



International Network for Doctoral Education in Nursing

NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 3

OCTOBER 2003

INDEN ELECTION: News from Professor Louise S. Jenkins, University of Maryland

On behalf of the Elections Committee, that consisted of Shioh-Li Hwang, National Taiwan University, Taiwan, Christa Lohrmann, Humboldt University of Berlin, Germany (student member) and Sopin Sangon, Mahidol University, Thailand and me, I am pleased to announce the results of the INDEN election completed on 9/26/03 as follows:

Shaké Ketefian, University of Michigan, USA, Board Member and Chair

Sr. Callista Roy, Boston College, USA
Board Member

John Daly, University of Western Sydney, Australia, Board Member

Congratulations to our re-elected Chair and newly elected Board Members. We thank the many INDEN members who participated in the nomination/election process.

INDEN Board members

Chairperson
Shaké Ketefian, ketefian@umich.edu

Treasurer
Hugh McKenna, hp.mckenna@ulst.ac.uk

Secretary
Afaf Meleis, meleis@nursing.upenn.edu

Members

John Daly j.daly@uws.edu.au

Valerie Ehlers, Ehlervj@unisa.ac.za

Morag Gray, m.gray@napier.ac.uk

Mi Ja Kim, mjkuic@uic.edu

Auxilia Chideme Munodawafa
Amunodawafa@hotmail.com

Callista Roy, Callista.roy@bc.edu

CHAIRPERSON'S COLUMN

The final preparations for the INDEN conference in Toronto are well under way. We have a strong group of speakers representing nine countries and different domains of activity, who will discuss visionary leadership. The program is on our website [<http://www.umich.edu/~inden/>]. Time has been allocated for group discussion, during which we hope additional ideas will be generated for leadership development in doctoral education, and ways in which INDEN can play an instrumental role globally. We will ask for the active participation of those of you who will be at the conference.

An important part of the conference is the business meeting; we have scheduled one

session on each day to transact the business of INDEN. We will be receiving reports from several committees and making decisions. The membership committee will present recommendations on institutional membership. The task force on quality will present its work and document to date on standards, criteria and indicators for quality doctoral programs. The Commission on an International Collaborative Doctoral Program has been at work for a year developing ideas, and will be presenting its report. There will be a recommendation from the Board of Directors to create a position of Chair-Elect. These are critical decisions that the membership has to make and the presence of everyone at the business meeting is crucial.

In an effort to encourage strong attendance at our Toronto conference, we are offering a 10% discount on registration for groups of 5 or more from the same institution. For this to occur, the registration and payment of all in the group must be received at the same time. I hope many of you will take advantage of this.

This offer applies both to those who are INDEN members and those who are not. Please share this information with colleagues.

We have had a successful membership campaign. Approximately 75% of the members have renewed their membership in the first round of renewals. We have been receiving quite a few new members as a result of our campaign and the assistance that many of you have been giving in spreading the word about INDEN, for which we are most grateful. There is a strong student contingent among the new member enrollments. We welcome new members and we hope to achieve a 100% renewal rate in the coming months. INDEN is as strong as its members make it, and the importance of members' willingness to contribute to INDEN's mission in a variety of ways cannot be stated strongly enough.

The Board of Directors has established the policy that members will be given a grace period of 3 months, during which several renewal reminders will be sent. If renewal does not occur within 3 months of expiry, the name will be deleted from our data base. I will have a precise breakdown of members in the various categories and

bands in my report at the business meeting.

Some of you are aware that the Treasurer, Dr. Hugh McKenna, and I have initiated the preparation of a book on international doctoral education, and we are serving as editors. A number of INDEN members are authoring chapters on different aspects of doctoral education. Routledge is the Publisher. The book is expected to fill a gap in our literature and we hope it will make a contribution to futuristic thinking about doctoral education. The royalties will go to INDEN to strengthen its financial foundation, and enable us to provide assistance to students to attend the international seminars we are organizing for doctoral students. It is expected that the book will be out in 2004.

At the ICN conference in June 2003 [moved to Geneva], several of us presented a symposium on international doctoral education and INDEN.

It was a well-attended session, and it gave a measure of added visibility to INDEN. Board members Shaké Ketefian (Chairperson), Hugh McKenna (Treasurer), and Mi Ja Kim (Board member) were the panelists. INDEN Secretary Afaf Meleis was in the audience as well.

On behalf of all of us I would like to thank Dr. Louise Jenkins, Chair of the Election Committee, and the committee members, for conducting this year's election. They have done a wonderful job, and have our gratitude. They have reported the results of the election in this issue of the *Newsletter*.

As Chairperson, speaking for myself, and for the Board of Directors, we would love to hear from you, the members. Please send us your thoughts, suggestions, recommendations and aspirations for INDEN.

See you in Toronto!

Best regards,

Shaké Ketefian, Chairperson
Ketefian@umich.edu

Mentoring Project Phase 1 Report Available

A working group of the INDEN Mentoring Project reports in this issue of the newsletter the results of the first phase of the project aimed at developing a Position Paper. The article entitled "Mentoring: A Project in Process" reports on the development and pilot testing of an opinionnaire to elicit views of faculty and students about the role of mentor in an effort to identify and clarify the critical attributes of mentoring as it relates to doctoral education. The working group has made six recommendations for continuing the project. One approach involves on-line dialogue for further contributions to the position paper. As a way of beginning this dialogue, Sr. Callista Roy has offered to e-mail to the members a couple of questions about the reported work in the weeks between the newsletter publication and the November meetings in Toronto. All members are invited to reply to the questions, to ask further questions, and raise issues for on-line dialogue.

Mentoring: A Project in Process
C. Roy, M. Murphy L. Eisenhauer*
William F. Connell School of Nursing
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

Introduction and Overview

In June of 2001, the International Network for Doctoral Education in Nursing Board of Directors proposed a "list of ideas" for consideration at the business meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark. One of the talking points was "what is expected of mentors?" As a result, a Task Force was appointed to work toward developing an INDEN Position Paper on Mentoring. The first author serves on that Task Force. Mentoring often has been described as a key process in the development and socialization of scholars (Byrne & Keefe, 2002). In doctoral education the student's advisor usually serves as the assigned mentor for the student. Different titles are used in various countries for this mentor role; advisor, sponsor, promoter, supervisor are examples. The qualifications and responsibilities of the mentor vary in institutions and in different countries. Therefore it was thought to be timely to initiate discussion of the mentor role in preparation for the anticipated position paper.

This document reports on the work done by a subgroup in the USA (convened by Dr. Roy) that addressed the development and pilot testing of an opinionnaire to elicit the views of faculty and students about the role of mentor. It describes the pilot testing of the instrument in one program and makes recommendations for future steps to be taken. These include further data collection and dialogue, with a view toward creating an INDEN Position Paper on Mentoring in Doctoral Programs by the Biennial meeting in 2005.

Development of Opinionnaire

Sakalys, Stember & McGilvery (2001) concluded from their study of alumni outcomes that further study was needed to link the process of doctoral education to its outcomes. Data from our own doctoral program evaluation pointed to mentoring as one of the key processes in achieving desired outcomes related to research and scholarship.

INDEN's focus on mentoring and our experiences led us to look to key documents and other programs and settings for approaches to the mentoring process.

- ❖ The Pew Foundation Report on Re-Envisioning the PHD (2000)
- ❖ Indicators of quality in research-focused doctoral programs in nursing (AACN, 2001)
- ❖ INDEN draft of International Quality Indicators for Doctoral Programs. (Kim, 2001)

The University of Michigan Handbooks on Mentoring (2001) for both faculty and students were very helpful. Their work evolved from faculty and student conversations around ways to improve the Ph.D. experience.

Barbosa's work (2000) at the University of Maryland was useful in conceptualizing components of the mentoring process from the perspective of the faculty's expectations of students and the students' expectations of faculty within the mentoring relationship. His conceptualization of the components of mentoring (see Table I) provided many of the stems for a 50 item instrument for use in the USA pilot. Many of our items related to what the mentor wants to see in the

student and what the student sought in a faculty mentor.

Table 1 (adapted for newsletter)

What faculty want in a student:

Commitment; communication; curiosity; sound work ethic and follow through

What students want in a mentor:

Assistance; communication; guidance; entre; support

Adapted from Barbosa, P (2000).

Strengthening your graduate program through mentorship.

(www.gradschool.umed.edu/mentorship/mentorexpect.html). Retrieved: April, 2002

Piloting of the Opinionnaire

A pilot survey was conducted to identify agreement on the items between faculty and students involved in one program. For the pilot survey, 14 faculty and 17 students attending a Doctoral Research Development Day at a university in the northeastern part of the USA completed the Opinionnaire. This represented approximately 76 percent of those in attendance. Faculty had varying experience with mentoring as advisors in the doctoral program. The doctoral students were finishing the first or second year of course work and a few were newly admitted students.

The opinionnaire was in 4 sections; mentor qualifications, mentor responsibilities, general expectations, expectations of students. Response choices were essential, preferable and optional.

A summary of findings follows:

Faculty and students agreed that the following qualifications were *essential* for a mentor.

- ❖ a doctoral degree
- ❖ publication/recognition for research and scholarship
- ❖ awareness of the scope of the discipline and state of knowledge development and of a given area
- ❖ understandings of the program and the procedure for approval of research.

Two items that more students than faculty felt were *essential* are experience and expertise related to the student's area of interest and experience in the guidance of research. Student comments handwritten

in this section included: the mentor should "provide support and guidance; give the inside story and help interpret curriculum and policy; provide helpful feedback; open doors; be what one aspires to be and helps (sic) student assimilate those characteristics."

Regarding mentor responsibilities, the faculty and students agreed at the *essential* level on the following:

- ❖ helps the student to formulate and refine both short and long-term goals.
- ❖ guides the student in formulation of a plan of study.
- ❖ guides the student in the development of the dissertation proposal.
- ❖ helps the student to identify and successfully obtain funding for education and/or research.

On one item the faculty and students indicated less agreement. Faculty were evenly split between *essential* and *preferable*, whereas a little more than twice as many students responded *essential* (versus preferable) on the following item:

- ❖ promotes the overall development of the student through experiences in teaching, grant writing, writing for publication, paper presentations.

To a lesser degree faculty and students saw it as *essential* that the mentor assists the student in readiness and preparing for comprehensive/general/qualifying examinations and with identifying individuals to serve on examination and/or dissertation committees. Assistance in providing opportunities for the student to network with other professionals and scholars in nursing and other disciplines and assistance with career planning was valued somewhat lower by both faculty and students. Items that had less support, with close to half the students marking them as *optional*, were sharing the history and foundation of the discipline and maintaining post-graduation involvement and guidance of the student.

A general comment from one faculty member at the end of the items related to the responsibilities of the mentor noted that "something is left to students." The student comments in this section related to the nature of the relationship as happy, assistance and guidance with funding,

helping the student focus on the doctoral experience and the need for mentors to guide students in seeing the need to decrease hours working (in positions they held before beginning doctoral studies), and guiding the student through progression in the program to graduation.

Related to General Expectations, faculty and students tended to agree on the following items as *essential*:

has a broad perspective on nursing as a discipline with a specific focus of research interests that lead to significant contributions to knowledge for nursing.

- ❖ has a commitment to the sustained time and effort required of a scholar and mentor in nursing.
- ❖ ensures the responsible conduct of science.
- ❖ has a record of fulfilling scholarly and academic commitments in a timely fashion.
- ❖ is committed to the student's success and completion of the program in a reasonable time period.
- ❖ is competent in research writing and capable of directing others in developing these skills.
- ❖ Both groups were close to evenly split between the following two items as *essential* or *preferable*:
- ❖ is actively involved in the key issues and debates of nursing as a scholarly discipline.
- ❖ maintains a network of contacts that can be called upon as resources for student.

One faculty member's comment at the end of this section asked whether "mentors must get mentored?" One student noted that "the student needed self direction and initiative and to not be dependent."

Concerning the Expectations of Students, the following items were marked *essential* by most faculty and students:

The mentor schedules regular meetings with the student to explore goals, expectations and progress.

- ❖ The mentor gives priority to the student as learner.
- ❖ The mentor allows for the student's independent learning.
- ❖ The mentor is flexible in meeting the student's changing needs.

- ❖ The mentor credits publicly the student's contributions to teaching and research.
- ❖ The mentor allows for the student to grow beyond the mentor's expertise.

Agreement between faculty and students was noted on the following items where about half of each group marked the following as *essential* and half *preferable*:

- ❖ The mentor facilitates professional relationships advantageous to student development.

Some items in this section showed a spread and/or inconsistency in responses. The Committee believed that there was ambiguity in wording and has re-worked these items for clarity.

The hand-written comments were summarized. Some related to items about providing resources such as office, desk space, computer and statistical support, noting that this was a university responsibility and that faculty had little control over this. One faculty member's comment related to boundary issues when the phrase "personal interest" was used in an item, while another mentioned co-dependence. Another commented that students have a variety of mentors, across settings. A faculty member commented that flexibility had to be within reason. Several faculty members commented on the profoundness of the mentoring role and the need for preparation to be a mentor, and also that workload credit must be given for mentoring.

One student commented that the student has responsibility and another noted that the institution should support faculty time for mentoring. Finally, one student commented that crediting student contributions will build confidence in the student.

Example of Use of Data From Opinionnaire

To illustrate how the opinionnaire can be used to enhance the mentoring process, at this institution it was used to plan and conduct a Faculty Forum on Mentoring in the Doctoral program. A modified form was developed in which 39 of the opinionnaire items were used to indicate whether it was a High or Low priority for faculty development and whether the

likelihood of the person participating in an educational program on the item was High or Low. Thirteen faculty members of about 30, who are full-time and tenured track, filled out the needs assessment (available from Dr. Roy). The resulting Faculty Forum was attended by 10 faculty members and included the following topics for discussion:

1. Advising

- ❖ Helps the student to formulate and refine both short and long term goals.
- ❖ Guides the student in formulation of a plan of study.

2. Mentoring students to be scholars

- ❖ Offers the beginning student interesting research experiences.
- ❖ Ensures adequate depth and breadth of research experiences for the student through practica, and other formal and informal experiences.
- ❖ Provides entry and support for the student into the research team and/or links to peers and other scholars.
- ❖ Facilitates professional relationships advantageous to student development.
- ❖ Allows for the student to grow beyond the mentor's expertise.

3. Comprehensive Exams

- ❖ Assists the student in assessing readiness and preparing for comprehensive/general/qualifying examinations.
- ❖ Assists the student to identify individuals to serve on examination and/or dissertation committees

4. Dissertation development

- ❖ Schedules regular meetings with the student to explore goals, expectations and progress
- ❖ Guides the student in the development of the dissertation proposal.
- ❖ Directs the student in research writing competence.
- ❖ This seemed to be a useful approach to stimulate thinking and discussion on this important topic, faculty learning from each others' experiences, and hopefully enriching the educational experience for doctoral students.

Summary

The USA Opinionnaire Version I is attached in its revised form. In the spirit of improving communication between faculty and students in Ph.D. programs in nursing

we hope that others will use it to expand the data base on experiences in other programs in the USA and globally. Although much of our work is based on small numbers and qualitative observations we believe it is representative in many ways. Variations on this opinionnaire are encouraged so that various traditions, different approaches to doctoral education (e.g., doctorate by coursework versus doctorate by dissertation), and the philosophy of the faculty are incorporated. Even within a given doctoral program there also may be differences in beliefs about what constitutes the role of the mentor. We note differences existing between the perceptions and expectations of the faculty mentors and the students in our institution. It is expected that this will be the case in other institutions as well. As with any pilot we fully expect revisions of the USA version and adaptive changes to provide an instrument for use in different member countries.

Recommendations

The purpose of these recommendations is to facilitate the preparation of the first draft of an INDEN Position Paper on Mentoring in Doctoral Programs by the Biennial meeting in 2005. Specifically we recommend:

Members of INDEN from different countries collaborate to conduct a similar survey in their countries/regions INDEN collect data from members worldwide on expectations of mentors. Members can adapt the revised 49-item opinionnaire, taking into account terminology and specific characteristics of their country/environment, and administer it to provide data to INDEN.

Members can use the opinionnaire, or an adapted version, to assess faculty and student agreement in their own settings. Individual schools can use the opinionnaire, or an adapted version, to assess faculty needs for development in the role of mentor and use the assessment to plan relevant faculty development programs.

INDEN can provide for on-line dialogue for further contributions to a position paper.

References/Resources

AACN (2001). Indicators of quality in research-focused doctoral programs in

nursing. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Nursing.

Barbosa, P (2000). Strengthening your graduate program through mentorship. Retrieved April, 2002 from [\(www.gradschool.umed.edu/mentorship/mentorexpect.html/\)](http://www.gradschool.umed.edu/mentorship/mentorexpect.html/)

Byrne, M. W. & Keefe, M. R. (2002). Building research competence through mentoring. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*.: 34 (4), 391-396.

Kim, M. J. (chair) (2001) International quality Indicators for doctoral programs. INDEN Task Forces, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Ketefian, S. (2001). Ideas to consider in establishing priorities, INDEN BOD. Handout at INDEN Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Lewis, E (Ed) (2001). *How to get the mentoring you want: A guide for graduate students at a diverse university*. University of Michigan Press. Retrieved: April, 2002 from www.rackham.umich.edu/studentinfo/publications/studentmentoring/contents.html).

Sakalys, J.A., Stember, M. L. & McGilvery, J.K. (2001). Nursing doctoral program evaluation: Alumni outcomes, *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 17 (2), 87-95.

Korean-American Nurses celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Immigration to the United States.

The "International Conference on Overseas Korean Nursing Scholarship: Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of Korean Nurses Immigration to the U.S.A. and Overseas" will be held on 11/15/03 in Los Angeles to highlight Korean nurses achievement and leadership in the United States and abroad. The gala banquet will be held in the evening with national and international dignitaries to honor distinguished nurse leaders and celebrate nurses professional life abroad. The conference will be held in Radisson Wilshire Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles (213 368-3000). Drs. Mi Ja Kim, the University of Illinois at Chicago and Jung Sook Miller at Cal. State Univ. are co-directors of the International Conference and 46 presentations will be made including 32 research abstracts and 14 panelists. In addition to the research presentations, the panels are: faculty/doctoral students, clinicians/APNs and nurse entrepreneurs, and non-USA overseas nurses. Mrs. Boon Ja Lee and Ki Sook Kwon, both nurse

leaders in Los Angeles are co-directors for the overall event.

This event will provide a wonderful opportunity to network among Korean colleagues in education, practice and service/business, both in the U.S., Korea and Europe and honor our leaders. We plan to organize the Overseas Korean Nurses Association (temporary name) during the conference to promote networking among nurses, nurse scholars/researchers, and doctoral students, and provide mentoring opportunities for students. To date, more than 80 Korean-American faculty and doctoral students have been identified in the United States, and we continue to gather more names as we know this is only a small fraction of the total numbers.

Dr. Mi Ja Kim, one of the founding members of the Asian American Pacific Islanders Association (AAPINA) is pleased to lead this conference and look for more opportunities for the AAPINA members to strengthen the relationship with Korean-American nurse leaders and students.

A Valuable and Useful Experience: Advances in Qualitative Methods, The Fourth International Interdisciplinary Conference (2 -5 May 2003), Banff, Alberta, Canada. A report by Morris E. Brodrick

The beautiful town of Banff in the Canadian Rockies hosted about 450 attendees at the Fourth International Interdisciplinary Conference hosted by IIQM (International Institute for Qualitative Methodology), University of Alberta, Canada. The variety of content at this conference on advances in qualitative methods attracted interests from novice to expert qualitative / mixed method researchers, including doctoral students and subject experts who author some of the acclaimed research texts that are used in the qualitative enquiry. The scientific director of IIQM and editor, *Qualitative Health Research* journal, Dr Janice Morse, opened the conference. This was followed by a keynote address by Dr Norman Denzin, editor and author of the widely used *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. It was often exchanged at breakfast and dinner conversations that attendees were impressed with the quality of the oral and poster presentations. For

doctoral students, this “sweater and jeans event” immediately sets one at ease in a relaxed and comfortable atmosphere that promotes dialogue with experts and fellow students alike. It certainly was a fun experience alongside major new learning occurring. Presentations included a fascinating mixture of methodological and substantive topics in qualitative research including issues in data collection, validity, ethics, conduct of research, interviewing, paradigmatic approaches, methodological innovations, narratives, life stories, eliciting experience, triangulation, video research, phenomenology, grounded theory, meta-analysis, critical ethnography, instrument development, arts-based research, concept analysis, and the use of technology, computing and the web. At the beginning of the concurrent sessions, an invited expert speaker presented a lecture followed by conversations with the expert, which promoted learning and enquiry specific to the context of the audience. The post conference full-day workshops conducted by experts in the field were valuable and worthwhile. Workshop topics included ethnography, dialectic of meaning, arts-based research, using video in research, qualitative analysis, narrative enquiry, introductory qualitative research, focus groups, concept development, and experience and story. The experts respectively were Michael Agar, Max van Manen, Joe Norris, Jude Spiers, Juliet Corbin, Arthur Frank, Maria Mayan, David Morgan, Janice Morse and Jean Clandinin.

Two noteworthy conference presentations for me were by (1) Dr. Janice Morse on ‘Writing for Publication’ and (2) Dr. Julianne Cheek on ‘Research Identity’. The many doctoral students in the first session benefited from the focus on writing from dissertation to publication. Helpful insights from the desk of the editor were shared giving fascinating insight to the writing process from the perspective of both the writer and the publisher. Of particular benefit were the questions asked by the audience ranging from salient technical aspects of constructing an article to dealing with rejection of journal articles. The answers came from the extensive experience background of Dr. Morse with precision and clarity in “down-to-earth how to” responses. The second session by Dr. Cheek from the University of South Australia was an

introspective encounter for both seasoned and novice researchers. The title of the session best summarizes the experience – ‘strategically planning and advancing an identity as a qualitative researcher: considerations, choices and consequences’. This was a critical point for me in my development as a qualitative researcher. Dr. Cheek facilitated an introspective journey that embraced an inventory of the main versus peripheral activities that captures one’s time and attention. This was followed by a focus on the factors that contribute to creating, maintaining and sustaining research activities. The prospective aspect of the journey included considerations of what lies ahead on one’s research calendar on funded projects, conference participation, publications in draft, scholarship, networking and collaboration, organizational commitment and committee participation, teaching, administration and practice obligations, and quality of academic and research life. The culmination for me still rings clearly in my mind – position your thinking, position yourself as a researcher according to the research profile you decide for you!

This reflective experience was a turning point for me because it became a major force in reviewing and clarifying my own essential versus non-essential activities that result in the perception of there not being enough time to undertake meaningful research activities and to contribute, however minor or major, to the advancement of qualitative research methods. As part of follow-up action on meaningful research effort, I became involved in an international collaborative activity between South Australia, England, the Middle East / South Africa, to review the use of the vignette technique in qualitative methodology. Beyond the new insights gained from this ongoing interdisciplinary exchange, the international collaboration adds purpose to ensure that one targets the next useful conference for sharing and exchange so that the spirit and momentum of qualitative enquiry is advanced. In 2004 there are two IIQM qualitative research conferences worth considering. The first is scheduled for January 29 – 31, 2004: the Fifth Anniversary Advances in Qualitative Methods Conference in Edmonton, Canada

www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/aqm2004/info.html

and the second is scheduled for April 30 – May 4, 2004: the Tenth Anniversary Qualitative Health research Conference in Banff, Alberta, Canada (www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/qhr2004/informati on.htm). The workshops offered at these conferences are attractive, in addition to keynote speakers that include John Creswell, Max van Manen, Kathy Charmaz and Linda Connell. Undoubtedly for qualitative researchers these are conferences worth considering for the 2004 calendar!

Morris E. BODRICK, *Director Clinical Nursing, National Guard King Abdulaziz Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and PhD(Nursing) student, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa.*

Report on the 3rd Annual International Doctoral Workshop by Nadia Ali Muhammad Ali Charania, Pakistan Emiko Imamura, Japan, Pratum Soivong, Thailand and Tanyaluk Obeom, Thailand

The four authors of this report represented INDEN (International Network for Doctoral Education in Nursing) in attending the 3rd Annual International Doctoral Workshop at Lund University, Sweden from June 15 to 19, 2003. The topic of this workshop was “Living with Cancer and Other Chronic Diseases and Palliative Care.” This workshop was a collaboration effort of Lund University, Sweden; University of Ulster, Northern Ireland; The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, U.S.A.; and The University of Toronto, Canada. A total of 12 doctoral students (4 from Lund, 2 from The University of North Carolina, 2 from The University of Ulster, and 4 from INDEN), and 7 nursing faculty (3 from Lund University, 2 from The University of North Carolina, and 2 from The University of Ulster) attended this workshop.

The purposes of this workshop were to (a) enable doctoral students to meet with other doctoral students and faculty from participating countries to exchange ideas and share academic, clinical, and scholarly experiences; (b) present and discuss doctoral research projects; (c) create a network with other participating members working in similar areas of research; and (d) dialogue on future research directions and the next international doctoral workshop.

Over the five-day workshop which was conducted in a professional and friendly environment, a variety of topics were discussed. This included discussions on the health and social care systems of each representative country. In addition, the participants presented the PhD programs and current research trends at their universities.

Through these presentations and discussions, the participants learned the similarities and differences among the various health and social care systems and PhD programs. The INDEN representatives shared information about INDEN and encouraged participants to become INDEN members to create strong ties among nurses in the world and to strengthen nursing scholarship.

The most exciting part of this workshop was the presentation of doctoral research projects followed by an in-depth discussion about theoretical, methodological, and ethical and moral issues related to each project. These discussions provided valuable opportunities for the doctoral students to gain new insights about strengthening their research projects. It also enabled the doctoral students to establish a network with other doctoral students and faculty members working in similar research areas or using similar research methodologies. In addition, the doctoral students had excellent opportunities to professionally critique one another's research projects and to respond to questions raised about their own projects.

To meet the themes of the workshop the faculty from the representative universities conducted three thematic lectures. The first thematic lecture was on “living with a chronic illness.” In this session, the presenters described the phenomenon of chronic illness using cancer and pain as exemplars. The participants focused particularly on current methodological and cultural issues related to the phenomenon and suggested future directions to address these issues.

The second thematic lecture was on “palliation and chronic disease.” In this session, the presenters highlighted the practical, and ethical and moral issues they encountered while conducting their research projects. In addition, they shared

how they dealt with these issues and how to deal with them in future research. They also invited participants to share their experiences with such issues. Furthermore, the presenter shared the research project that used a phenomenological approach for understanding patients' experiences with chronic illness (the concept of suffering) and the ways they dealt with the chronic illness (the concept of alleviation of suffering). This presentation gave the participants new insights into the human experiences of living with and dealing with chronic illness. It also increased awareness about the importance of focusing on patients' perspectives of living with chronic illness rather than focusing on professionals' perspectives on how patients with chronic illness should be cared for. The participants developed a greater appreciation for the value of knowledge generated from qualitative research and its enormous potential to contribute to nursing education and practice.

The third thematic lecture was on "chronic disease from care/nursing and a family perspective." The presenter shared her research project entitled "Existential Support in Brain Tumour Patients and their Spouses," using a new qualitative approach, called "phenomenography." We gained an idea of how nursing knowledge generated from research can be a valuable asset in establishing nursing education programs in holistic nursing care for patients with chronic and life threatening diseases.

Besides these three thematic lectures there was a special lecture introducing the new idea of looking at the link between nursing theory and practice. This idea poses an argument that there is, per se, no gap between nursing theory and practice. This new idea raised new questions regarding the relationship between nursing theory and practice.

The unique opportunity of attending the 3rd International Doctoral Workshop provided doctoral students, INDEN representatives, the professional and scholarly experiences, which are highlighted as follows:

1. Broadened our knowledge and perspectives about chronic illness, theoretical, methodological, and ethical and moral issues in nursing research.
2. Provided an opportunity to network and exchange ideas both professionally and socially with other international doctoral students and faculty members from representative universities. This network has a potential for establishing internationally collaborative research programs, which would assist in developing culturally sensitive nursing practice.
3. Enhanced critical thinking and facilitated academic discourse which we believe are necessary for doctoral students to become nursing scholars.
4. Presented our research proposals to an international group of nursing researchers who were not familiar with the projects. This provided us an opportunity to receive diverse feedback and fresh perspectives. In addition, sharing culturally specific research projects with an international community of nursing scholars drew our attention to the similarities and differences that researchers around the world are experiencing in their research projects.
5. Experienced support and respect as nursing scholars. In addition, our research projects were valued and recognized as making potential contributions to future nursing knowledge.
6. Increased awareness about various considerations that we researchers must pay attention to when selecting a particular methodology such as qualitative and/or quantitative methods, to answer research questions.

Finally, we would like to extend our deepest gratitude to INDEN for providing us an opportunity to participate in an outstanding international workshop. We thank our own universities [Chiang Mai University, the University of Michigan] for their support of our attendance. We also thank the consortium of four universities that sponsored the workshop. We strongly recommend that INDEN continue its support for doctoral students to participate in future international workshops.

**Forthcoming Conference
National Nursing Research Conference
May 12-14 2004**

Yolanda Bbenko-Mould is a student member of INDEN and a member of the University of Western Ontario School of Nursing, Public Relations Committee for the National Nursing Research Conference May 12-14 2004 being held in London, Ontario, Canada.

The title of the conference is **“Transforming Health Care Through Nursing Research: Making it Happen.”** Yolanda suggests that you take advantage of this opportunity to present your thesis research at a prestigious national conference and share your work at the graduate student poster exchange. Award are given for the best Masters and Doctoral Level Posters.

Other events exclusive to graduate students are:

Pre-conference workshop: From idea to ink: Writing for Publication with Editor Nikki Polis

Graduate Student Breakfast: The experience of being a graduate student: How to make a difference along the way. Gail Tomblin Murphy, Associate Professor, Dalhousie University.

The program will also include invited symposia, special programs for graduate students, social events and **keynote speakers:**

Linda Cronenwett, University of North Carolina
Sally Thorne, University of British Columbia
Diane Doran, University of Toronto

Abstracts are invited which are relevant to the conference theme in the areas of education, service, policy, and practice are invited for paper, poster, and symposium presentations.

ABSTRACT DEADLINE: November 19, 2003

Visit the website for details:

<http://publish.uwo.ca/~maandrus/nnrc/nnrc.htm>

Deadline for submission of items for the next newsletter is 31st January 2004

Please send items to m.gray@napier.ac.uk