions and investigations indicate that our current understanding of what constitutes education research in the United States is derived at present from scatological evidence, hearsay and testimony from disparate locations within and outside the field. Without data to analyze we cannot claim to understand how the field operates, what is wrong with it and how to solve its problems. That means that a great deal of work remains to be done. Through the work of the Joint Committee a start has been made on the first stages of data collection and a prioritization of what kinds of studies should be undertaken in order to come to a baseline understanding of the contours of the field and the dynamics that help constitute its future growth. It is now up to both individual scholars who make up its membership and the organizations associated with the field to pursue the worthy goal of carefully studying education research.

This article reflects the views of its authors and as such should not be considered a representation of the views or policies of the Social Science Research Council or the National Academy of Education.

Notes

- [1] Joint Committee members from 2001 to 2004 included: Robert Boruch, University of Pennsylvania; David Cohen, University of Michigan; Michael Cole, University of California, San Diego; Harris Cooper, Duke University; James Farr, University of Minnesota; Carol Greenhouse, Princeton University; Lowell Hargens, University of Washington, Seattle; Helen Ladd, Duke University; Ellen Lagemann, Harvard University; Annette Lareau, Temple University; Robert LeVine, Harvard University; Maris Vinovskis, University of Michigan; Carol Weiss, Harvard University. Larry Hedges

of the University of Chicago and Pamela Barnhouse Walters of Indiana University served as co-chairs.

- [2] National Academy of Education Strategic Plan (2001) New York: National Academy of Education, p. 4. See also Lagemann, & Shulman (1999a, b).
- [3] Some additional data on education research advanced training in comparison with other social science fields has been collected by the National Science Foundation. See Levine et al (2004). Doctoral training in education was also the subject of a one-day workshop held at the National Research Council (NRC) in early 2004. For proceedings of that event please see the NRC website: <http://www7.nationalacademies.org/core/>
- [4] US institutions grant two different doctoral degrees in education: the Doctor of Education (or EdD) and the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). Very generally speaking, the EdD is considered a degree focusing on the applied nature of education; it is often needed by top level school and education administrators to reach executive level management positions. The PhD is considered an academic track certification required for those who wish to serve in university faculties or other scholarly positions. Because education is taught at the graduate level in both social science departments and in Schools/Departments of Education however, either degree can lead to a career in research or teaching at the university level. Comparisons with the doctoral production of other fields would suggest only education PhDs should be compared with other PhDs. However a full accounting of the production of education researchers would require some further disaggregation of the data to determine who among both EdD and PhD populations are conducting careers as education researchers.

Websites

<http://www.ssrc.org/programs/edresearch/index.page>

<http://www.nae.nyu.edu>

References

- Becher, T. (1998) *Academic Tribes and Territories: intellectual inquiry and the cultures of disciplining*. Bristol, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Berliner, D. (2002) Educational Research: the hardest science of all, *Educational Researcher*, 31, pp. 18-20.
- Depaepe, M. (2002) A Comparative History of the Educational Sciences: the comparability of the incomparable? *European Educational Research Journal*, 1(1), pp. 118-122.
- Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Labaree, D. (1998) Educational Researchers: living with a lesser form of knowledge? *Educational Researcher*, 27(8), pp. 4-12
- Lagemann, E. (2000) *An Elusive Science: the troubling history of education research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lagemann, E. & Shulman, L. (1999a) *Reflections on Education Research and Ways the National Academy of Education Might Help to Further Strengthen It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lagemann, E. & Shulman, L. (Eds) (1999b) *Issues in Education Research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lakatos, I. (1970) Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes, in I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds) *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, F., Abler, R. & Rosick, K. (2004) *Education and Training in the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences: a plan of action*. Washington, DC: The National Science Foundation.
- Lincoln, Y.A. & Guba, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Ravitch, D. (1998) What If Education Research Really Mattered? *Education Week*, 16 December.
- Schoenfeld, A. (1999) The Core, the Canon, and the Development of Research Skills, in E. Lagemann & L. Shulman (Eds) *Issues in Education Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shavelson, R. & Towne, L. (Eds) (2002) *Scientific Research in Education*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

APPENDIX 1

Estimating Value: the evidence on quality in education research

Presented by the Social Science Research Council–National Academy of Education Joint Committee on Education Research in San Diego, California on April 15, 2004. A presidential invited session.

Convenor: Sheri Ranis, SSRC

Presenters: D.C. Phillips, Stanford University, Margaret Eisenhart, University of Colorado; Jeffrey Valentine, Duke University, Larry Hedges, University of Chicago

Discussant: Pamela Walters, Indiana University

At a time when calls for more rigorous and effective research on education are being made both outside and within the academy, the Social Science Research Council–National Academy of Education Joint Program on Education Research has organized a study on issues surrounding the definition and assessment of quality in education research. This in-depth inquiry is looking closely at how quality is defined, vetted and attributed in the field of education research. The papers presented during this panel, which are still in draft form, will consider the various means by which rigor, value, and prestige are distributed such as scholarly publication, grants and tenure evaluation.

We are interested in determining (a) how practicing researchers define quality research, (b) how their location in the larger field of education research affects those standards, (c) how much consensus exists within the research community on appropriate research methods and standards for assessing quality, and (d) how that consensus (or lack thereof) affects the reception of education research within the broader scholarly community and the public at large. We address issues of quality in education research in a manner that is grounded in the analysis of carefully collected empirical evidence. At the same time we take into account the considerable variation in research traditions and protocols across the field of education research.

The authors are a multidisciplinary group of scholars from a very broad range of research traditions and disciplinary backgrounds. The SSRC–NAE Joint Committee on Education Research is co-chaired by Larry Hedges (University of Chicago) and Pamela Barnhouse Walters (Indiana University).

The selection of papers was as follows:

Paper One: A quixotic quest: philosophical issues in assessing the quality of education research. D.C. Phillips, Stanford University

Paper Two: Quality in educational research on ‘what works.’ Jeffrey Valentine, Duke University

Paper Three: The question of quality in qualitative research. Margaret Eisenhart, University of Colorado

Paper Four: Vetting quality during the scholarly lifecourse: evidence from the Spencer-NAE postdoctoral fellowship evaluation. Larry Hedges, University of Chicago

APPENDIX 2

Journals in the Education Research Publications Database

- 1 Adult Education Quarterly
- 2 American Biology Teacher
- 3 American Educational Research Journal
- 4 American Journal of Education
- 5 Annals of Dyslexia
- 6 Anthropology & Education Quarterly
- 7 British Educational Research Journal
- 8 British Journal of Developmental Disabilities
- 9 British Journal of Educational Psychology
- 10 British Journal of Educational Studies
- 11 British Journal of Educational Technology
- 12 British Journal of Sociology of Education
- 13 Child Development

14	Chinese Education and Society
15	Cognition and Instruction
16	Communication Education
17	Comparative Education
18	Comparative Education Review
19	Computers & Education
20	Contemporary Educational Psychology
21	Creativity Research Journal
22	Discourse Processes
23	Early Childhood Research Quarterly
24	Economics of Education Review
25	Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities
26	Educational and Psychological Measurement
27	Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
28	Educational Leadership
29	Educational Policy
30	Educational Psychology Review
31	Educational Research
32	Educational Studies
33	Elementary School Journal
34	European Journal of Psychology of Education
35	Evaluation Review
36	Exceptional Children
37	Focus on Exceptional Children
38	Gender and Education
39	Gifted Child Quarterly
40	Harvard Educational Review
41	High Ability Studies
42	Higher Education
43	IEEE Transactions on Education
44	Infants and Young Children
45	International Journal of Educational Development
46	International Journal of Science Education
47	International Journal of Technology and Design Education
48	International Review of Research in Mental Retardation
49	Intervention in School and Clinic
50	Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology
51	Journal for Research in Mathematics Education
52	Journal for the Education of the Gifted
53	Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy
54	Journal of Adolescent Research
55	Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities
56	Journal of College Student Development
57	Journal of Computer Assisted Learning
58	Journal of Counseling and Development
59	Journal of Counseling Psychology
60	Journal of Creative Behavior
61	Journal of Curriculum Studies
62	Journal of Early Intervention
63	Journal of Economic Education
64	Journal of Education Policy
65	Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics
66	Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation
67	Journal of Educational Measurement
68	Journal of Educational Psychology
69	Journal of Educational Research
70	Journal of Experimental Education
71	Journal of Higher Education
72	Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability
73	Journal of Intellectual Disability Research
74	Journal of Learning Disabilities

- 75 Journal of Learning Sciences
- 76 Journal of Literacy Research
- 77 Journal of Moral Education
- 78 Journal of Philosophy of Education
- 79 Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment
- 80 Journal of Research in Math Education
- 81 Journal of Research in Science Teaching
- 82 Journal of School Health
- 83 Journal of School Psychology
- 84 Journal of Special Education
- 85 Journal of Teacher Education
- 86 Journal of Teaching in Physical Education
- 87 Journal of the Learning Sciences
- 88 Journal of Youth and Adolescence
- 89 Language Learning
- 90 Learning and Individual Differences
- 91 Learning and Instruction
- 92 Learning Disability Quarterly
- 93 Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development
- 94 Mental Retardation
- 95 Minerva
- 96 New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies
- 97 Oxford Review of Education
- 98 Phi Delta Kappan
- 99 Quest
- 100 Reading Research and Instruction
- 101 Reading Research Quarterly
- 102 Reading Teacher
- 103 Remedial and Special Education
- 104 Research in Higher Education
- 105 Research in the Teaching of English
- 106 Review of Educational Research
- 107 Review of Higher Education
- 108 Review of Research in Education
- 109 Russian Education and Society
- 110 School Psychology Quarterly
- 111 School Psychology Review
- 112 Science Education
- 113 Sociology of Education
- 114 Sport Education and Society
- 115 Studies in Higher Education
- 116 Teachers College Record
- 117 Teaching and Teacher Education
- 118 Teaching of Psychology
- 119 Teaching Sociology
- 120 TESOL Quarterly
- 121 Theory into Practice
- 122 Topics in Early Childhood Special Education
- 123 Urban Education
- 124 Volta Review
- 125 Voprosy Psikhologii
- 126 Zeitschrift Fur Entwicklungspsychologie Und Padagogische Psychologie
- 127 Zeitschrift Fur Padagogik
- 128 Zeitschrift Fur Padagogische Psychologie

SHERI RANIS organizes and directs programs on education research and higher education at the Social Science Research Council. Her research and writing primarily concerns access and achievement in US postsecondary education among underrepresented populations. *Correspondence:* Sheri H. Ranis, PhD, Program Director, Social Science Research Council, 810 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019, USA (ranis@ssrc.org).

PAMELA BARNHOUSE WALTERS teaches and conducts research on social inequality, with a particular focus on American education. Her work situates education in its larger historical, political and social contexts and closely examines the political struggles between potential winners and potential losers over access to valued educational resources. *Correspondence:* Pamela Barnhouse Walters, PhD, Rudy Professor of Sociology, Indiana University at Bloomington, 1020 E. Kirkwood Avenue, Bloomington, IN 47405-7103, USA (walters@indiana.edu).