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CHAPTER I
Introduction and Rationale

Introduction

This paper is the culmination of a year spent with graduate students at the Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. The author studied their professional socialization to the field of student personnel work, combining periodic interviews and classroom observations. From these inputs, which were accompanied and followed by intensive review of a great volume of data, the author will present a picture and analysis of those 11 months. The students charted an active and sometimes stressful course through the demands placed before them. The meaning of those dynamics will be proposed for careful consideration.

To study a program that prepares its members for membership in an occupational field, one must first recognize that there are factors and histories to consider. In order of increasing breadth, there are four major elements. First, one is learning about a specific graduate school program for people who wished to enter student personnel work. The author cannot claim that that program was "typical" of other such programs across the nation, but it had in common many elements. Second, in order to fully comprehend the significance of this program, one must have some understanding of the meaning and history of student personnel work. Third, there is the broader disciplinary and societal concern about professional education. Fourth, the meaning and importance of
professions to society must be appreciated.

As will be explained in greater detail in Chapter III, the method by which this study was carried out demanded that the author appreciate these factors but not allow them to dictate the precise manner in which data were recorded and interpreted. Grounded qualitative methodology insists that the investigator approach the research setting without preconceived frameworks in which to place the emerging data. The data must be able to suggest their "true" meanings. Therefore, the author, while familiarizing himself with the various contexts implied by his topic, was first and foremost dedicated to learning about the social and psychological dynamics which were the professional socialization experience of the students. Later, the histories about which he will now briefly write can be considered as they relate to the data analysis.

**Histories and Definitions**

Hughes (1963) wrote that professions were becoming more numerous than ever, and that professional people were becoming an increasingly larger proportion of the workforce. Professional status, it appears, is highly sought after, what Hughes called the "professional trend" (p. 655).

As a result, writers have been very concerned with the definition of profession. The controversy has waged on, with no clear resolution of the question in sight. It has been acknowledged that this is an issue without simple answers, and that the complexity is appropriate, given the multi-faceted nature of the question. Furthermore, society itself is not static, and that makes the problem particularly perplexing.
According to Hughes (1963), the earliest meaning of the adjective "professed" was "that has taken meaning of a religious order" (p. 656). By 1675, the word was secularized as "that professes to be duly qualified" (p. 656). In other words, it changed in meaning from an act—professing—to the occupation itself. It became, as Hughes wrote, "a vocation in which professed knowledge of some branch of learning is used in its application to the affairs of others, or in the practice of an art based upon it" (p. 656).

Nelson (1980) presented the following definition.

The occupations which one professes to be skilled in and to follow. a) A vocation in which a professed knowledge of some department of learning or science is used in its application to the affairs of others or in the practice of an art founded upon it. Applied specifically to the three learned professions of divinity, law, and medicine . . . b) In wider sense: Any calling or occupation by which a person habitually earns his living. Now usually applied to an occupation considered to be socially superior to a trade or handicraft; but formally, and still in vulgar (or humorous) use, including these. (p. 276)

While concern with the definition has been a rather recent phenomenon, the existence of profession has been traced as far back as ancient Greece, in the academies fostered by the teaching of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics (Cogan, 1953). Writers such as Moore (1970) have even drawn comparisons to non-literate societies. He wrote that professional activities intermix three analytically distinct orientations. These are "the religious request for assuring immortality, the magical manipulation of non-empirical forces for achievement of observable cures, and the technical use of bone setters or herbal remedies" (p. 29). These, he claimed, are analogous to the functions of professionals and society of today. He summarized his point by
saying that specialists identifiable in non-literate societies "share several characteristics of professionalism in modern society, often rudimentary and incomplete in degree: esoteric knowledge and skills, used in service to a community and not solely for self or kinsmen, and exercised with considerable autonomy" (p. 38).

A journey through history reveals the emergence of professions and professional traditions through a variety of developments. Eleventh century England was witness to the formation of exclusive societies of teachers and students, which led to universities. It was there that it was agreed that formal license was necessary for practicing one's craft (Cogan, 1953).

Lawyers were organized into secular guilds by the 14th century, and specialists in common law split off from the church in the century that followed. Within 200 years English universities had become completely secularized (Carr-Saunders & Wilson, 1933).

As the university became a mechanism of training, scholarship, and scientific innovation, there emerged the establishment of formal and somewhat impersonal criteria for recruitment and training. This reduced significantly the probability of strictly hereditary apprenticeships. The dramatic increase in technical and scientific knowledge, particularly in medicine, required that training be codified and written, rather than handled simply by verbal communication. That led to the formalization and institutionalization of the training process.
However, the industrial revolution was probably the most significant influence on the growth of concern about professions. Modernization led to the need for highly trained people, in medicine and in engineering fields essential to industrial productivity. In addition, the growth of the service sectors in society—social, business, and more recently, computer, has led to many movements by practitioners to secure the recognition, rewards, and territorial prerogatives previously restricted to the traditional professions. By comparing themselves to the "recognized" professions, they have argued to their own members and to outside groups that they are, indeed, worthy of that title. The result has been the proliferation of opinions about the definitions, meanings, and implications of profession to which the author has referred. It also tells the reader that he/she is reviewing a study about a process whose definitional foundations are somewhat controversial and very possibly in transition.

Professional Education

History

Just as professions have evolved over time, so have the methods by which their members have been educated. Mayhew (1971) traced that evolution from colonial America. Since the colonists found it impractical or inadequate to send people to Europe for training in law, medicine, and religion, they developed the American concept of apprenticeship. Medical apprentices performed some unsophisticated but professional duties, Mayhew reported, along with reading some books which provided theoretical knowledge. Eventually, more stringent
educational requirements for entrance to professions were established. For example, the New York City Bar developed the requirement of four years of college and five years apprenticeship for admission. Some colonial colleges began to create professorships in the professional fields, especially theology and law.

Expansion of the apprentice system led to the appearance of practitioners who were both good at and enjoyed teaching. With an increasing number of apprentices, schools were needed. In these schools there was an increasing reliance on lecture and discussion, which made it necessary to convert lecture notes into textbooks.

After the Civil War, medical research and practice increasingly drew on sciences such as chemistry and biology. Lawyers began paying greater attention to economic insights. Meanwhile, land-grant colleges were emerging and preparing students for occupations such as agriculture, engineering, and home economics, and there was an impetus to assign professional status to those fields. Overall, there were only a few institutions producing graduates of high quality. These factors, when combined with the reform power of newly-emerging state examining authorities, made for conditions which permitted colleges and universities to become responsible for the formal education of many types of professional workers (Mayhew, 1971). That potentiality has been realized in the 20th century, and, for the traditional fields, government regulations and professional conduct statements have cemented that role.
Concerns

Along with such authority come serious concerns. Professions supposedly help society deal with major problems and challenges. As Schein (1972) wrote, changes in social and technological domains led to the growth of professions, and continued changes in those areas now challenge those responsible for professional preparation efforts. Changes which have to be accounted for include (a) new work settings, (b) new types of clients, (c) advanced technology, (d) increased differentiation of professions into specialities, and (e) new social values which produce new client systems.

McGlothlin (1960) noted that the dependency of society on professions demanded, in turn, that these professions be able to supply enough people, along with insuring that they are competent to fulfill those expectations. In other words, the issue pertains to quantity and quality. The quantity issue translates into concerns about recruitment and selection of students. Quality issues, McGlothlin maintained, pertain to competence (practice and research), social understanding, personality, and "zest" for continued study and knowledge creation (p. 7). These have led to concern and discussion by educators about (a) curriculum content and structure, (b) instructional methodology, (c) faculty competence, pedigree, and rewards, (d) relationships between the university and the professional school, (e) accreditation, and (g) transmission of values regarding professional ethics.

The overriding concern, then, has been with the professional socialization of trainees. How well have they assumed the role of physician and identified with the purposes, responsibilities, ethics,
and mission of the profession? Will they carry on the traditions? Will their performance be competent enough to bring respect and honor to the field, and thus maintain the autonomy and authority it so dearly covets and protects? Does the individual feel, think, and behave like a doctor/professional?

Since the 1950s, sociologists have given a great deal of attention to these questions, writing about students in medicine, law, nursing, teaching, social work, and psychiatry, to name the most prominent. The fruit of their labors has been a clearer presentation of the dynamics that are part of that process. Significant controversies have arisen as well. What is most apparent is the complex interplay between student and organizational structure, which must be more thoroughly understood if professional education programs are to increase the effectiveness with which they facilitate the professional socialization experience. It is also clear that important questions about definitions of profession, now complicated by the changing nature of society, the workforce, and the meaning of work, must be considered in evaluating current programs and making recommendations for change.

**Student Personnel Work**

In student personnel work, one finds a field in which it is easy to find written and spoken concern about most of the issues just cited. A quick review of the literature of the past 25 years reveals an intriguing mixture of insecurity, pride, cynicism, hope, and ambition with regards to the institutional and societal roles and professional status (Arbuckle, 1953; Ayers, Tripp, & Russel, 1966;
Brown, 1972; Crookston, 1974; Dewey, 1980; Feder, Bishop, Dysinger, & Jones, 1958; Greenleaf, 1968; Hodgkinson, 1970; Penn, 1974; Penney, 1969; Williamson, 1949a, 1949b; Wrenn & Darley, 1949). There have been efforts at arriving at standards for the field (Stamatakos, 1981a, 1981b), and recommendations for methods and content of professional preparation.

Definition

The author feels safe in asserting that student personnel work is not a household term. Yet, the functions it serves in higher education are not new to that domain, and, as stated by Ayers, Tripp, and Russel (1966), are "an integral part of the higher education process" (p. 4). Many have attempted to define its essence, and they have provided exhaustive lists of its particulars. Among the functions associated with the field are housing, financial aids, counseling, career planning and placement, special population services (minorities, re-entry students, international students, to name a few), athletics, health services, orientation and admissions, student activities and unions, academic advising, and fraternity/sorority affairs. It is reasonable to summarize these efforts by saying that student personnel work is, essentially, the attempt to stimulate and support college students so they may reach their full potential as learners and human beings (p. 15).

While academicians have clearly stated that the purpose of the university is scholarship and intellectual development, student personnel workers have been steadfast in maintaining that the university's role is to develop citizens who are capable of
contributing to society not only intellectually, but socially, vocationally, creatively, physically and morally. Accordingly, student personnel workers see their role as creating an environment and providing services which enable such development to take place. They argue, too, that one cannot separate cognitive competence from social, physical, and emotional maturation, and have been involved, especially during the past 15 years, in research to support that very point. This concern, with what is known as student development and student development theory, has led to further clarifications of the stated mission of the field, along with an attempt to articulate and prove how the knowledge gained from such research can be used to enhance both classroom teaching and service delivery. The argument is stronger than ever that student personnel workers are full partners in the total educational enterprise.

History and Current Issues

It is interesting that the basic work of student personnel workers used to be handled by faculty. Traditional student personnel work concerns consisted basically of housing and student activities. Humphries (1977) provided a useful review of this history. He pointed out that as late as 1869, the administrative staff of Harvard, beyond president Charles Eliot, was only three people--a dining hall steward, a regent responsible for the dormitories, and a part-time registrar.

The 1900's were witness to the growth in number of administrative positions. As enrollments increased, there emerged new and more specialized administrative functions, and student personnel work became a specialty.
Traditional roles in administration were dean of men and women, and in the early days, appointments often came from within faculty ranks. Humphries (1977) wrote, "The deans of men and women were to preside . . . over the moral and spiritual destinies of their student wards with impeccable and unassailable dignity" (p. 62). However, the growth of college enrollments after World War II, especially in the late 1950s and the 1960s, led to a change in that charge. With what was becoming an almost universal access to higher education came student unrest and questioning of traditional values and authority. Deans and other student personnel workers were thrust into a new role. That is, while their first response was control/riot control, they soon sought to stimulate dialogue and counseling. Concurrently, deans of men and women became deans of students.

After the Kent State incident, which, in a sense, marked the end of an era, calm returned to campuses. Instead of being peace makers, the student personnel workers had to re-orient themselves. They had always maintained that they were on campus to promote student growth. Without the need to deal with student insurrection, and faced with the prospect of reduced enrollments and budgets in the 1980s, how could they justify their existence on the college campus? Furthermore, how could they convince faculty and other skeptics of the importance of a proactive developmental role?

A related challenge to student personnel workers, and to higher education in general, was also emerging—the change in the nature of higher education in American society. Projections were for reduced enrollments of traditional-age students (19-22) and increased numbers
of minorities and adults. Student personnel workers often ask themselves how they will help the university and their own staffs attract, serve, and retain these new populations. The university is also no longer the sole site of post-high school training, and the growing impatience of business with what it sees as antiquated, insufficient, and unnecessary educational methods and content has encouraged them to take on more and more of that role.

In order to provide the services, expertise, and inputs that these challenges present, student personnel work educators must be concerned with the competencies, knowledge, and awareness of their current staff. Concurrently, the professional educators must consider how to prepare new students to assume the new roles envisioned for the field. Furthermore, given the supposed lack of widespread job opportunities, continued need for self-justification, and survival in the face of budget cuts and wholesale retrenchment, how do educators attract the most qualified trainees? How can these students then be taught the skills, be assisted in internalizing the mission, and then be given encouragement to carry on the work of the field after graduation?

**Rationale for the Study**

It was with the aforementioned questions in mind that the author first approached this study. Actually, his initial interest was in what happened to people in their first professional jobs. How did they respond to the "reality" they encountered, how did they change, and what happened to their commitments and motivations?
After discussions with faculty and administrators at the university, the author realized that in order to fully appreciate the data a study of that nature would provide, it was necessary to understand the dynamics of their pre-professional preparation. That is, reactions to professional positions, goals, and commitment levels had to have a relationship with the training and orientation provided by graduate school education. Consequently, the author's dissertation study would most appropriately be of graduate students in student personnel work. And since most entry-level professional positions were given to those with a master's degree, the focus would be on that particular population.

Proposal Formation

At the time the idea of this study was being generated (spring, 1980), the author was a Ph.D. candidate in student personnel work at The Ohio State University. Simultaneously, he was a graduate administrative associate in the university's residence hall system. That position was one of several provided through an assistantship program--Student Personnel Assistant Program--formed through the relationship between the College of Education and the Division for Student Life. That program supported master's degree and Ph.D. students studying student personnel work, along with a small number in counseling psychology, counseling and guidance, and higher education administration. The author had not been a master's degree student at this institution, but during the previous three years of doctoral study had taken academic courses required by that program while
serving in a residence hall position identical with those of the master's degree students. His ongoing involvement with the residence life program provided him with a great deal of insight into what was a major component of the assistantship program.

Given the author's history and current situation, it made sense to approach those connected with the graduate academic program in student personnel work about undertaking a study of their students. Secondly, since the assistantship program was such an integral part of that program, a study of the professional socialization of those students would have been only half complete if their assistantship assignments were not considered as part of the data base.

Methodology

Some important decisions had to be made. How many students would be asked to participate? How long would the study take place? What part would faculty and staff play in the study? Finally, in what fashion would the study be carried out?

To some degree, the response to the last question helped determine the answers to the other three. The nature of the process of professional development in which the author was interested was a function of the complex interaction of individuals, groups, and their environments. Consequently, the study had to be of that entire social system. The author had to develop a thoroughly constructed portrait of the system, as well as a record of the individuals' unique perspectives on being members. Out of that data would emerge concepts and hypotheses to explain that which had been observed.
The academic and assistantship programs being studied were arranged with the intention of certain outcomes—students with particular skills, dispositions towards the profession, necessary knowledge, and perhaps a career commitment. Beyond the skeleton formed by the curriculum, assistantship duties, and a few planned educational and social events, most of what took place in the graduate program was a function of the human dynamics that evolved.

Having reviewed similar studies, one could have supposed that certain things would happen. For example, the author might have expected student subcultures to flourish. However, how that might have taken place was hardly predictable. To anticipate the emergence of social events and trends could have seriously narrowed the author's flow of data. Consequently, to create as full a picture as possible, he had to be prepared to see everything and record such data as they emerged. Since virtually everything the subjects did would somehow be related to their graduate student lives, the researcher was compelled to record as much of this information as possible.

It was only after the author had the opportunity to review and compare observations and interviews when he could begin to make tentative categories that represented trends in thought and action. As he continued, he could begin to check the validity of these categories. Eventually, through thought, review, and testing, the researcher would be able to narrow his focus to key notions that seemed to be descriptive of the social situation and developmental dynamics.
At that point, explanatory concepts could be speculated about. The author could hypothesize that due to conditions x, y, and z, factors 1, 2, 3, and 4, and situational variables I, II, and III, students in this graduate program acted and felt the way they did about themselves and the field of student personnel work. Finally, having thoroughly recorded, studied, and evaluated the data, the author could begin to ponder the broader meanings and applications. Perhaps a key factor in professional socialization would be, for instance, anticipatory socialization, or some other concept that had no precedent in the literature.

In summary, the author has just described, albeit simplicistically, the process and rationale behind qualitative grounded theory development. Glaser and Strauss (1967) provided a compellingly supportive discussion of this research strategy. In addition, they described the method of comparative analysis, a five-step process through which the investigator may handle the data he/she is gathering and develop insights, concepts, and hypotheses. After considering the topic he wished to investigate, the organizational structures, and situational variables, it was clear that a research approach guided by this methodology and philosophy was most appropriate for this study. The reader will find greater detail and explanation in Chapters III and V.

Specifying Conditions

The desire to develop as complete a picture as possible led the author to initially consider interviewing all degree candidates on a
periodic basis, as well as attending all of their classes and program meetings. He also hoped to join them at meals, informal "bull sessions," and parties. Interviews with assistantship supervisors, faculty, and academic advisers would have contributed to the emerging portrait as well.

Given the means of research support available, it was not feasible to engage in all those activities. Some limitations were necessary. However, the problem was not as difficult to resolve as might appear. First, the author wanted to focus on the socialization of master's degree students, so Ph.D. students, despite their interaction with the former, did not need to participate in interviews. Second, his study was of trainees for student personnel work careers. Therefore, students not in that academic program, that is, counseling psychology, higher education administration, counseling and guidance, who were also not in the Student Personnel Assistant Program, were eliminated. However, students from those three fields who were in that assistantship program were interviewed, since they shared in some classroom and many residence life experiences with the student personnel work students. However, they were included only in an auxiliary way in the data analysis.

Third, since insights into professional socialization were to be garnered from the perspective of the students, interviews with staff and faculty, while perhaps helpful, were not essential. Fourth, as suggested by the governing research methodology, the researcher was expected to observe events and pursue information suggested by the emerging data. Accordingly, the author could choose from the many class sessions in a fashion consistent with the data. Not all classes required his presence.
Managing the Study

What emerged, then, was a proposal to interview master's degree students in student personnel work, both full- and part-time, assistantship and non-assistantship, along with students in the assistantship program from higher education administration, counseling psychology, and counseling and guidance. Interviews would take place three times in the year, one per fall, winter, and spring quarters. Due to his time parameters, the author would have to work with the first- and second-year classes simultaneously, as opposed to following one group over the entire two years of study. He would observe classes and official program meetings. Finally, since housing was such an integral aspect of the first year, he would also observe students' orientation to housing and related staff training.

During the interviews, the author would present questions which would allow the participants to express their definitions, evaluations, and commitments to student personnel work. In those sessions, each ranging from one to two hours in length, the participants would talk about the three basic aspects of their lives as graduate students--classes, assistantships, and social lives. (Students without assistantships could not, of course, discuss the second factor.) The students also would be asked to talk about major programs or elements of the experience associated with the university, such as the initial orientation to the assistantship and academic programs, the second-year selection process, and the job search process.
Finally, in these discussions the students would be asked to explain their current reactions and perceptions of their environment, as well as comparing them with previous impressions. This applied also to matters relating to self-concept, commitments, and goals.

In the spirit of grounded research methodology, the author planned to record his social observations and tape record all interviews. These data he would review in an ongoing fashion. With the assistance of his adviser and doctoral committee, he would try to develop ideas about what he was encountering in his study. These hypotheses or hunches, what Mintzberg (1979) referred to as "creative leaps," (p. 584) would lead to category creation. These categories would be coded, thus suggesting and facilitating future observational choices and data recording. However, the author would also remain open to other perspectives on the data, as he would have to guard against premature closure. In fact, nothing would be concluded until all data had been gathered and thoroughly reviewed.

Between quarters the author would review the previous quarter's events with his adviser and attempt to reach tentative hypotheses about what had been taking place. The progress of the study would be reviewed and, if necessary, changes would be considered. The author expected to learn not only about his topic but also about how to carry out this kind of research in a more effective manner.

Finally, after all data had been collected, the final analysis and synthesis would be undertaken. It was expected that in addition to explanations of what had taken place during the past year, many questions for further study would be raised.
Limitations

Despite the confidence with which the author approached this study, he was aware of the limitations that surrounded his efforts. Ideally, this study should have been carried out over two years with a team of researchers. Trained to observe and record data, as well as interview participants, they would allow the author to collect more extensive stores of information and to more effectively process that data. The author's energies could then have been devoted to analysis. Without such a team, he was limited physically in how much he could do.

A second major consideration was the relationship of the author to the research situation. He was a member of the program under scrutiny, with allegiances, values, commitments, and personal relationships therein. There was a very real concern about the willingness of students to participate fully in their interviews with someone with whom they could have had any of several relationships, including peer, friend, and subordinate. The author, despite the assurances he gave participants about confidentiality, reported to a committee composed of individuals who taught the classes and ran the programs in which these students participated. Would participant self-protection subvert the value of the data?

This question was studied with great care. The author and his committee felt that despite his entrenchment in the program, the author's reputation in that community was "clean." He would attempt to maintain that reputation by giving explicit definitions of how the study would take place and what being a participant would mean.
By honoring his pledge to those participants, any doubts would cease to exist.

In addition, the author would be extremely diligent in his deportment throughout the year. He would be careful to speak about the study only with his committee, and to do so in a fashion which safeguarded the participants' anonymity. He would not reveal to anyone the identity of the participants. During interviews, he would treat the students as subjects, not colleagues. In other words, a clinical, detached approach to the work of the study would be the best way of reinforcing the genuineness of his pledge.

On the other hand, the author would have to continue to function as a member of the residence life program and a Ph.D. student. Those responsibilities would bring him in contact with participants on many occasions, ranging from formal meetings and training sessions to casual interactions on the campus, meals, and parties. It would be imperative that in those instances the author behave in the fashion attributed to the situation/role. To change his normal working and social style because of the study could very well have raised doubts about the boundaries of the research situation and thus led to a loss of the trust that would be so crucial to the study.

Given these awarenesses and precautions, along with the author's and committee's confidence in his ability to maintain those roles successfully, this study was approved. The author realized that he would not necessarily be privy to all the private feelings that a participant might be willing to reveal to a totally neutral investigator. On the other hand, due to the trust and respect developed from
non-research interactions, he might have been able to gain deeper insights than would the neutral observer. There was no formula that could be applied to the situation to predict the outcome. Clearly, the nature of what emerged during the year would either support the author's optimism or invalidate the study. Upon entering the project, the author had strong reason to be confident in the former outcome. When it concluded, interviewee comments and the author's own observations supported the usefulness of the results.

Summary

The reader is now prepared to proceed through the upcoming pages. They include a review of related literature, a discussion of the methodology by which the study was carried out, a report of the data, and an analysis of the meaning of this work. Historical trends, societal changes, and current issues regarding professions, higher education, and student personnel work, combined with the author's keen interest in career development, brought him to the point of learning in great detail about the professional socialization experiences of a group of first- and second-year master's degree students at the Ohio State University. From these efforts one can learn how these students developed interests, learned and used skills, and made occupational and life choices and commitments related to student personnel work. Furthermore, that information will suggest broader, perhaps more abstract meanings which may give students, practitioners, educators, and planners food for thought as they chart a course for educational and social progress.
CHAPTER II
Review of the Literature

Aside from direct observation, interest in this study has been stimulated by review of a rather significant body of literature. For the past 27 years there has been a concerted effort at developing a greater understanding of the sociology of professional education. Much of the literature has been concerned with the professional socialization of medical students. These efforts have produced greater insight into processes through which students acquire the necessary skills and attitudes for entrance as bona fide members of the professional medical world. Significant controversies have arisen as well, providing continuing interest in this topic.

Brim (1966) defined socialization as the process by which individuals acquire knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make them members of their society. People acquire an understanding of recognized statuses, and they learn what behavior is expected of people occupying the roles of that society. Role learning, in turn, takes place through personality development. Children develop what Brim called "self-other systems," self-definitions and orientations towards social roles determined by expectations for and evaluations of their behavior by significant others in their environment. The judgements are especially potent when they are associated with the power to reward or punish
The rewards (praise, acceptance, status) and punishments (criticism, rejection) reinforce the learning of role expectations of others. The result, said Brim, is that individuals anticipate how others will respond to their behavior and act accordingly. They are motivated to live up to their standards, as their sense of well-being depends a great deal on acceptance, which, in turn, comes from conformity.

While this does speak to socialization in general, it is mostly aimed at childhood. Brim (1966) went on to talk about socialization and how it changes in the latter stages of the life cycle. He noted shifts in the content of socialization. Most important, he contended, is a change in content from a concern with values and motives to a concern with overt behavior. Other changes include shifts from "(a) acquisition of new material to a synthesis of the old, (b) concern about idealism to realism, (c) teaching expectations to teaching how to mediate conflict among expectations, and (d) concern with general demands of society to a concern with role-specific expectations" (p. 276).

Brim's (1966) discussion was not made in the context of professional education. However, it overlapped concepts found in that body of literature. Merton (1957) wrote that socialization referred to the following:

the processes by which people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills and knowledge—in short, the culture—current in the groups of which they are, or seek to become a member. It refers to the learning of social roles. In its application to the medical student, socialization refers to the processes through which he develops his professional self, with its characteristic values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills,
fusing these into a more or less consistent set of dispositions which govern his behavior in a wide variety of professional (and extraprofessional) situations. Socialization takes place primarily through social interaction with people who are "significant for the individual." (p. 287)

Becker and Carper (1956a) studied graduate students in physiology, philosophy, and mechanical engineering. They noted that students' participation in informal peer groups, apprenticeship relationships with professors, and formal academic structures of the university led to new experiences and changes in self-image. In the same article they wrote about the elements of identification with a profession. Students, they claimed, experienced a change in identity due to the development of interest in profession-related problems, growth of and pride in applicable skills, and, finally, the acquisition of professional ideology and internalization of associated motives. In an article that followed (Becker & Carper, 1956b), they addressed more directly the major elements of work identification. These four were (a) occupational title and associated ideology, (b) commitment to task, (c) commitment to a particular organization or institutional position, and (d) significance of one's position in the larger society.

A difference can be noted in the works of Becker and Carper (1956a, 1956b) from that of Merton (1957). While the latter discussed socialization, the former concentrated on what one might call the process of identifying with a field or occupation. Occupational identification undeniably is a desired outcome of professional education, a product of the socialization process. However, socialization in medical school encompasses a wide range of factors and outcomes that may or may not influence occupational identification. One of the
significant controversies in this field centers around the extent to which students are socialized to the profession while in medical school. The major question being raised is if students are socialized to the medical profession while in school, or if true identification must take place after the student enters the field as a full-time professional. In short, is it possible that students are socialized to medical school and not the medical profession?

The prevailing sentiment, guided by Merton's (1957) writings, was, until the publication of Boys in White (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961), that students in medical school were physicians-in-training. That is, they were being socialized to the profession by virtue of their medical program. However, Becker challenged this point of view, claiming that students were not being socialized to the medical profession, but rather the society of the school in which they were enrolled. He felt that the identities and commitments developed in that setting did not necessarily persist into professional practice.

Simpson (1979) provided a useful review of this issue in an attempt to bridge the existing gaps. She labelled the former school of thought the inductive approach, and the latter reactive. Inductive refers to the induction of students into a professional role, while reactive indicates that students react to educational experiences on a situational basis. Another implication of the difference is that the former sees faculty as the socializing agents, while the latter would claim that students create their own behaviors and attitudes.
The assumptions upon which these two approaches rest, when compared, perhaps extricate for the reader some important understandings about the essence of professional socialization. Those underlying the induction approach, according to Simpson (1979), include the following:

1. A profession is essentially an institution of society, around which a subculture develops (Merton, 1957).

2. The professional school faculty, being the main repository of this culture, must pass on to the students the knowledge, skills, norms and history of the profession.

3. Students look to faculty for definitions of professionalism and how to become professionals.

4. Enrollment and progress in professional school makes the students professionals-in-the-making, and faculty look at and treat them as such (Bloom, 1965).

As Merton (1957) concluded, socialization is the acquisition of attitudes, values, skills and behavior patterns that constitute this professional role, through a cumulative process. As Simpson (1979) added, such acquisitions develop a professional being comprised of a consistent set of dispositions which govern the individual's behavior across a wide variety of professional situations.

The reaction approach, on the other hand, does not view the professional school as a subsystem of the parent profession. Rather, it is an independently organized social unit, within which students and faculty are not bound together in mutual interests and expectations. Students and faculty are seen as distinctly different groups, with the former setting their own goals relating to career interests and
comradeship with their student cohorts.

As intimated by the "situational" label, the norms learned by the students are not expected to carry on beyond medical school or across a range of situations. In fact, adherents to this theory wonder whether faculty standards and roles are uniform within or across schools of the profession.

Proponents of both perspectives tend to agree that the continuity of an individual's behavior in moving from pre-professional to professional is the essence of socialization. As noted, the induction approach assumes that continuity exists across the status transitions, while those of the other school of thought disagree. The latter see continuity, instead, as due to: (a) structural factors, such as serial interconnection between professional elements; (b) continuity in life goals and general perspectives that guide the selection of a career; and (c) gains of an individual due to moving from one position to another.

Simpson (1979), as noted, saw these two perspectives as complementary. Motivation, she said, explains membership in a profession and continuance of a career. Assumption of a professional role involves variables that can be observed to see whether behavior learned as a student is continued as a professional.

Simpson (1979) elicited support for this model by noting how the three dimensions corresponded to Brim's (1966) outline of socialization, in which the author wrote that socialization included preparing people for a role so they would know what was expected of them, how to deal with the related expectations, and the desire to practice
the expected behavior and pursue the appropriate ends. In Simpson's format, this translates to education, orientations, and relatedness to the occupation. Education is required if one is to know what is expected and how to proceed. Orientations provide a frame of reference for perceiving and acting upon others' expectations. Finally, relatedness to the occupation links the person to the occupation in what motivates continuance in the occupation.

Bess (1978) defined professionalization as the process by which students learn the skills, values, and norms of the occupation or profession they are preparing to enter. On the other hand, he saw socialization as the process of adapting values, norms and social roles which constrain behavior in an organizational setting. Both are learning processes, ongoing and social in nature. In an institution such as medical school, where professional values, attitudes, and skills are so much a part of educational and social intercourse, it is difficult to separate the two concepts and say that one or the other predominates.

However one chooses to define the process being observed, there is little doubt that it is social in nature. Simpson (1967) noted that being socialized into a role involves both learning its cultural content--skills, knowledge, how to act towards significant others--and self-identification with that role, that is, internalizing its values and goals. In her study of student nurses, she noted a sequential process involving three distinct phases, each including the learning of cultural content and self-identification with the occupational role. In the first phase, students shifted their attention from broad, societally-derived goals that led to their field choices to the
profession/school emphasis on proficiency in specific work tasks. Initial notions of wanting to serve others gave way to the desire to be a nurse. To accomplish the latter students had to master the technical skills and knowledge that are necessary for professional status. Lay conceptions about the field were cast aside by blunt technical and educational demands, often routine in nature.

In the second phase, significant others in the work setting became the main reference group. In other words, the need for approval from patients was replaced by that of their supervisors. What were isolated techniques and knowledge became integrated through formulation of care plans for patients. These prepared plans were then the focus of the students' energies. Constructing and carrying them out was what professionals supposedly did, and the students' involvement in such actions brought doctors and nurses into the realm of colleague. The approval of those colleagues was extremely important to the students, and their acceptance was an important facet of seeing themselves as professionals.

The third phase was the period when students internalized the values of the occupational group they had chosen to enter. One sign that this process was taking place was when students evaluated others on the basis of symbols from their professional culture. That is, students began to view people outside the profession, be they lay persons or professionals in other fields, as incompetent to evaluate their work as professionals. An example that Simpson (1967) cited was the student nurse who questioned a doctor's order on the basis of nursing research. According to Simpson, this internalization of professional values
took place on the job after graduation. Again this brings forth the question of the extent of professionalization in graduate school.

Olesen and Whittaker (1968) specified three central tasks in the socialization process. First, students must become aware of what is required in the professional role. Secondly, they must recognize themselves as being in that role. Finally, the socialization process must foster their capacity to properly communicate about themselves as professionals, a notion referred to in Simpson's (1979) second phase of socialization. According to Olesen and Whittaker, these three tasks lead students to see that they are separated from laymen by virtue of being aware of special knowledge, skills and insights particular to their profession. Secondly, these students can communicate that special recognition to themselves and others.

This lay medical culture was directly referred to by Hughes (1958). He described the process by which this culture, brought to medical school by the new student, is changed. The students are separated, almost alienated from the lay medical world. That old culture and the new medical school culture interact within the students, leading them to a period of uncertainty. During this transition the students are expected to begin playing the new role of doctor or student-physician, and thus embrace the professional medical culture. However, these students vary in their degree of readiness and educational preparation for this task. Similarly, they do not necessarily see themselves as being at the stage of professionalism that those behavioral expectations would assume. In other instances, the students are suitably prepared and see themselves accordingly, but others do not concur with
that vision. In short, the process of professional socialization involves a significant period of uncertainty and transition where the students struggle to destroy their ties with the pre-entrance lay medical culture and to fully embrace that of their individual institution. The factors that facilitate and otherwise interact with this process have been studied extensively, and the proposed project design is partially a result of their careful consideration.

Before moving onto a discussion of those factors, it is important to mention one other notion brought forth by Hughes (1958). In discussing medical education and professionalization, he referred to the medical/professional culture and specialization subcultures within. Each subculture, he claimed, has its own set of assumptions, attitudes, philosophies, and publics. He saw medical education as a series of processes by which these cultures and subcultures are kept alive over time, through both planned and unplanned experiences. In attempting to understand the dynamics of professional socialization, one should not overlook or treat too lightly the particular professional ethos and common culture. Professionals, especially in the medical arena, guard very zealously their separateness and associated self-governance prerogatives. The strength of these written and unwritten messages concerning medical practice and its traditions should play a meaningful part in the professional socialization of neophyte students.
Outcomes of Professional Socialization

In order to discuss the professional socialization experience, the author will first present the outcomes of that experience. What follows are desired dispositions and commitments of entry-level professionals. The "proper" professional orientation is a very necessary attribute of new members to the club.

Becker and Carper (1956b) set out to identify the dimensions of occupational identification. Subsequent study led to a modification of their concept of professional identity, including these five dimensions: (a) a definition of the nature of the field, including its boundaries, the problems with which it is concerned, and its basic tools and methods; (b) a sense of mission, that is, beliefs about the larger values served by the field; (c) the proper conditions for doing the work of the field; (d) the relationships which should exist between people in the field and others with whom they interact—colleagues, clients, and workers in other fields; and (e) the relationship of the field to larger publics and institutions, that is, where the field fits within society.

Bess (1978) specified more richly the characteristics of commitment. In discussing professors, he urged that students must understand the "symbolic meaning" of a professor's work. He wrote that "they must know what, for example, research in the American culture signifies, what responsibility for education of students implies, what service obligations they have within and outside the college" (pp. 293-294). In short, there is an essence to the profession—its raison d'être and associated ethical and applied meanings— that
professionals must not only understand but have assimilated into their own sense of being.

Another outcome of professional socialization is the anticipation of career path. Graduates have become familiar with the directions in which one's career can head, and they enter the world of work with some sense of where their paths might lead. Kadushin (1969) wrote that anticipated career is related to self-concept as it is developed by experiences in school. His study with music education students demonstrated that those who anticipated a teaching career had their self-concepts less affected by professional performing experience than those who were seeking performance careers.

Several studies have looked at attitudinal development in professional students (Becker & Geer, 1958; Gordon & Mensh, 1962; Lortie, 1959; Reinhardt & Gray, 1972; Reissman & Platou, 1958; Rezer, 1974; Silberman, 1976). Eron (1955) noted the increased cynicism of medical students as they progressed through their programs. In his follow-up study (1958) he noted this tendency again, along with a reduction in expression of humanitarian feelings, which he defined as a benevolent regard for others' interests and needs.

Coombs (1978), in reviewing these data and those of related studies, suggested that there are other plausible explanations for these trends. The work of Becker and Geer (1958), Becker et al. (1961), and Becker (1964) explained the cynicism as situational, a temporary disillusioned reaction to medical school, as opposed to a permanently fixed personality trait. This is in line with the reactive approach.
set forth previously in this chapter. Werner and Korsh (1979) suggested that one outgrowth of such cynicism is an increasing concern about quality of life outside of professional activity—physical comforts and freedom of time.

Students' attitudes towards self have been studied as well. Coombs (1978) suggested that a professional identity requires not only knowledge and skills but self-confidence, and that professional behavior reflects self-attitudes. Coombs' study traced the emergence of these attitudes, as perceived by the students themselves. The picture he painted was of students who, upon entering medical school, arrived feeling a high status and idealism, due to the prestige accorded them by family and friends, who saw them as doctors-to-be. They were immediately humbled by their initial experiences in medical school, as there was too much information to retain and they were lowest members in the hierarchy. As they moved through school their confidence and self-esteem increased, buoyed by the realization that they were surviving and that in the future they would be doctors. Along with that awareness was one of maturation. They saw themselves becoming more responsible, serious-minded, and disciplined. They also found themselves being more careful in their actions, as opposed to the impulsiveness that characterized their earlier behavior. As they increased in confidence they saw themselves as more assertive and taking an active role in their education. Having accepted that they could not know everything, and supported by the student culture and its prescription for what to study and what to ignore, they felt more confident in managing their education.
While some might see this as cynicism, there was a shift in how physicians were seen. They realized that doctors do not have all the answers, nor are they infallible. Accordingly, their self-image was reshaped, often by increased humility. It felt safe to admit when they were wrong, where previously they felt they had to always know the answer.

Rosenberg's (1979) study of the stresses of medical education corroborated the observations of previous studies, as well as suggesting the lowering of self-image. He also noted an apathy emanating from the fear of risk-taking and the desire to avoid blame. Most significant was the concern about the "preciousness of time" (p. 90). The students were faced with constant decisions about how to divide their time among school and other needs.

Rosenberg (1979) brought to light other facets of professional education that were perhaps endemic to medical education. He cited four commonly held theories which explained attitudinal change in medical school, and then proceeded to suggest a fifth, one based on medical school as an ecosystem built on faulty foundations. His point was that major conflicts were created by a system of training which had to result in failure for people who were selected because of prior academic success. This ecosystem concept may suggest understandings for other fields as well. The author pointed to concepts such as: (a) desire for independence, as opposed to their financial dependency; (b) the value of independent learning, versus a rigid curricular structure; (c) the necessity of learning a seemingly infinite amount of knowledge, in opposition to the students' past experience of academic
mastery in learning; (d) the need to substitute the concept of learning for oneself for the drive to compete with others; (e) the need to learn technology and language of medicine, versus the need to serve patients; and (f) the need for self-sufficiency and creativity, versus the need to trust others regarding the validity of the material being learned.

Rosenberg (1979) noted a series of conflicts in the socialization for the physician's role as well: (a) exposure to the role model of specialist, versus an orientation to the total patient; (b) the need to begin the business of living, versus the need to postpone decisions about having children; (c) the need to be a leader and work with a team, as opposed to the need to be an authority figure; (d) the need to be responsible, versus the need to verify everything with a superior; (e) the need to be self-critical, versus the need to never make a mistake; (f) the need to support one's altruistic concern about the patient, as opposed to the challenge of medical politics and hostility that occur among practitioners of various disciplines; and (g) the need to protect the image of medicine and one's colleagues, versus the awareness of instances of incompetence of senior staff. The results were the stresses which led to the behavior and attitudes reported on the previous page.

Along with negotiating their way through these conflicts and accepting a "realistic" viewpoint, the students must learn how to deal with their limitations, mistakes, and failures. Stelling and Bucher (1973) found that trainees could not respond to the words "failure" and "mistake" until they had translated them into their own frame of reference; these were lay, not professional concepts. Mistakes were
seen as procedural and process matters, not outcomes. In other words, physicians were judged not by how things turned out but by how well they had acted procedurally. Laymen, the authors claimed, were concerned with results, while professionals attended to the work itself. The authors saw that the language of different groups of trainees was very similar with regards to evaluation of their efforts.

In another area of their study, Stelling and Bucher (1973) found that residents talked about becoming "more realistic" during residency training, having to "divest themselves of high expectations" (p. 660). They also heard phrases such as "giving up my missionary zeal" and being "less grandiose" (p. 670). The authors summed this up as the students' recognition of limitations.

Finally, it was found that students developed a vocabulary to deal with the "gray areas," that is, judgement areas where there was more than one way of handling situations and no clear guidelines provided. The authors concluded that the acquisition of vocabularies of realism was an integral part of professional socialization. They wrote that "among professionals, acquiring a language for coping with failure and human fallibility can be seen as the part of the process of acquiring a professional orientation and frame of reference towards the work of the profession" (Stelling & Bucher, 1973, p. 673).

Levinson (1967) made an important point about socialization that merits inclusion in this discussion. Ideally, he claimed, graduates are prepared to meet the future requirements and problematic issues of the profession. He inquired about what personal/professional characteristics the students developed in medical school that would
influence their later competencies and limitations as physicians working within a larger professional and societal framework. Ostensibly, the just-completed training would enable professionals to adapt to the changing world in rendering the services of their profession.

In conclusion, the literature generally describes a socialization process by which students learn the hows and whys of their intended profession, as well as adjusting their self-concepts accordingly. Naivete gives way to a more mature understanding of the "real" world, and the self-concept is forced to come to grips with any accompanying dissonance. If not fully assimilated into that new culture, new professionals have at least been educated and oriented for that task.

The Experience of Socialization

What is the experience that produces the professional out of the raw material that enters the graduate or professional program? What are the dynamics of being a student in that setting? There are several treatments of these questions worthy of the reader's attention (Becker et al., 1961; Olesen & Whittaker, 1968; Bucher & Stelling, 1977). The author will attempt to summarize those descriptive accounts, as well as several others.

Students enter the post-undergraduate educational institution with individual motivations, abilities, values, prior experiences, and goals. However, as the bulk of the literature demonstrates, their socialization is significantly a product of group contexts. From the day they arrive they are part of a group of recruits. Faculty and staff comprise a group, as do upperclassmen. As time passes groupings will form that are the students' response to the demands of the formal
organization. It is through these subcultures that students' perceptions and behaviors are mediated.

Coombs (1978) described medical school in this fashion:

Medical school is sometimes comparable to a submarine that submerges with its crew of students and, over the next four years, makes only occasional contact with the outside world. Since students are completely engrossed in their studies or spend most of their waking hours confined to either the medical school or to the hospital, they feel "totally immersed in the sea of medicine," even to the point of drowning. (p. 63)

These students are confronted by enormous challenges, particularly due to the overwhelming academic load. It is to their peers that they turn for support and the standards by which they can handle the work. The freshmen face the task of trying to learn all the assigned information. They are fearful of falling behind their classmates and often imagine that everyone is doing better. To survive they often cooperate by studying together and trying to help those having the greatest difficulty. As several studies showed, this is often done in reaction to what is seen as the unrealistic expectations of faculty. The students often work to beat the system, developing a network through which information is communicated about previous mistakes made with faculty. Coombs (1978) also reported that upperclassmen are sought after for old examinations, notes, lab reports and advice about professors. The new students also look to cut corners in assignments and exercises that seem unnecessary, and by dividing up their work.

Olesen & Whittaker (1968), in a study of student nurses, provided a fascinating discussion of this entire phenomenon, which they labelled "studentmanship," a kind of subterranean student behavior that plays a
part in shaping how people act, relate and think. These are not necessarily verbalized or explicit understandings, but they are norms inherent in all students' lifestyle. The authors explained this in the following fashion:

Studentmanship, therefore, functions to suggest answers to a perpetually problematic issue: how to get through school with the greatest comfort and the least effort, preserving oneself as a person, while at the same time being a success and attaining the necessities for one's future life. (p. 150)

Olesen and Whittaker (1968) reported how their subjects, in a sense, had some influence over the process of becoming nurses. This included establishing norms for what not to study, how to make a classmate look good to faculty, and how to look interested in a classroom or to appear "nursely" on a ward. There was a difference between what the school wanted students to be and what the students were able and willing to take and place in their emerging professional identities. Students not only had to become professionals, but they had to convince faculty that such was indeed taking place.

Becker and Geer (1958) described the student culture in medical school. They cited certain conditions that permitted or encouraged subculture development. Chief among these were (a) the amount and difficulty of material, (b) the clarity about what materials were important to learn, (c) students' isolation from outside influences, (d) time spent together, and (e) the size of the group. An intensity developed as students discovered the similarity of their problems and worked together to find solutions. In a sense, these provisional solutions and guidelines for activity were the basic student culture. The authors pointed to two sets of such guidelines. One specifies
goals and values, indicating to the students that they are in school to learn what is relevant to their professional futures. The other suggests methods of cooperation that allow them to handle exams, deadlines and other "crises."

Factors included in the development of the student culture include the following:

1. Formation of groups/friendships which facilitate member interaction. According to Becker and Geer (1958), this takes place either in small groups of equal social status that have the opportunity for leisure interaction due to proximal living arrangements, or in classes.

2. Common understandings arising from isolation. That is, students have all or a preponderance of classes together. A "we-versus they" ("they" being faculty) syndrome can develop. This antagonistic posture is noted particularly by Becker et al. (1961). However, a more cooperative posture is cited by Merton (1957).

3. The development of a student concept of the field. This concept is narrowed down to "what is important." Divergent views can emerge, especially as students must choose field specialties.

Becker and Geer (1958) concluded that the student culture affects the institution in three ways. First, it is adaptive. It creates a way for students and supervisors to exist. It allows students to fit into the activity of the school and the hospital. In other words, student culture is an accommodation to the facts of life in medical school.

Second, the culture leads to a system of social support for students that allows them both as individuals and groups to independently
assess faculty statements and demands so they can reinterpret these and make some sense of what they (the students) want from their education.

Third, as Hughes (1958) also noted, student culture affects the level and direction of effort students expend while in school. This leads to a rationale for how much time and effort to devote to school work, and lends enough social support to act differently than faculty would suggest.

As noted, Olesen and Whittaker (1968) dealt with the students' active interpretation of their academic situation. They wrote how students are not totally constrained by their low academic status, instead shaping their own roles and taking an active part in their own education. They assess faculty demands and create strategies and behaviors that they feel will deliver what faculty want. The authors also noted that students interact with others who have roles both inside and outside the formal institutional structure, and who influence their learning. For example, medical students learn from their patients. Again, some of what the students are learning are "non-official" ideas and values.

Olesen and Whittaker (1968) provided a useful capstone discussion. They wrote that students and beginning professionals get much information from sources other than faculty. These other sources--clients, family, and friends--view and act towards students and new professionals in ways that may or may not be harmonious with the students' self-images. The two authors concluded:
The growth of the student's ability to place in perspective the views of those in other roles, both in the functions as sources of information and as ratifiers of a professional self, is an important aspect of student separation from the world of laymen. (pp. 8-90)

Handling the Graduate Environment

Much as been written about students as group members. It is also important to talk about individual students and how they experience the graduate education environment. How that environment is interpreted and acted upon by individuals results in the product of professional socialization. As Bucher and Stelling (1977) argued, students play an active role in determining how their environment will impact them. Individual experiences are well worth studying.

Davis and Olesen (1963) wrote about identity problems faced in the transition of coed to student nurse. Some of these issues were particular to women. For example, the authors noted that women's career commitments could compete with other roles in life. Of primary interest, however, is their description of status transition. Students graduate from one college, a setting characterized by "a diverse multiplicity and overlap of student ties, interest and associations" (p. 93), and enter one in which there is a central and overriding tie, that of being together in a class of occupational novices, having similar experiences, pressures, and choices. Students experience significant identity stress, as they must integrate psychologically their identities of student professionals with their emerging adult identities. They must also cope with some fairly stressful practical experiences.
There are several manifestations and adjustments. Students often feel inadequate and incapable of managing their new environment. There is a kind of homesickness for their previous colleges, and they are frequently seen visiting those institutions and their homes on weekends. The first six weeks are witness to a kind of collective group depression, and students are seen griping about conditions and demands. In short, they are faced with the difficult task of adjusting to a new situation, shedding old and developing new ties, and feeling competent. It is out of these individual experiences that we-versus-they feelings about faculty emerge, and eventually there appears group solidarity and a student culture. As Olesen and Whittaker (1968) pointed out, the students are simultaneously acquiring new views of self along with role behaviors demanded by the profession. Their inner world is shifting and changing. Their progress, even after much of the transition has been managed, is continually problematic, not necessarily smooth or forward-moving. There is a different rate of progress and degree to which students buy into the central core of values of the profession. During that process students become aware of themselves as they serve in various roles. Furthermore, Olesen and Whittaker pointed out, they learn "to be aware of being aware" (p. 14). That is, they are directed inward.

Internalization

A key element of professional socialization is the process by which students internalize that which they have been exposed to. This point was raised by Olesen and Whittaker (1968), whose volume provided perhaps the most complete and cogent discussion of this
phenomenon. They wrote:

Socialization does not only involve the recognition of an assumed identity by the outside world. It also involves the individual's recognition of the identity within himself and the non-deliberate projection of himself in its terms. This process is usually referred to as internalization, and it depicts the success of past socialization. (p. 247)

These authors (Olesen & Whittaker, 1968) noticed early in their work a significant amount of discomfort in these students, pertaining to lack of competence with patients, and uncertainty about their practical and academic performance. The cycles of depression and occasional elation that emanated from these uncertainties the authors labelled "cycles of the inner world," and postulated that they bore an important relationship to identity formation. That is, they expected that these cycles tied the students' sense of inner, psychological reality with the objective social reality of professional education.

These cycles, wrote Olesen and Whittaker (1968), were side products of the students' expectations. That is, an individual contemplating the assumption of a role develops an inner dialogue wherein awareness of the self is traded against a layman's conception of the role. The process is set in motion when the students, entering school with confidence, realize things are far more complicated and difficult than expected. They realize there is a gap between who they are and the role of nurse, and they are thus depressed and perhaps become somewhat self-deprecatory in their behavior.

As the students progress through the program, this "identity predicament" resurfaces frequently. Such is caused deliberately by the faculty, who give the students difficult patients, while at the same time other predicaments come about just from the daily life in the
hospital and difficulties in being a student. In each situation, the student's personal claims on the identity of nurse are challenged by the situation at hand, and discrepancies become quite evident.

As the student continues to face and react to these challenges, as well as dealing with the mood cycles described previously, the discrepancies are slowly but clearly bridged, and thus the student begins to integrate self and professional role. One might call this successive approximation. From this she/he is virtually forced to see her/himself in new ways. Such does not necessarily take place smoothly, and the student can regress by becoming alienated when these new views feel so discordant that such is the only way to cope.

Other variations are what the students in this study (Olesen & Whittaker, 1968) called "play-acting," where they forced themselves to perform the actions and mouth the words nurses were known to use. Going onto the wards was almost like going on stage. Accompanying these actions were real doubts about whether they belonged in nursing.

Eventually, evidence of integration was more frequently and clearly noticeable, but it was not seen by the authors as solid and stable (Olesen & Whittaker, 1968). They described it as an advancing and receding state, depending on the situation at hand. The students could one week feel they were right for nursing and the next week have doubts.

The reader will recall that there are two fields of thought regarding this socialization process. Olesen and Whittaker (1968) are most appropriately grouped with the reactive group, and this is evident from how they perceived the role of the student in this
situation. They maintained that the individual, while obviously put in situations deliberately by faculty to promote role integration, was making choices and quite capable of acting on his/her social environment. They noticed how students tended to try to act in terms of a future level of identity. This seeking out of predicaments for themselves the authors labelled self-testing, evidenced by a phenomenon noticed early in their school experience called the experience hunt. The students sought out experiences which were a bit more challenging than the level to which they had progressed, by asking professors if they could perform new procedures, take on additional patients, or even observe professionals handling difficult chores.

The authors (Olesen & Whittaker, 1968) also noted that this self-testing was with a certain rhythm, a scheme of pacing, as they called it, which seemed to suggest to the students the appropriate time for them to actually seek out a predicament or to introduce another boundary-forcing discrepancy. This scheme, they suggested, was partially developed from the students' layman-based notions of what a nursing student should be capable of at different stages of his/her education, as well as the dialogue with faculty which conveyed the expectations of the institution. In particular, this message came in the form of faculty evaluations and patient assignments. Finally, these rates were partially defined by the student culture, primarily by competition and one-upsmanship.

The outcome of these testing situations is a more integrated sense of self and new professional identity, supported by an inner reality which promotes a feeling of authenticity. The student has, after
successful testing, become increasingly ratified. However, as the authors noted, the ratification is not merely due to self-testing. One must engage in dialogue with others, as noted above.

Not only is the development process uneven and perhaps unpredictable. While students sought out testing situations, they also gave evidence of trying to either minimize or have control over the severity of this process. Olesen and Whittaker (1968) labelled this psychological maneuvering, a kind of ongoing dialogue with self by which the student gave self-support for the self already integrated. This would come in the form of silent self-encouragement, or even avoidance of other stressful aspects of their lives.

While the students attempted to more clearly define and immerse themselves in the nursing identity, there came a time when they reacted in the opposite direction. They began to feel a kind of narrowing of the self, and an isolation from the world-in-general. In reaction, they expanded their lives, in manners such as taking liberal arts courses and going to cultural events.

Accompanying these feelings, especially as the students were incorporating higher and higher levels of the nurse identity, the students began feeling a sense of loss, a kind of physical removal from their former selves. For nurses, in particular, there was a feeling of loss of femininity to the nursing role, and some would even attempt to reclaim their former selves by wearing additional jewelry or make-up, or wear their hair longer.

Of course there was no absolute single moment when the students or observers could say that they were now a nurse. A significant
question and measure, however, was if the students changed as people, whether they were beginning to see the world differently, and if they recognized those changes in themselves. Could they see themselves as different people?

The authors (Olesen & Whittaker, 1968) found that they did recognize a broadening and narrowing. That is, some saw that their perspectives were broadened, due to exposure to a broad variety of people, experiences, relationships, and distressful situations. A few, on the other hand, felt they had narrowed and were perhaps different than the persons they would have become had they not become nurses.

However, the single most prominent theme was that of emergent self-awareness, something the authors (Olesen & Whittaker, 1968) saw as a critical dimension of change in professional socialization. Students became far more aware of themselves as people. The institution demanded such self-analysis in courses, as it considered that process as an integral part of the socialized professional identity. An increased knowledge of self would support the students through most situations, regardless of how ambiguous the role demands were, as such knowledge and accompanying self-confidence would help the students feel in control of professional situations, and thus of themselves as professionals.

Olesen and Whittaker (1968) concluded with two passages which excellently summarize and describe the socialization process. First they wrote:

These, then, are the cycles of the inner world—the depressions and elations, bravado and timidity, the language of claims, predicaments and discrepancies, self-regulation of the cycle, emerging self-awareness, and integration of self
and role. Together they suggest the nature of the movement between social and inner reality. They suggest, moreover, how social reality permeates the membrane of the self, and conversely how the self could make itself felt on the social reality. In this way, the individual moves towards higher and higher levels of integration, of internalization and of socialization. The higher the level, the greater, presumably, is the independence of the individual from his social environment in the self sense of his identity. (p. 286)

Later they added:

It (professional socialization) was not in the high council of the curriculum planners, nor in the skill of the most sophisticated and understanding instructor, nor in the late night cramming for exams that professional socialization occurred. Embedded in the frequently banal, sometimes dreary, often uninteresting world of everyday living, professional socialization was the common place. In the mundane, not in the abstract or exalted, occurred the minute starts and stops, the bits of progress and backsliding, the moments of reluctant acquisition of a new self and the tenacious relinquishing of the old; the flush of pride and elation when telling a fellow student about a good evaluation or listening silently and painfully when being told of someone else's good marks; the feeling of relief that one had not been the object of group laughter in conference; the sense of anxiety when learning from a classmate that yet another student had married or become engaged; the right look at the right time when discussing the patient with the instructor.

These matters constitute the silent dialogue wherein are fused person, situation, and institution. Therein lies the heart of professional socialization. (Olesen & Whittaker, 1968, pp. 296-297)

In summing up, Olesen & Whittaker (1968) took what amounts to an existential view of the student's course through school. It was portrayed as a series of encounters between self and various others which lead to definitions, choices, actions, and an increasing self-consciousness. There was almost a cyclical notion of action having implications for others and for self-view, and those consequences became part of the current experience and a basis of further choice. This was a dynamic, continuous interchange between the public self, inner self, and the
outside world, from which emerged an individual hopefully more congruent with the social situation within which he/she was living.

**Personality and Individual Factors**

Levinson (1967) suggested paying closer attention to individual personality factors in professional socialization. He criticized Becker et al. (1961) for limiting themselves almost exclusively to behavioral interactions and students' conscious ideas about their immediately impinging situation. In addition, he was dissatisfied with their reliance on group data. In a related criticism, Levinson noted that *Boys in White's* (Becker et al., 1961) central concept of perspective, a "coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about such a situation" (p. 34), gave little credence to the part played by feelings. By making perspective a rationalistic concept of belief and action, those authors, said Levinson, did not deal with students' possible inner conflicts between beliefs or behavior governed by "private wishes, fantasies or aspirations" (Levinson, 1967, p. 277).

Continuing in this line of thought, Levinson (1967) noted that *Boys in White's* authors (Becker et al., 1961) claimed that students' perspectives emerged mostly out of the group experience. In other words, students developed perspectives from the student culture and how it dealt with the immediate challenge of medical school. When students became doctors, they supposedly developed new perspectives for the new social situations in which they found themselves. This viewpoint, said Levinson, and the one taken by Becker (1964),
minimized the relevance of motivational and characteriological factors in motivation. That which must be studied, argued Levinson, is the central question of socialization theory, "relatively enduring professionally relevant changes . . . students undergo under various socializing conditions" (p. 258).

On the other hand, Levinson (1967) noted, Boys in White (Becker et al., 1961) did offer some important contributions in understanding how the professional socialization experience confronts students. Students faced problematic issues over the course of their school experience. Medical students, for example, had to deal with ambiguity and uncertainty in a profession that prides itself on rationality and competence. They had to cope with the fact that their technical knowledge could not be as detailed and extensive as faculty would like, or even as they themselves would have preferred.

There are problems, of course, in forming a student culture for mutual protection and assistance. Finally, students must choose a specialty, with all its personal and career implications. While these issues are raised with medical students, they certainly are not the exclusive province of that domain.

Levinson (1967) called these major role-tasks that students must work on as a result of internal needs for direction and career choice, and external pressure from school demands. The students must find a personally acceptable balance between professional detachment and individual concern for patients. They must selectively assimilate and integrate all these pressures. In the process, their inner fantasies, preferred modes of defense, talents, and commitments must be
involved. Changes and adjustments in personality can emerge, and, as Olesen and Whittaker (1968) noted, will lead to further internal interpretation of and behavior in future professional/societal environments.

Identification with Occupation

A final category in this discussion of the experience of socialization is the identification with an occupation. Becker and Carper (1956a) described this process quite thoroughly. They mentioned three components of the process. The first is movement through the academic structure. In the classroom, new problems present themselves to the students. This leads to new research and the interest of the students becomes aroused. New work techniques are presented. As the students observe faculty and staff using these skills, they acquire them and the interest the presuppose, and others start seeing the students as being associated with the work identity they symbolize. The students also assume this identity because they want to satisfactorially meet expectations of others in the work world.

The second component is acquisition of ideology. This leads to a commitment to an occupational title. This acquisition is helped through participation in informal student groups and, secondarily, classroom and informal discussions with teachers. Students raise questions about the worth of the activities in which they are engaged, or others will do so for them. They ask themselves why they are doing these rather than something else. In looking for answers, they find them in the developed professional ideology with which they have become familiar in interactions with older students and professors,
and take them for their own use. Now this ideology can back up what feels like their field.

Third, the students internalize the relevant motives. This produces attachment to institutional positions associated with the given work identity. Students learn what jobs exist and why people want them. There is gossip in the student clique and talk of professors about "placing them." These factors, too, provide the students with a set of reasons for wanting things that will soon become available to them and for choosing between them in terms of the newly assumed professional identity.

Variables Contributing to Socialization

The author has just completed a review of the professional socialization experience. The next question concerns the factors that influence that experience. For simplicity sake, this section will group them as (a) structural, (b) situational, and (c) individual. Considering their significant interaction, it is not difficult to understand why professional socialization is such a complex subject. Secondly, this complexity largely influenced the methodology of this study.

Structural

Wheeler (1966) provided some general notions of how people move through organized settings. In the process of doing so, he set out some broad structural considerations useful to this discussion.

Generally speaking, a graduate school can be viewed as a processing system. In such a system work is done on whatever enters, in hope that its state will be changed when it leaves. The primary purpose
is to change knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, or skills of those who pass through.

Levinson (1967) laid out the basic components of such a system as: (a) the organization as a socializing unit; (b) persons as client members; (c) a socialization process, involving the engagement of client members in the life of the socializing system; (d) outcomes of socialization—changes direct or indirect of participants in the system; and (e) advanced students who affect the organization.

Wheeler (1966) noted that organizational goals and social structure play a key part in influencing socialization outcomes. Organizational goals can differ within and among socializing organizations in specificity or generality. In addition, a distinction can be made between the organization's intentions for role and status socialization. That is, some organizations or departments will train their recruits for specific tasks and statuses, for example, engineers. Others prepare their recruits, such as liberal arts majors, to occupy a generalized status in life along with its associated life styles. If an organization/socializing agency has both types of goals, conflicts between staff, especially competition for scarce resources (such as students), can emerge. Finally, problems can develop concerning the recruits' participation in goal setting, particularly if their objectives differ significantly from those of the organization. In any event, the goals of the organization certainly shed light on its structure and, eventually, how it attempts to enact those priorities. Understanding the controversies arising from conflicts in goals is helpful in seeking significant causal factors in the students' professional
socialization experience.

Bucher and Stelling (1977) did a noteworthy job of defining the contexts and contents of the process of socialization. They posited the existence of two sets of social variables that must be taken into account. The first, **structural variables**, pertains to the nature and organization of professions, and to the social structure of organizations that produce professionals. The second, **situational variables**, refers to those social situations which are a function of those larger structural variables.

Underlying Bucher and Stelling's (1977) conceptual framework is an approach to professions which emphasizes processes and segments. They saw professions as continually in flux. That is, they are in process. Segments, on the other hand, are the basic social units, subgroups within the profession that are comprised of individuals who have in common some professional characteristics and beliefs which distinguish them from the members of other segments. Members of a segment share a specific professional identity. They also have similar ideas about the nature of their discipline, the relative order of importance of the activities it includes, and its relationship to other fields. In addition, segment members share a professional fate: events have similar effects on or implications for those in a given segment, while those same events may have quite different consequences for others in the profession.

This foundation led the Bucher and Stelling (1977) to pose six sets of questions about socializing organizations. These suggested structural dimensions to consider when studying the nature of professional
socialization in particular organizations:

1. What is the nature of the organization housing the training program and its affiliations with other institutions? The activities of students can be strongly influenced by the organization's context. Types of patients available to trainees can be determined by the nature of the college. Affiliated institutions can provide both resources and constraints (demands) on a training program.

2. What is the position of the professional staff with regards to the organization? Are staff departmentalized or spread throughout the organization? What power do they have? Of special significance, how great is their ability to control the training program?

3. What segments of the profession are represented in the organization? Who has the most power? Staff content can influence who is recruited (Bucher, 1965), selected, and what is emphasized in the program (Reissman & Platou, 1960). Bucher and Stelling (1977) pointed out that by having representatives of different professional segments on the staff, there will very likely be conflicts over program organization and how staff should interact with students. Finally, Ondrak (1975) argued that the greater attitude and value consistency of the faculty and staff, the greater the degree of student professional socialization.

4. What is the relationship of the professionals in the socializing organization to the larger professional community--their professional colleagues outside that particular organization? The colleague network, pointed out Bucher and Stelling (1977), can influence who is selected and provide information about career options and career lines for sponsoring trainees.
5. How do selection processes operate? This question relates to segmental affiliations in the organization.

6. What is the structure of the training program itself? Students must pass through steps and stages, each with particular activities. The sequence of those activities, along with its degree of flexibility, will affect the students' socialization experience, perhaps giving rise to a strong student subculture. There are also many unplanned experiences that affect students' development.

Situational

As Bucher and Stelling (1977) described, situational variables are important to the process of socialization. According to Bucher (1965), these can affect or determine the professional philosophies to which students are exposed, thus delimiting available models. First in Bucher and Stelling's list is "role-playing," the opportunities afforded trainees to do the work and service in the roles of the profession. Huntington (1957) and Kadushin (1969) both claimed that the opportunity to play professional roles is critical to the development of a professional self-concept. It is through these opportunities that the core act of the profession is defined. In addition, a "range of experiences" is an important key to learning (Bucher, 1965). Simpson (1967) described how students first learned desired behaviors and later learned to apply the skills by developing organized plans for dealing with patients.

Bucher and Stelling (1977) posed several important questions about role-playing experiences, centering mainly on the clarity, realness, range, and significance of those opportunities. One's degree of
autonomy in carrying out these assignments, when coupled with the
degree of professional role enactment—degree of task complexity,
perceived similarity of tasks to faculty activity, previous experience,
and perceived success—can have a significant effect on self-concept
development (Pavalko & Holley, 1974). The opportunity to achieve and
perceive success provided by these experiences also contributes to
self-concept development and professional growth (Huntington, 1957).

The availability of role models is cited by Bucher and Stelling
(1977) as a significant situational variable. Simpson (1967) discussed
how a large part of professional socialization is the students seeking
acceptance and approval of faculty, thus implying that the former rate
classification as professional colleagues. Students learn to anticipate
the evaluative comments of staff and faculty, and they seek to
behave in a "suitable" fashion. Bucher and Stelling also noted how
students began to pick and choose among faculty in assembling their
own ideal professional model. Finally, Bucher (1965) suggested the
importance of determining if students' role models are global or
selective in nature.

Bucher and Stelling (1977) mentioned that the peer group can
exert significant influence over students' professional self-concept,
as well as adjustment to the medical school society. An additional
variable to consider is the nature of coaching and criticism received
by trainees. Bucher (1965) suggested the importance of determining
if coaching is formal, that is, classroom evaluation, or personal,
that is, face-to-face. How cues are received and what aspects of
one's performance are evaluated will influence professional self-
concept development as well.

Another situational variable cited by Bucher and Stelling (1977) is the conversion experience. They defined this as an experience "which has enormous emotional impact on people" (p. 25). They raised questions about the opportunities for such events to take place, what form they take, and their intensity.

Finally, Bucher and Stelling (1977) discussed status passages, key transitional points in the passage of trainees through the organization. Bucher (1965) mentioned the selection of a professional specialty and how it leads to professional identity differentiation. Bucher and Stelling asked questions about how clearly marked these points are, as trainees apparently need information on their progress.

In the conclusion of their study, Bucher and Stelling (1977) were able to substantiate the significance of these situational variables for professional socialization. They found compelling support for the effect of the training program on outcomes of socialization, what they referred to as the programming effect. Role-playing, when responsibility and autonomy were granted, had an extremely significant effect on development of professional identity and commitment, especially through the development of a sense of mastery over the subject matter and practical demands. Other situational variables as proposed by these authors were seen as important but only in a supplemental way. Role-playing was the key.
The Individual

The remaining piece in the puzzle is the individual. Bucher and Stelling (1977) argued quite convincingly that while there is a programming effect, students do actively construct their identities. Citing the work of Blumer (1969) on symbolic interactionism, they described humans as having "the capacity for self-interaction, and that self-interaction makes it possible for the person to engage in a continuous process of interpretation, and to construct a line of activity, rather than to merely respond" (Bucher & Stelling, 1977, p. 177). In this manner did the authors explain the active role played by students in their own professional self-concept development.

In a sense, students interact with the graduate institution before ever arriving. Much has been written about the role played by "anticipatory socialization" in graduate education (Bess, 1978). Wheeler (1966) discussed this concept from the organization's standpoint. How well the organization manages advance preparation of recruits increases the probability of their successful socialization. Among the factors to consider are (a) the power of the organization to select desirable candidates, (b) the degree of preparation those recruits need, (c) the time between selection and participation, (d) the capacity of the organization to control the source of prior knowledge about the program of recruits, (e) the realism of information prior to entry, (f) who does the actual selection, (g) recruit attributes that are emphasized, and (h) whether or not the organization can get the "best" applicants.
On the other hand, recruits bring with them different idiosyncracies, motivations, imagery about the field (Bucher, Stelling & Domermuth, 1969), interests, and abilities. They have had differing degrees of opportunity to be exposed to the field. Different sources have influenced their choices. Consequently, they have differing abilities to specify and elaborate on possible career lines of the field in advance. Geer (1966) noted that students varied according to pre-investment. In cases where the profession was highly regarded in the society, the declaration of an intention to pursue that career led the students to feel that they had to follow through on that choice.

Summary

Certainly not every facet of professional socialization has been drawn out. However, the framework of that phenomenon and a discussion of the relevant explanatory categories have been provided. It is apparent that in studying professional socialization, one is confronted with a complex, multi-faceted issue. The literature seems to be saying that the process is fundamentally the interaction of students and program. The latter's emphases, personnel, experiences, content, and social order depend on several key macro-organizational variables. Those students are affected by, but in time can moderate, the influence of the program, both individually and through subcultural groups. The end result is a group of individuals with self-concepts that include a vision of the fields they are about to enter.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

Introduction

Spradley (1980) defined ethnography as the work of describing a culture, understanding a way of life from a native point of view. The researcher is concerned with the meaning of actions and events to the people he/she seeks to understand. Dobbert (1982) suggested that of major concern are the patterns which are the essence of a culture. These include shared values, interpersonal and group behaviors, material objects, and overriding patterns which subsume these. By observing behavior, one infers these patterns, as well as their underlying meanings.

Many authors offered detailed processes and related considerations by which one may effect such a research strategy (Becker, 1958; Becker & Geer, 1960; Dobbert, 1982; Downey & Ireland, 1979; Jicks, 1979; Von Maanen, 1979). Spradley (1979, 1980) focused separately in his two volumes on interviewing and observation. He demonstrated how one can begin with a general area of interest and, after gathering data, progress from a highly detailed analysis of that information to broader relationships and concepts. These not only increase understanding of the subject matter at hand, but of other groups and cultures.
While variations on this theme exist, there is an overriding concern that one must first observe without judgement or bias. In fact, one should try to get as close as possible to the population under scrutiny, in order to understand from their perspective the lives which they lead. Ongoing analysis of those data can then lead to hypotheses which can be supported or refuted by continued or revised data search and analysis.

This was a study of a group of students in a particular setting. The author was attempting to understand their situation and how their lives progressed in an identified period of time. His approach to that task was stimulated by this mission and guided by the ethnomethodological wisdom underlying many relevant strategies. At the same time, he tempered those influences by acknowledging the particular idiosyncrasies of the research situation to which he had committed his efforts. The results of that combination was a year-long relationship with a group of students, constructed and punctuated by interviews and observations, and sustained by an attempt to gather meanings from those efforts. In the following pages are presented the foundations to this approach and the methods by which they took place.

**General Considerations**

Becker and Geer (1960) wrote that a common notion is that science is the "production of general propositions stating the relation between two or more variables under a specified set of conditions" (p. 267). However, they noted, these propositions avoid the unique characteristics of the case under scrutiny, and they extract for consideration only those variables contained in that proposition.
Becker and Geer (1960), along with Glaser and Strauss (1967), argued that theory development ought to be for its supposed uses. They maintained that for many problems, both practical and theoretical, those factored-out variables must be studied, as they comprise the organizational complexity which must be understood if such problems are to be adequately addressed. In effect, the organizational complications are situational but not tangential, and their existence may be more revealing than the variables being raised for the research situation.

Becker and Geer (1960) went on to say that the researcher should assume that he/she does not know enough. That is, he/she has an insufficient theoretical and experiential background from which to understand what is taking place in the organization about to be studied. Rather, a large part of the research should be devoted to finding out what are the key problems and hypotheses worth pursuing, and what observations will be most significant. This demands a data gathering technique that is sufficiently unstructured to increase the likelihood of such discoveries.

Lofland (1976) contended that social life can be seen more clearly if approached without an agenda or expectations. By entering a social research setting trying to prove or disprove some point, or by striving to explain certain behaviors according to existing theories, the researcher is placing serious limitations on the range of understandings that can emerge. In effect, the behavior being studied is being limited to a certain framework. That other meanings might exist is not allowed, at least in the main body of the study. Perhaps such notions may be
entertained as afterthoughts in the discussion section of the report, but that is all.

Lofland (1976) proposed that the researcher observe social life and record the behaviors and conditions. Then the behaviors can be examined to see what they might mean in their own context. Later these understandings can become theories that may or may not bear resemblance to existing theories.

This author's initial impulse was to use a battery of instruments to assess the students' progress. It was soon apparent that, while some instruments might contribute useful data, the program could best be understood by methods that would allow the data to be seen first without the constraints imposed by prearranged scales and categories. The graduate school experience of the students in the Ohio State University program was a highly complex interplay of elements. Perhaps a very different set of perceptions and understandings would emerge if the data were simply reported and not forced prematurely into categories of analysis provided by standardized surveys, psychological instruments, and other related devices. Furthermore, such instruments could not extract all the social life data that existed by being administered at hypothetically critical points. There would be too many gaps and much information passed over.

Instead, the author needed to develop ongoing familiarity with the people and program under consideration. The development of identity, be it professional or otherwise, is not confined to neat, predictable, and orderly segments which can be pinpointed and frozen in time by
scheduled test sessions. Granted, human development theoreticians have made strides in measuring, describing, and predicting the emergence of distinct stages. However, a great deal of variance exists, due to individual differences and environmental factors. If this study had been of life-long professional socialization, these factors could have been minimized in order to provide a broader view. Standardized instruments could have been administered at theoretically key points, and then their results would have been compared to provide a lifeline portrait. However, since this study was of one small time segment from within the larger continuum, the examination of all the individual and environmental factors which were the causes of the variance previously mentioned was essential.

Once this small segment is extracted for examination, its variance becomes the focus. While theory may provide general understandings, specific meanings of identified situations may be more clearly derived by situationally gained familiarity. Thus, to truly understand the process of professional socialization for certain students in an identified program, the researcher must first arrive at a definition and explanation of such socialization within the context of those situational parameters. By describing and understanding what happens in that setting because of that setting, the researcher can propose an explanation of professional socialization at that institution. Then he/she can compare the results to other situations: Out of many such studies formal theories can be developed.
A significant body of research has been designed and carried out with just such an inductively inspired methodology. Understandings have been developed about professional socialization, as pointed out in the previous chapter. One might ask, then, "Why not take the categories established by Bucher and Stelling (1977), Becker and Geer (1960), and others and test them out with the students at Ohio State?"

Several reasons legislated against such an approach. Many professional socialization studies had been done with students in training for the medical profession. The differences between that field and student personnel work, both at the professional and preparatory level, are striking. One might consider the following:

1. The medical profession has a lengthy history, long-established standards, and universal recognition. Student personnel work is a rather recent phenomenon, continues to search for an agreed-upon identity, and, at the time of this study, was only beginning to attempt to establish universally recognized and accepted standards for professional preparation.

2. The curricular content and structure of medical and student personnel work academic programs differ significantly. In addition, students are expected to spend a six- or seven-year period in medical education, while student personnel work master's degree students have only a two year commitment (or less).

3. Medical students (and law students, for that matter) spend much of their time in their own building. Hence, there appears to be a high degree of physical isolation or separation from the rest of the university. This did not seem to be the case with student personnel work.
students at Ohio State University, and one could speculate that the
same was true of programs at other institutions. While student
personnel work students' psychological separation might have been
equally significant, there did not appear to be the concentrated
academic lifestyle portrayed in so many of the medical studies.

4. Student personnel work programs do not command the resources,
prestige, or power of a medical school. At Ohio State University,
student personnel work classes were scheduled throughout the university,
largely because the program's needs had a low priority in university scheduling decisions.

One could also draw parallels between the two fields. However,
the many noticeable differences forbade the author from making the
assumption that they were similar enough to accept a priori that
theoretical constructs from the medical area applied closely to student
personnel work. Only after the study had been completed would a comparison with results of medical studies have been instructive.

This point needs elaboration. When the author began his project,
many options were available. It could have shed light on the
"definition" of student personnel work. He could have focused on its
status as a profession. In fact, a broader ambition would have been
a statement about the social science professions in comparison to
"traditional" professions. He could have attempted to evaluate the
effectiveness of the program at Ohio State University in preparing
professionals. Yet another emphasis could have been the interpretation
of the graduate experience in terms of student development theory.
While these and other notions were recognized, the initial purpose of the study was simply to learn how master degree students in the student personnel program at Ohio State University became professionals. The knowledge and theories gained from other studies, along with broader questions such as those suggested, could have been entertained after the preliminary notions gathered from the data were conceived. This would have prevented a hasty interpretation of the events at the university. Furthermore, and this is critical, research undertaken to verify or test a theory does not necessarily allow the author to develop new notions. Instead, one is limited to testing hypotheses of previously established theory and is not free to think about the meaning of data on their own merit. If this author had been studying medical students, perhaps he would have considered the previous research sufficient. He might have then set up a study wherein comparisons would have been made between this program and those of other schools. He might have been more concerned with specific facets of professional socialization (for example, anticipatory socialization) or learning how certain structural elements of the program affected these students. But due to the paucity of material on professional socialization of student personnel work students or, for that matter, social science graduate students, as well as the obvious differences expressed earlier, this study demanded to be first and foremost for generating hypotheses.
A second contributory factor merits inclusion in this discussion. Not only is a student personnel work program different in many ways from a medical program, but there is also a great variety of graduate programs in this field. This includes but is not limited to length, content, philosophy, and opportunity for practical experience. It is difficult to feel confident in asserting that the Ohio State University program was representative of many student personnel work programs. It might have been more representative of a particular type of program, that is, theory-based, but that too was not certain. Therefore, the author needed to first establish what the professional socialization experience was for students in this particular program, not in comparison to others. Only after that was done could tentative generalizations be offered.

Methodological Foundations

This section will explain in greater detail the qualitative research strategies which informed this particular effort. Glaser and Strauss (1967) defined grounded theory as discovery of theory from data. Concerned with what they portrayed as an imbalance of emphasis favoring testing (verification) of existing theory over generation of new theory, they offered rather compelling rationale for the latter. Actually, these authors did not minimize the importance of theory verification. They claimed that both may take place without conflict within any research project. The conflict lies in the mind of the researcher, who is caught "between a desire to generate theory and a trained need to verify it" (p. 2).
The author noted with interest the reaction of colleagues to his particular study. Invariably, they would be excited about the content but confused by the methodology. They found it hard to believe that this author had no underlying hypothesis, that he was not attempting to demonstrate or prove something. It also seemed to be a very difficult way to do research.

The author readily acknowledged that having no hypothesis did make for some difficult moments. He had to resist many urges, ranging from speculations he had informally made throughout the three previous years at the university (and which may have added to his motivation to do the study), to his personal need for structure and closure, which was fueled from time to time by exciting possibilities raised by the data being gathered. At the same time, he had to guard against not developing tentative hypotheses, that is, being too diligent against such impulses. These complexities, and the reactions of others to the study, give support to the author's opinion that verification-inspired research can be very enticing. Many human perceptions are based on prior learning and experience, and to perform research as seen in this study requires that the author actively resist his/her own cognitive and emotional predispositions.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) repeatedly emphasized that theory should be discovered from data systematically obtained from social research. This allows one to arrive at a theory suited to its supposed uses. This is contrasted with theory generated by "logical deduction from a priori assumptions" (pp. 2-3).
Merton (1957) described the traditional model for empirical research, research geared to testing or verification of hypotheses. He wrote that "the investigator begins with a hunch or hypothesis, . . . from this he draws various inferences and these, in turn, are subjected to empirical test which confirms or refutes the hypothesis" (p. 103). However, Merton wrote, this is a logical model, and does not mirror the reality of the research experience. Research, he claimed, does not take place as it is reported. It has a more active role, going beyond theory confirmation or hypothesis refutation to originate new hypotheses. Merton proposed that serendipitous occurrences give rise to new ideas, that one observes the following:

unanticipated, anomalous and strategic datum which become the occasion for developing a new theory or for extending an existing theory. Research directed toward the test of one hypothesis yields a fortuitous by-product, and unexpected observation which bears upon theories in question when the research was begun. (p. 104)

The occurrence is surprising because it seems inconsistent with what is theoretically expected, and the investigator feels compelled to make sense of it in a "broader frame of knowledge" (Merton, 1957, pp. 104-105). Finally, the unexpected fact must be such that the observer can find the universal quality to which it is related.

However, as Glaser and Strauss (1967) noted, this is not a grounded research strategy. It is not purposeful. Rather, one is dependent upon a surprise, and deals with that surprise in terms of already existing theory. The researcher, Merton (1957) offered, can derive understanding from the datum by drawing inferences based on his/her already existing general theoretical frame of reference. In other
words, Merton was preoccupied with "grounded modifying of theory, not grounded generation of theory" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 2n).

To define the rationale behind the choice of any research methodology, one must first verbalize the purpose of theory. Glaser and Strauss (1967) listed five: (a) to enable prediction and explanation of behavior; (b) to be useful in theoretical advance in sociology; (c) to be usable in practical applications, as prediction and explanation should be able to give the practitioner understanding and some control of situations; (d) to provide a perspective on behavior, that is, a stance to be taken toward data; and (e) to guide and offer a style for research on particular areas of behavior. (p. 3)

Thus, theory in sociology is actually a strategy for handling data in research. It provides conceptualizations for describing and explaining. From theory should come enough categories and hypotheses so that crucial ones can be verified in research. They must be clear enough to be readily operationalized for quantitative studies when appropriate. The theory must also be readily understandable to sociologists of any viewpoint, to students, and significant laymen. It must fit situations being researched and work when put to use. By "fit" is meant that categories must be readily, not forcibly, applicable to and indicated by the data under study. By "work" is meant it must be meaningfully relevant to and be able to explain the behavior under study.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) went on to say that "the adequacy of a theory cannot be divorced from the process by which it is generated" (p. 5). Generating a theory from data means that most hypotheses and
concepts not only come from the data, but they are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research. Therefore, "generating a theory involves a process of research" (p. 6). The source of ideas can come from sources other than data, such as insight. However, the generation of theory from these insights must still be brought into relation with the data.

This author, then, was attempting to provide ideas grounded in the situation he was studying. The strategy of Glaser and Strauss (1967), which stimulated this work, requires presentation at this point. The author will first discuss comparative analysis, which lies at the core of their method. Later he will focus on two methodological elements central to this concept--constant comparative analysis and theoretical sampling. Finally, he will explain how his research and data management evolved and differed from the "ideal."

**Comparative Analysis**

Comparative analysis, like experimental and statistical analysis, is a general method of theory generation. By comparing social units, the researcher hopes to arrive at hypotheses and theoretical statements about the significance of their relationships, at either or both substantive and formal levels. By "substantive" the author means an empirical area, such as "professional education" or "research organization." Formal theory pertains to the conceptual area, such as "socialization" and "formal organization." Notice that the former are specific examples of the broader categories represented by the latter.
Glaser and Strauss (1967) listed five uses of the data gained from comparative studies. They include (a) accurate evidence, (b) generalizations, (c) specifying concepts, (4) verifying theory, and (5) generating theory. In the following passages the author elaborates on these purposes.

**Accurate Evidence.** The evidence gained from comparing groups is important, in that it allows verification of the accuracy of initial evidence. However, there is a more significant issue at hand. If the intent is to generate theory, the conceptual categories and/or their properties that emerge from the evidence are of greater importance. The continuing flow of data helps confirm, adjust, or even eliminate these categories. A concept is a "relevant theoretical abstraction about what is going on in the area studied" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 23). It also allows predictions of behavior. Even if the predictions are not realized, one can determine what situational conditions may have interfered. That is, categories have greater permanence than evidence. Only when predictions continue to be incorrect is the category proven theoretically dead. Thus, the generation of evidence by comparative analysis is not an end in itself.

**Generalizations.** Comparative analysis is often used to establish the generality of a fact. For example, do all psychologists wear beards? Are all actors "liberals?" As with evidence accuracy, empirical generalizations are established under the umbrella of theory generation. These generalizations allow a broadening of the theory, expanding its applicability, and increasing its explanatory and
predictive powers. "By comparing where the facts are similar or
different, we can generate properties of categories' generality and
explanatory power" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 24).

Specifying Concepts. Specifying a concept is important when an
author is doing a one-case study and wants the reader to be able to
distinguish his/her particular case from other similar units. By doing
this comparison, the author brings out the distinctive elements of the
case. For example, this author might have compared the Ohio State
University student personnel work program with all other master's degree
student personnel work programs. By doing this early in the study, the
author would have been clarifying for the reader what distinguished
this particular program and thus "getting the story straight" (Glaser
& Strauss, 1967, p. 26). As with the previous two data uses, this is
part of the overall purpose of theory generation, not an end in itself.

Verifying Theory. Verifying existing theory is a major use of
comparative data. The analyst can use comparative data to test emerg­
ing hypotheses, to see if the categories are relevant. By doing so, one
can find universals, conditional variations of theory, and, in the mode
of Merton (1957), grounded modification of existing theory. That is,
theory is generated in "the analyst's work but such is taken for
granted; intended focus is on verifying these propositions" (p.103).
One can either find negative cases or intentionally gather positive ones.
Generating Theory. The fifth and final use of comparative data is for generating theory. As was the case with the first three uses of data, verification of theory is subsumed under theory generation. That is, one must verify the emergent hypotheses with accurate data, but not become so preoccupied with verification as to lose the impetus for theory generation. In theory generation a momentum must be developed, caused by the excitement that evolves from initial discovery, hypothesizing, and verification. A premature halt to speculation and broadening of concept development, inspired by a need for verification, defuses the needed impetus for theory generation. Saturation of categories, which will be addressed, should be done in a manner which allows and energizes more investigation, rather than causing stagnation. Verification for its own sake can be done at a later date by another study.

As mentioned, comparative analysis can yield both substantive and formal theory, both which must be grounded in data. While the two can overlap, separate focus can be brought to bear on one or the other. Glaser and Strauss (1967) pointed out that the choice of one or the other dictates particular research strategies. When focusing on a substantive area, theory can be generated by doing a comparative analysis between or among groups in the same substantive area. With formal theory development, the focus is on the comparison of different substantive cases within the formal area, without drawing a relationship to one particular substantive area.
This particular study provides an interesting dilemma, as the subject under study is apparently a mixture between a substantive area—professionalization—and a formal area—socialization. The author's intention was to examine the people in a particular professional education program and learn how socialization took place to that profession. Thus, there was greater emphasis on the substantive area of student personnel work than the formal area of socialization. Comparisons were chiefly made to understand how such socialization took place, given the structural qualities of this program and the field it represented. That does not mean, however, that some comments could not be made about professional socialization as a formal area.

What, then, are the elements of theory generated by comparative analysis? Two exist. First, the researcher produces conceptual categories and their conceptual properties. Both categories and their properties are indicated by the observed data. They evolve from the similarities and differences produced by constant comparison of groups. The initial categories that emerge are eventually integrated or overridden by higher level categories, which in turn become theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, pp. 35-36). These authors again stressed that one does not simply take categories established by another theory and find data in the current research situation that fit if one truly wants to generate new theory. That is why this author did not rely upon categories established by Bucher and Stelling (1977) when analyzing his data. Only after the data and categories were established from the current project would consideration of similarities with that body of literature have been legitimate.
The second element of theory is the set of hypotheses that state the possible generalized relations among categories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The researcher who is attempting to generate theory, stressed these authors, takes on an active role in generating and verifying hypotheses by group comparisons. These hypotheses can be prevalent over a period of time or be superseded by newer hypotheses. Because this is such a dynamic and ongoing process, the analyst does not need an abundance of evidence to generate a hypothesis, as he/she is not establishing a proof. What may seem like tentative and unrelated hypotheses soon tie together a network of categories and yield a central framework or theory core. This core, in turn, guides further collection of data (pp. 39-40).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) underlined one final point. To generate theory, one must jointly collect, code, and analyze data. While this author could not follow their guidance strictly, their statement is worth recalling.

They (joint collection, codification, and data analysis) should blur and intertwine continually, from the beginning of an investigation to its end. To be sure, in any investigation the tendency is to do all three simultaneously; but in many (if not most) studies of description and verification, there is typically such a definite focus on one operation at a time that the others are slighted or ignored. This definite separation of each operation hinders generation of theory. For example, if data are being coded and a free analytic idea emerges that jolts the operation, the idea may be disregarded because of pre-established rules or plain routine--thus stifling at that moment the generation of theory. (p. 34)

Once the notion of comparative analysis is grasped, two major elements of grounded theory generation must be reviewed. They are theoretical sampling and constant comparative analysis.
Theoretical Sampling

Theoretical sampling is a process of data collection for theory generation. The analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his/her data, and then decides what data to pursue next. Where he/she goes for those data is determined by what are the emerging hypotheses. Only the initial decision for collecting data is determined by the researchers' interest in a problem area or a sociological perspective, but not in a pre-conceived theoretical framework (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45).

Within the initial question, that is, "what happens to students in graduate school that turns them into student personnel workers?", is prescribed a partial framework of basic features that will be studied. For example, in studying a graduate program, one knows there are professors, classrooms, and administrative procedures, as well as students. The relevance of these and other basic structures and concepts to the problem under scrutiny cannot be determined at this point. Categories will emerge that are concepts which describe relationships between these structures and other structures not yet described or in the picture (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45).

After it is decided how data will be collected in the initial stages, the researcher must depend upon the initial data and the theoretical hypotheses they suggest for the direction of further data collection. Theoretical sampling is primarily concerned with this question: "To what groups or subroups does one go next in data collection, and for what theoretical purpose? In short, how does the sociologist select multiple comparison groups?" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 47)
According to Glaser and Strauss (1967), the researcher should choose such groups because of their theoretical relevance for the development of emerging categories. "Preplanned, routinized, arbitrary content based on the existing structural limits of everyday group boundaries" are unacceptable, as they may prevent the researcher from reacting to changes and unanticipated information (p. 48).

As Bucher and Stelling (1977) noted, situational factors can mediate against such an approach. It demands the freedom and resources to follow leads provided by data as they become available, leads which may require interaction with unanticipated groups. For example, in the current study, the author might have found that greater understanding of his subject was possible if he interviewed student teachers at the university or graduate students in history. He might have interviewed interns in a mental health clinic, or even minor league baseball players during spring training. All are in training positions for professional roles, despite the range of activities in which they are engaged. Undoubtedly, the ability to discover new concepts can be inhibited when theoretical sampling is not undertaken. This author was limited, and he decided to place some restrictions on the extent of his study. Yet the topic was so rich that he expected exciting concepts could emerge, and that hints of more elaborate research projects would surface.
Constant Comparative Analysis

Glaser and Strauss (1967) sought to establish an approach to the analysis of qualitative data that allowed both systematic codification of data and flexible development of hypotheses. The strategy--constant comparative analysis--is ostensibly an optimal marriage of two distant and opposite methods. One demands that the analyst convert qualitative data into quantifiable form, through codification and subsequent analysis of data, so hypotheses can be provisionally tested. The second permits the generation of theoretical ideas by ignoring data codification for the freedom to constantly redesign and re-integrate theoretical ideas while reviewing materials. By systematizing the codification and analysis of data within the flexible research framework needed by the researcher, potential for theory generation is strengthened, not threatened.

The constant comparative method is described in four stages. In the following passages the author provides a brief review.

Codification. First, as categories emerge from initial observations, the analyst codes each incident into as many categories as possible. Coding is not an intricate procedure at this point. One only need note the categories to which the data belong on margins in his/her notes. At the same time, and this is a cardinal rule of the constant comparative method, the analyst must compare the incident with previous incidents coded in the same category in the same and different groups.
Fairly soon, this constant comparison of incidents leads to theoretical properties of the category. That leads the analyst to consider dimensions of that category, situations where it varies in strength, its consequences, and relationships to other categories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 106).

These authors (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) suggested that conflicts in the emphases in one's thinking can arise after coding for a category three or four times. These conflicts are valuable, as they contain one's theoretical notions. The authors stressed the importance of recording a memo at this point that summarizes these notions. The analyst may need a great deal of time to ponder and derive logical conclusions. These occurrences can not be planned. This is an essential aspect of this method. While the author of this particular study did not always have the freedom to behave as suggested, there were many moments stimulated by interaction with subjects, review of tapes, and discussions with advisers that re-opened many exciting notions that were followed up in subsequent questions and observations.

Integration. In the second stage, the analyst integrates categories and their properties. He/she finds him/herself "no longer comparing incidents with incidents but instead comparing incidents with properties of categories that resulted from initial comparisons of incidents" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 108). From the integration of diverse properties and categories, theory emerges.
Delimiting. Third, as theory develops, delimiting takes place in two ways. The more confident the analyst is with the solidity of the theory, the fewer major modifications are made through comparisons. Those modifications are for clarifying logic and reduction to a smaller set of higher level concepts, concepts which can often be generalized to broader populations. In the case of the current project, the author might have found that some theoretical notions explaining the behavior of student personnel work students may also have pertained to all students in training for helping professions, such as teaching.

Delimiting of categories is also caused by their becoming theoretically saturated (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). That is, after the analyst has coded incidents for one category a certain number of times, additional support of the existence of this category is unnecessary. At that point, only incidents which point to new aspects are coded. For example, if the analyst had clearly established height as the baseline for calculating salesperson attractiveness to customers, additional coding of incidents refering to height for calculating attractiveness would be unnecessary. Only if a case appeared when height was not the baseline would coding and comparison take place.

This theoretical saturation also prevents another problem. If new categories emerge after many pages of coding, the analyst can start to code for them at that point. There is no need to return to the beginning and re-code. Only if the new category does not become saturated should the analyst go through the previous pages for additional evidence.
Theory Writing. The analyst must then write the theory. Categories become major themes of the theory that is presented in written form. Memo discussions become the content behind those categories (Glaser, 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Schatzman & Strauss, 1973). The fact that the analyst has compared incidents with incidents and categories in terms of as many similarities and differences as possible means he/she has had to consider the diversity of the data. Having done so assures him/her that the theory can be complex and corresponds with the data. If, on the other hand, he/she had done coding for the purpose of proving some aspects of already existing theory, the extent of possible meanings of the data would be severely limited.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) pointed out, pertinent to this study, that the constant comparison method tends to result in "developmental theory, that is, a theory of process, sequence, and change pertaining to organizations, positions, and social interactions" (p. 114). In addition, finally, the constant comparison method can lead to either discusional or propositional theory. In the former, usually more useful at the exploratory stage of theory development, the analyst covers many properties of a category. Later he/she may choose to write projections about the category.

Design Parameters

At the time of the study, the author was enrolled in the Ph.D. program in student personnel work and was working as a graduate assistant in the Ohio State University residence hall system. As a member of the assistantship program, he was a legitimate and active participant in meetings which included many of the subjects of his study.
As a result, he could have ready access to classes, meetings, and informal gatherings with little or no problem.

In designing this study, the author wished to be as thorough as possible. He would have preferred to follow the incoming group of students for two years, beginning with admissions interviews and culminating with graduation. However, practical and methodological considerations suggested a research strategy that enhanced the data collection capability, while allowing its management in an appropriate and sound fashion. The following is a description of the solution to that challenge, one which permitted broad and close coverage along with the appropriate data analysis.

Scope

Number of Years. Just as it would have been inadequate to study entry-level professionals without familiarity with the dynamics underlying pre-professional preparation, a study of graduate professional socialization would have been incomplete had the author singled out only one-half of that experience. It was essential that both first- and second-year students be included. Since the researcher had one year in which to work, he had to do the study by working with both groups simultaneously. It was acknowledged that he could not claim that the composition and experiences of the first-year class were exactly the same as those of the second-year group. Nevertheless, the author could study what happened to people in the first and second year of the program, and then suggest similarities and differences in their underlying causes. Furthermore, there were potential advantages in
studying both groups simultaneously. In a sense, the researcher had two groups to study, rather than one, and had two studies. One study was of the professional socialization of second-year students, which included their current second-year experience and their recollections of the first. At the same time, the author was beginning a study of a new group, the first-year students, and would hopefully be able to develop inferences about their second-year experiences from those of the current second-year students. Thus, the author had the advantage of witnessing two rather than one group of people, while also joining them to create an overall single-group impression.

Another advantage of this format had to do with a group's impact on its environment. The outcomes of one year's classes and policies could have led to changes for the next year's group. By studying two different groups simultaneously, the author had the added advantage of being able to hear second-year students talk about what happened to them in the previous year, and at the same time see new students experience the "same" first year, perhaps changed somewhat. While recollections of a year are not the equivalent of current experiences, they do allow for comparisons. A study with one group over two years does not allow for a current comparison.

There was yet another advantage of using two groups. While no direct mention was made, it is reasonable to speculate that the composition and experiences of one class could have affected the selection priorities for the next group. The concern about lack of success in attracting minority students was mentioned on several occasions by the assistantship program director. Notions such as class "character,"
that is, intellectual versus practical orientation, personality diversity, and cohesion, as well as "success" of students in the first year, could have led to changes or continuation of strategies and priorities for selecting new students. This author had no evidence that he and others participating in the selection process did things differently due to such factors, but such was possible.

Finally, current students often interacted with candidates, and the latter developed impressions of the program as a result. The effect of those impressions on the students—both their decision to come to Ohio State University and their predispositions to interpret and react to experiences once there—was hard to gauge but could not be discounted. For example, many first-year students had heard about alleged divisive competitiveness surrounding the second-year assistant-ship selection process, and they voiced a concern and desire to make certain that such did not happen within their group. While trying to avoid such behavior, they watched their peers and labelled behavior accordingly as early as the first quarter. Thus, their socialization experience was possibly influenced by the experience of the previous year. While the author had no evidence, it was possible that those considering selection priorities could have made an effort to select less competitive people to prevent a recurrence of those dynamics.

In summary, the study of these students' professional socialization consisted of gathering data about complex social situations, and had to be done in a manner which allowed for the consideration of that complexity. The strategy of using simultaneous classes enhanced the ability to do so. In a one-group study, the researcher could only have
asked first-year students what their impressions were of the previous year's group. In this study he observed that group's behavior and asked its members about their own recollections of the previous year.

Actually, two groups or classes were not sufficient to understand a program and/or professional socialization. By trading off the continuity provided by a two-year study of one group, the author afforded himself a richer look at the experience at Ohio State University. The study was both of a program and a process. A two-group, one-year study better allowed for both.

Subjects. As noted in the introductory chapter, there were two major elements to the program at the university--academic and experiential. The students first had to be admitted to the academic program. Only then were they eligible for an assistantship. Not all assistantships were administered through the assistantship program, but almost all students in the student personnel work master's degree program did, in fact, receive their assistantships through that assistantship program. Each year a certain number of assistantships were granted to counseling psychology majors, along with an occasional counseling and guidance or higher education administration student. Concurrently, a limited number of those with assistantships majoring in student personnel work could and did take a minor in counseling psychology. That is, they enrolled in the three-course counseling psychology introductory counseling sequence.
In deciding how extensive his study should be, the author was initially concerned about the importance of the larger social situation in which the students existed. Assistantship students, regardless of their majors, had certain courses and experiences in common. In particular, they worked quite closely in the residence hall systems in which they were placed during the first year. One could not simply ignore the presence of non-student personnel work graduate assistants.

On the other hand, the author discovered not long after beginning his observations and interviews that he would, in essence, have to do a complete study of the counseling psychology students in order to give justice to their inclusion in the study. That was simply not feasible, given the resources available to the author. He continued to interview them, as their comments stimulated some thinking that assisted the author in understanding the experience of the student personnel work students. It was clear to him, however, that they could not be a significant part of the results and analysis. The author also considered that their data might be useful if future studies of this nature were considered.

Student personnel work students who were not part of the Student Personnel Assistant Program and without other assistantships were included. There were also a few students who began without an assistantship but were offered and accepted one later. There were, as well, two students with assistantships from outside the Student Personnel Assistant Program. Many possibilities existed for the perspectives all these people could contribute, but those did not enter into the original decision to include them. Rather, they were seen as student personnel
work students who happened not to have assistantships. Some were part-
time, others full-time students. Neither qualification caused any
concern. If anything, these were thought to offer additional and
possibly enlightening perspectives.

In all, the author's original count of potential first-year par-
ticipants was as follows. Of the 29 in student personnel work, three
would pursue a minor in counseling psychology, and nine were not in
the Student Personnel Assistant Program. However, in that program
were three in counseling psychology, two in counseling and guidance,
and one in higher education administration.

Potential second-year participants were broken down into the
following groupings. Of the 22 in student personnel work, five had
a counseling psychology minor, and three were not part of the Student
Personnel Assistant Program. Six others were in counseling psychology,
and two studied counseling and guidance.

These numbers were reduced by the elimination of counseling
psychology majors, the withdrawal of two first-year students, and
the non-participation of a few others. This will be explained in
greater detail later in this chapter.

Sources of Data. As noted, there were a variety of settings from
which data could be gathered. The decision how to parcel out this
time was crucial. One research strategy had to have top priority, but
there also had to be some time for information from other sources. The
author reasoned that the study was from the perspective of the persons
being socialized. That could be inferred from observed actions, interpreted from others' observations and reports, and recorded from the participants themselves. Since paper-and-pencil tests were long ruled out as insufficient, interviews seemed to be the most direct method. Furthermore, it would have been much more efficient to schedule and use interview times to gather data than to attend a plethora of classes, meetings, and informal gatherings that were taking place and overlapping continuously, not only throughout the Ohio State University campus but the greater Columbus area. The decision was to try to interview students at certain times and observe settings as often as feasible.

Initially, the author wanted to interview the students' instructors and supervisors. However, in addition to time considerations, the author felt it was still the students' perspectives that were most useful to the study. Second, he would want to see students' behavior. Comments by faculty and supervisors might have been interesting and revealing, but there were not crucial.

In studying a group in process, it is helpful to see the members throughout that process. In addition, interviews provide anchor points, that is, times during which one can make crude measurements and comparisons. One need not predict differences of any sort will emerge at different times. When one is attempting to do grounded research and has limitations in time and movement, such as reported by Bucher and Stelling (1977), one must set aside times which allow flexibility in pursuing data but make data collection manageable. Since theoretically-based reasons for choosing interview times would possibly have
biased the study in advance, the author reasoned that practical considerations, while not necessarily optimal, should be the starting point. The chief of these parameters were subject availability and the calendar. The academic year was divided into four quarters—fall, winter, spring, and summer—but students enrolled chiefly in the first three. An interview in each of those three for every student was manageable for the author and acceptable to the students. Each quarter's interview allowed for pursuit of different emphases as well as continuing themes. Finally, because this was a study of people over a short period of time, it was important to gather as much data as possible. Interviews at the beginning and end of the year would only be "before and after" measurements. A third interview, in the middle of the year, would not only provide an additional marker period, but would also allow for a much closer view of the individual "in process."

Other Considerations

A review of the literature often precedes a study in order to define the current problem and prescribe the research strategy. However, due to the particular nature of this kind of research, the purpose of a literature review is different. The author read enough material to get a sense of the subject at hand and how its study had been undertaken. Bucher and Stelling (1977), in particular, provided an instructive text, from methodology through insight into professional socialization. However, the author restrained his reading so as to allow freedom in seeing and understanding the data that would come
from his study. Additional reading would take place after the results were reported and the data analyzed, in hopes of bringing perspective and understanding from these data alone.

There was some influence from the literature, nevertheless, on how the study was carried out. Previous studies showed that individuals with whom students had contact played certain roles—advisers, instructors, clients, colleagues—and those roles could have had significance for the students' development. In choosing what to study, the author decided to inquire about the roles those people played in their development without presupposing their relative importance or how such importance emerged. In other words, the researcher, informed by the literature, could confidently assert that professional socialization involved some general elements—people and their roles, learning content, work activity—and that these could be explored. That did not bias the results or the information-gathering effort in such a way as to skew the results or miss something completely. As Glaser and Strauss (1967) mentioned, the scientist does not do his/her research completely uninformed. He/she has an underlying theoretical basis which guides the research strategy and subject choices. Knowing that professional socialization can include some basic elements, as well as being open to new elements and new combinations of old ones, but without pre-asserting how or why that might happen, the researcher can arrange a study which allows grounded theory development which can be related to previous knowledge in an appropriate manner.
Attracting Subjects

Originally, all entering and currently enrolled student personnel master's degree students, assistantship and non-assistantship alike, were to be included in the study. In addition, all first- and second-year students in the Student Personnel Assistant Program who were not in student personnel work were asked to participate. Names, addresses, and phone numbers were provided by the office of the Dean of the College of Education and, when necessary, by the Student Personnel Assistant Program office. This was gathered by the author during the early days of June 1980. There was some difficulty in tracking down some people who had been enrolled on a part-time basis over a period of time in the student personnel work program, especially re-entry women who had been taking one course per quarter or even per year.

In early July a letter was sent to each individual. It explained the research effort being proposed and provided opportunities to respond. A return addressed and stamped envelope was included. The letter did not require a commitment to participate. Instead, the respondent was only asked to note an interest in participating, contingent on attending an orientation session.

On August 15 the new students in the Student Personnel Assistant Program arrived. By that time the study had been given formal approval by the university's Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee. During the Ohio State University housing orientation, in which all of that university's residence hall graduate assistants participated, the author arranged three major meetings,
one per residence hall area, at which he explained the study to those who had indicated an interest. These included the graduate assistants from the second-year class who were on the campus at that time.

The author explained that the study would consist of observations done in classrooms and official meetings, along with interviews with each participant that would be between one and two hours in length. They would be done once per quarter, at the convenience and at the location desired by the participant. In addition, one could withdraw at any time. Strict confidentiality was promised. The author explained that in the results he would talk about trends and use representative quotes that would not betray individual identities. To illustrate, he read passages from Bucher and Stelling (1977). The author explained that by professional socialization he meant "the way in which you become socialized to your field, from student to professional." He mentioned that these studies had been done with students from other fields but not student personnel work. He indicated that he would speak with his adviser and committee members, three who were instructors in the program, about the progress of the study, but would not divulge any information that would betray confidences.

The author also acknowledged that he was part of this group, and thus would be interacting with them in both formal and informal settings. While this might have appeared to them to be difficult to manage, he assured them that he would not be taking notes every time they encountered each other. They would know when he was observing them, as he would say so.
Questions were entertained. Usually they dealt with what the author expected to find. Several asked if they could see the results when completed. Finally, each person who wished to participate was asked to complete a waiver form on which he/she acknowledged understanding the purpose of the study and their willingness to participate.

While a large number participated in these meetings and no one refused to sign, there were still many others to be oriented. This process continued through early October, when the last available person was finally approached. The remaining sessions were done in the same fashion, but often in groups of two or three, some even individually.

Two second-year master's degree students, one in counseling and guidance and the other a non-assistantship student in student personnel work, declined to participate. Both felt their schedules were too busy, despite their interest in what the researcher was doing. There were four other students who did not participate. These people, despite several attempts by the researcher to accommodate them, were unable to find time to attend the orientation sessions. One was not on the list, and when her presence was discovered it was already second quarter. Two others did not register during fall and the researcher was unable to make contact with them.

By the end of the project there were three fewer subjects from those who began. Two withdrew from the academic program, one after fall and other after winter. Their initial interviews are not included in this study, since their identities would be easy to glean from their comments. A third person missed her initial appointment, was
difficult to contact, and seemed unenthusiastic about participating. After she missed another appointment, the author decided to desist with his efforts to include her. Table 1 on page 101 presents the final participation statistics.

Observations

Non-Classroom. The author began actively observing the non-classroom activities of participants on August 15, when the new first-year master's degree and Ph.D. students who were part of the Student Personnel Assistant Program were summoned to their first official meeting. The author continued following their progress at a series of meetings, workshops, and training programs through the year. Table 2 on page 162 presents a summary of his schedule.

All of these sessions included participants in the author's study. However, due to his need to participate himself, he was not able to take notes. He also engaged in many informal/social activities which included these participants, but did so as a member of their groups, that is, assistantship program and/or housing system. The difficulty of distinguishing his roles of member and investigator required that unless he attended for the expressly announced purpose of observing, he would not make notes.

Classroom. The observation of classroom activities began fall quarter. As mentioned, the author was limited by time. Rather than observe all classes perhaps one or two times, he decided to choose certain ones so he could develop a more thorough view of the progress of these groups. While he was dissatisfied with not being able to
Table 1
Subjects who Began and Completed Participation in Study by Academic Program and Assistantship Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Assistantship Program</th>
<th>Non-Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-year students (n=33)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling psychology minor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and guidance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second-year students (n=26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel work</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling psychology minor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Two students were admitted into the Student Personnel Assistant Program during the year (second and third quarter). One other student was a graduate assistant, but not in the Student Personnel Assistant Program. <sup>b</sup>Three students received Student Personnel Assistant Program assistantships during or at end of first year. <sup>c</sup>Student had assistantship, but not in the Student Personnel Assistant Program.
### Table 2

**Schedule of Observations of Non-Classroom Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic/Purpose of Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 18 - 19</td>
<td>Leadership lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20 (AM)</td>
<td>Housing system orientation - introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20 (PM)</td>
<td>Housing system - team building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21 (AM/PM)</td>
<td>Housing system - staff roles and evaluation of resident advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25</td>
<td>Academic registration of first-year members of Student Personnel Assistant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27 (AM)</td>
<td>Graduate assistant/supervisor orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17 (PM)</td>
<td>Housing system - operations management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8</td>
<td>Repeat of Graduate assistant/supervisor orientation for those who missed previous session, plus second-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22 - 23</td>
<td>Academic registration of student personnel work students not in Student Personnel Assistant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>Job hunting and placement strategies - second-year graduate assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30</td>
<td>Interviewing workshop - second-year graduate assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13</td>
<td>Introduction to second-year assistantship selection process - first-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13</td>
<td>Preparation for trips to professional conventions - second-year students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attend classes on a planned and regular basis, but rather when his schedule permitted, he did so with the understanding that his primary source of data were interviews. Observations would provide additional information, that is, the subjects "in action" and possible hypotheses.

The decision was made to observe core classes, that is, courses required of most participants, and/or classes which could include a sizeable portion of the students when requirements were no longer necessary. The second criterion was that the classes were student personnel work content-related. That is, general education requirements such as research and statistics would not be included. Again, since observations were of lower priority, they would be limited to classes where the content dealt with student personnel work and/or the assistantship program. The author also occasionally attended one class per quarter for the counseling psychology/counseling psychology minor students, to gain familiarity with the material and instructors. Because there were only two counseling and guidance majors and one higher education administration student, their classes were not observed.

Even with these limitations self-imposed, the author could not attend and view as many class sessions as he would have liked. Those he did follow in some part which included first-year students were: (a) group procedures course, introduction to student personnel work, and introduction to counseling (fall quarter); (b) student development theory and vocational guidance courses (winter quarter); and (c) student development theory course (spring quarter). Second-year
courses included: (a) administration of student personnel work (fall quarter); (b) administration of student personnel work, practicum seminar (winter quarter); and (c) case study seminar (spring quarter).

The group procedures and student development theory courses were required not only for the academic program but also for all graduate assistants in the Student Personnel Assistant Program. Therefore, Ph.D. and counseling psychology students (second-year) were also enrolled. All student personnel work students took the introductory student personnel work course as well as the two counseling courses. Due to the need for confidentiality, the author was unable to attend the lab sessions of the first of that sequence.

Second-year student personnel work students had only three major academic requirements. One was a two-course sequence in student personnel work administration. Another was a course dealing with the "culturally different." Time and content significance, the latter suggested by students' emphases in their interviews, directed the researcher to concentrate his efforts on the former. In addition, because all student personnel work majors had to take a student personnel work practicum, he chose to observe a seminar which accompanied that practicum. Finally, he attended three or four sessions of one class of student personnel work majors preparing for their case studies, which replaced comprehensive exams for those who chose that option.
Interviewing

In planning when interviews should take place, the author considered a combination of availability and timing. Most first-year students were still getting settled and accustomed to the rigorous demands of the busiest time in their residence life obligation. Cognizant of these demands, he opted to interview returning students first. He also wanted his interviews with first-year students to take place at a time when they had an opportunity to have significant exposure to the first-quarter curriculum. Also, he wanted second-year students' perceptions of their first-year before they were too far along into the second. Given these preferences, he planned second-year interviews for September and first-year students' for October.

Ideally, the interviews with each group would have taken place within as compact a time period as possible. Under such an arrangement, their reactions would have been gathered at approximately the same point in their program. The author found, unfortunately, that such was not possible, due to schedule conflicts and forgotten appointments (by the students).

Interviews were expected to be between one and two hours in length. In fact, they averaged about one and one-half hours, with only a few exceeding two or not reaching one. Length was more a function of interviewee communication style. The author did note that the part-time students and those not with assistantships tended to have shorter interviews, as they had less experience to discuss.
In carrying out the study, the author occasionally found himself doing three or four interviews in a single day. Each demanded a great deal of concentration and energy, and he found it difficult to maintain that pace. Consequently, he made an effort to avoid such a schedule. He also found he was more alert in the morning, late afternoon, and evening. Consequently, he tried not to schedule mid-afternoon sessions.

The bulk of the interviews for each group did take place within the respective identified time periods, but there were several students who had to reschedule their appointments for later in the quarter. This was more a nuisance than a serious impediment. In actuality, second-year students' fall interviews began the third week of October, due to difficulties in making arrangements and orienting all second-year students. Except for a few individuals, they ran through the end of October, at which time the first-year students began to meet with the author.

Second-interviews, originally scheduled for January (first-year students) and February (second-year students), took place in mid-February and late February/early March respectively. The meant that several first-year students had entered into the second-year assistantship selection process by the time these interviews began. Second-year students had already begun planning their job-hunting strategy and convention plans.
The interviews for the last quarter were planned to accommodate second-year students studying for comprehensive exams, which were in mid-May. Accordingly, first-year students were interviewed beginning late in April, and second-year students in late May through mid-June. Graduation was June 13, after which a final few interviews with second-year students still finishing their theses took place.

Research of this nature involves a delicate balance between structure and flexibility, with emphasis shifting from the latter to the former as the study progresses. One requirement of the Human Subjects Review Committee was that a clear outline of the intended line of questioning be provided before the study would be approved. Even without that expectation, the author would have proposed a general series and sequence of questions. These were of a nature that allowed him to learn each quarter what the participants' immediate perceptions were of their past, current, and future relationship with student personnel work. The literature review, along with knowledge of the basic structure of the Ohio State University program, suggested that the study should include questions about the students' perceptions and involvement with the academic setting, professional student personnel workers, and the assistantship experience. Finally, the students' perceptions of progress toward membership in their field merited attention. That could be done in two ways. Either the students could be asked how they felt they compared with themselves on certain dimensions between points A and B, or their immediate perceptions of self on those dimensions could be assessed at different points and compared by the interviewer. Because both strategies could provide useful data, both were employed.
First-Year Students. During the initial interviews with first-year students, most time was spent gathering recent biographical data, that is, educational and experiential activities, the process by which the Ohio State University program was discovered and entered, and the recent past experiences leading to fall quarter. Among the items covered were (a) expectations of the program prior to arrival, (b) reactions to the first month at the university, (c) the selection process into both academic and assistantship programs, (d) feelings about career/academic choices, (e) sense of belonging in the program, and (f) anticipation of success, both academic and experiential.

Second-quarter interviews included reactions to the previous quarter, assessment of current experiences in school and work, and expectations for the future. Among the areas covered were (a) learning the students felt had taken place to date, (b) sense of academic success, (c) being a student in graduate school, (d) reactions to class content and relationships with faculty, (e) feelings about assistantships, (f) being a non-assistantship student, (g) relationships with others in one's social network, (h) assessment of the program, (i) possibly desirable second-year assistantships, (j) relationships with supervisors, and (k) time management.

The last interviews of first-year students were spent more with goals and progress towards the future, both short- and long-term. Many self-comparisons were requested relating to the year's progress. Questions centered around issues such as (a) the second-year assistantship selection process, (b) current career goals, (c) academic and professional strengths and weaknesses, (d) time management,
Second-Year Students. The second-year students' first interviews included a review of the past. This included pre-Ohio State University days and general reactions to the first year—people, school work, self, and goals. Only a small portion of these interviews, which took place early in the quarter, was dedicated to their current situation and future goals. Specific topics that were covered included (a) goals for the second year, (b) reactions to the second-year assistantship assignment, (c) the experience of being a second-year student, (d) anticipated challenges from the curriculum, (e) relationships with adviser and assistantship supervisor, (f) anticipated career directions after graduation, (g) practicum/independent study opportunities under consideration, and (h) feelings about student personnel work.

Second interviews were a combination of three basic areas. First, the participants discussed their reactions to all aspects of fall quarter. Second, some time was spent discussing relationships with others and current assistantship job experiences. Third, and mostly, their perceptions of their relationship to the field of student personnel work, short- and long-term goals, and anticipation of the final quarter were explored. Questions dealt with (a) sense of success in meeting the challenges of practical experiences, (b) concepts of the field of student personnel work, (c) feelings about selves as potential student personnel work professionals, (d) issues in student personnel work of concern to the students,
(e) types of positions anticipated as desirable, (f) relationships with advisers, and (g) relationships with other students in the program.

The second-year students' final interviews were very general in nature. After discussing their experiences preparing for comprehensive exams and seeking jobs, the interviewees were presented with a series of questions dealing with their feelings about student personnel work, their futures, and how they compared on all dimensions since the year and program began. Specific topics included (a) sense of accomplishment over two years, (b) career paths anticipated and first type of position sought, (c) commitment to the field of student personnel work, (d) development of skills over a two-year period, (e) understanding of the field of student personnel work, and (f) value of the second year.

With both first- and second-year students, the author closed the final interview with a question about their reactions to participating in the study. In addition, the students were asked to report their sense of its impact on their just-completed year.

Conducting Interviews. Interviews were held either in the office of the author or in the offices or homes of the participants. They were informed at the beginning of their first interviews that the author had a series of general questions which he wished to ask, but that he might pose additional questions about the answers he was provided. While the respondents were free to elaborate as they chose, the interviewer could "cut them off" in the interest of time.
All interviews were taped, as none of the subjects were uncomfortable with that practice.

The author entered each session with a typed series of questions. He tended to follow their order unless a response took him elsewhere. In virtually all cases the order prevailed. He worded the questions almost exactly the same, especially when he was doing his first interviews and had to refer to his sheet. As he became more comfortable, the list was unnecessary.

If clarification of a response was necessary, or when an answer required further investigation, the author did so at his discretion. This allowed him to follow new leads and ideas. Typically, after five or six interviews in each quarter, he was confident about adjusting some questions, adding some, and even eliminating one or two. The decisions were based on the directions suggested by the emerging data. Yet, the basic format, flow, and control of the interviews remained the same. The interviewer occasionally found that in order to complete interviews, he had to shorten some areas by not following them in as great detail, or shorten other less fruitful areas to allow what appeared to be a significant content area more complete exposure.

Data Management and Analysis

Grounded theory development calls for the creation of a fabric woven from data collection, review, codification, and analysis. This author's strategy was one that allowed him to perform these functions in a manner compatible with the research and life situation under
which he was operating. As reported, his first step was to observe and record the activities of the first-year students prior to fall classes. This introduced him to his subjects and their initial experiences prior to interviewing. He circled comments and behaviors in his notes which were suggestive of categories by their recurrence and applied appropriate labels. This period also allowed him to fine-tune his initial interview questions as well.

During the quarter, the author first attended classes and then began interviewing. He continued to circle situations, behaviors, and comments, and whenever possible made comments. Likewise, he would write reactions to notions and concepts that arose due to interviewing.

After the first quarter's end, he reviewed what had transpired to arrive at a general impression of those three months. Had any possible trends emerged? Were some new directions worth pursuing? Should new questions be added or anticipated ones dropped? Should other classes be observed in the upcoming quarter? These were all questions he considered. At the same time, he had to resist reaching conclusions or even firm hypotheses at this time. It was safe to say that certain tendencies were in evidence, but to declare their significance would have been hasty. After discussing the previous quarter with his adviser, the author then planned for the one upcoming.

This "routine" continued for the next two quarters. At the end of the second quarter, the author was able to point with greater confidence to certain trends, but he still refrained from being completely conclusive in his remarks. Only after the third quarter could a thorough analysis take place.
That analysis was of a great deal of material. The author had tape recordings of all interviews, along with notes from observations he had made throughout the year and reactions to both types of encounters. His task at that time was to arrange the data so that he could recount what had taken place, along with allowing the data to develop their own categories, from which analysis could take place.

The first step was to write transcripts of all tape recordings. While doing this, the author circled, labelled, and occasionally wrote reactions to comments which related to the preliminary categories which had developed during the study. Similar actions were taken with the observational notes.

Next, the author had to organize the data so that reporting could take place. Since no standard instruments were used, data categories had to be developed. The author saw that at the most concrete level, the students' lives while at the university consisted of two major structural elements—academics and assistantships. These were covered by an umbrella known as "the program." Due to inclusion in this program, a network of relationships was established, and while this was not a structural element, it was certainly an outgrowth (sometimes intended) of the program. Finally, the study was of another category, "socialization to student personnel work." In other words, there were five categorical areas under which all comments and observations could be grouped.

The author began coding each response by the broad content area it implied or labelled. For example, a comment that was directed to a particular class was labelled as "academic," or "A." At the same time,
the same comment might have referred to the student's perception of student personnel work, his/her feelings about the program, or his/her relationship with the teacher.

The particular content thus implied was so labelled. For example, a comment could have been labelled "A/VSP" -- "Academic/View of Student Personnel Work." These sub-categories were developed as the author went along and saw commonalities and differences. Occasionally he returned to earlier comments to create new labels. As he continued, this became less and less frequent, until his categories became saturated. In fact, one quarter's worth of interviews and observations created some sub-categories which were unchallenged by the remaining two. Others were limited to one or two quarters, as they pertained to the content issues which were limited in time, such as comprehensive exams.

From these categorized codifications, the author hoped to describe the program to the reader in the results chapter. First, he wanted to explain what took place in the program and how that was perceived by the students. Second, he planned to describe what appeared to be the professional socialization experience of these students to student personnel work. In order to do so, he had to first re-write all of the comments. He set up separate sheets for each sub-category, and interview comments were written in the sheets pertaining to their codes. In the case where a comment was double-coded, it was assigned to both sheets.
Next, the author had to review the newly-organized data. In addition to tabulating the numbers of responses, he had to take into account the shades of affect and meaning. There were few if any unqualified responses, and thus charts, tables and statistics could not adequately portray data. His report had to describe these gray areas and their relationship to the predominant response patterns.

This was satisfactory for constructing a picture of the life of the student personnel work student at Ohio State University. However, broader and more abstract concepts were possibly within grasp, and for that additional analysis was necessary. The reader will recall how the author labelled behaviors and comments which hinted at such notions, along with making "reactions" to them. This he had done not only while conducting the study but when making tapescripts of the tapes. He continued to do this as he reorganized the data into content categories. After writing his description of the program, he proceeded to analyze these reactions and concepts through a series of comparisons. The results of that effort is the substance of the fifth and final chapter.

Final Note

Before proceeding to the results and analysis, the reader should be aware of one important limitation of this study. In defining his research questions and constructing the study, the author was heavily influenced by the framework employed by medical professional socialization research. Certainly the most extensive work had been done from within that arena, and that had allowed the author to acquire an understanding of the issues, questions, and dynamics quite often associated with the topic. In doing so, he provided himself an
"accepted" foundation from which to build his study. He felt confident from this literature review that he was building a research project that would provide results worthy of serious consideration.

On the other hand, by evoking the medical model he was foreclosing on the opportunity to perceive student/client, student/faculty, and employee/supervisor relationships from other perspectives. It is very possible that an investigator studying the interactions witnessed in this study who had not read the medical literature might not have constructed an interview and observation strategy comprised of the elements used herein. There are many levels of meaning possible in this instance, and the author would have been irresponsible for not acknowledging the boundaries under which the data and meaning exist in this study.

Finally, it should also be stressed that the author's research strategy was not one which would lead to grounded formal theory development. The size of the study suggested that such was unwise. In addition, the freedom necessary for theoretical sampling and constant comparative analysis was simply not his. However, given proper research conditions, the author is certain that grounded formal theory development is feasible.

This is not to demean the results that follow. The research and data management strategies employed in this instance bring forth a portrait rich in substance and suggest research questions of importance to a variety of social scientists. The reader, however, must be cognizant of the limitations of the representativeness and power of the results.
This last point demands elaboration. As noted, the author was unable to choose unanticipated observational settings suggested by ongoing data analysis. Nor was he able to observe every class and meeting. For example, he could not attend all practicum seminars. The fact that he attended the second-quarter practicum seminar did not mean that the analysis of data suggested the importance of that particular class. Certainly the program's structure, of which practica were a reasonably significant component, suggested that a group of practicum students be observed. However, one should not believe that what was reported by the author from the proceedings of this class was either different or the same as what had taken place in the practicum seminars which preceded and followed this particular one. The information is rich and has merit in of itself, and should be seen as such. It also supports some already established concepts and perhaps hints at new ones.

The emphasis given in reporting students' activities and perceptions also does not impute some absolute measure of their importance. That students spoke at greater length about their introductory student personnel work course than either of their counseling classes does not mean that the latter were less meaningful. However, the emphasis of reporting does reflect the students' perceptions of what was significant. Accordingly, an investigator might ask, "What does it mean about professional socialization in this instance if the students ignored or attributed relative insignificance to certain aspects of their program?" It is from such questions that more fundamental concept development might emerge.
CHAPTER IV

Results

Introduction

Chapter Four is an account of the author's interviews and observations. Together they describe the experience of the participants over a six-quarter period. While some students were enrolled during the summer between the first and second year, along with a few who had to extend their stay an extra quarter to complete their theses, the majority confined their stay to the standard two-year, six-quarter schedule.

For 30 years the program in which the students were enrolled had been mutually sponsored by the academic and administrative communities, respectively the College of Education and the Division of Student Services. In the words of the Student Personnel Assistant Program director, this resembled "a little college within the university." Operations included admissions, publicity, orientation, teaching, advising, placement, and alumni relations.

According to the director there were two systems of assistantships. "System One," as he called it, was geared to the master degree students, 45 of the total of 55 Student Personnel Assistants being at that level during the two-year period. The program was designed for the individual with limited previous experience. Re-emphasizing the relationships between residence halls and student services, he noted which core courses were taken by all participants and related to
both academic programs and their assistantship assignments.

While including students from four academic areas--Student Personnel Work, Counseling Psychology, Higher Education Administration, and Counseling and Guidance--priority was typically given to those in the first two. Of the 27 new admittees in 1980, 18 were in Student Personnel Work and six (two at the Ph.D. level) in Counseling Psychology. After those assignments were made, assistantships were granted to the people in the other two fields. Only one was in Higher Education Administration and two in Counseling and Guidance. The director noted that many students were "paraprofessionals" before admission; it was rare that they had been full-time professionals.

Second-year students were divided between residence halls and office settings. This, it was explained, resembled the "logic of the field," as the first jobs people tended to take after graduation were either in residence halls or assistant deans in small colleges.

Students were usually assigned to residence halls in the first year of the program to acquire a "generalist" experience. By generalist was meant a situation where one was exposed to a wide variety of students, problems, responsibilities, and demands for skills. The first two quarters' activities, combined with core courses, aided the choice of a second-year position. In that decision one could consider one's career interest. Usually five to seven students returned to the residence halls, and 20 to 23 were spread throughout the university in a variety of settings, such as the financial aid office, counseling center, residence life administrative offices, academic college offices, and student unions.
"System Two" assumed three to five years of post-master's degree experience. These students were Ph.D. candidates only. At the time of this study there were eight such positions, in areas such as the Dean of Student's Office, Housing, Athletics, and the College of Education. These Student Personnel Assistants were expected to spend a minimum of two years in these assignments and to take five master's level core courses.

Program in Process

The overall program was arranged with certain outcomes in mind. In a summer meeting with all new Student Personnel Assistants, the program director outlined the process as he had seen it take place. The first year in the master's degree program in Student Personnel Work was focused primarily on the self and on counseling skills. Courses were geared towards human development, counseling, group workshop design and leadership, career development, and research. The academic emphasis was on a minimum level of counseling skill, enough for a generalist but not necessarily for a counselor or therapist.

The second year saw a shift towards the formal organization and behavior in higher education, intervention for change, plus the implementation of student development theory. Students would have electives and practica along with seminars. If they desired, they could opt for a thesis, though that decision should have taken place by the end of the first year.

The first year saw the emergence of four themes. According to the director, the first year included: (a) adjustment to being in school, that is, to demands created by studies, work, and personal
needs; (b) awareness of the field of student personnel work and new options within; (c) self-awareness and analysis, skills and knowledge development; and (d) the discussion of these themes with the Director and one's academic adviser. In the autumn quarter the new student had to create a balance between academic, assistantship, and personal needs. He noted that it was rare that students failed at this task, and that faculty, supervisors, and "your own body" would signal any real problems. By winter quarter this adjustment should have been accomplished or well on the way, and spring quarter would find students who felt at home and were productive. In fact, many had chosen to remain for the summer.

In the fall, new students would be introduced to the field of student personnel work. They would be told what the field was, and thus their awareness would expand. The field's complexity would grow in their eyes, and they would see that nothing was simple or certain. This could lead to confusion. As second quarter proceeded, their awareness would continue to grow. However, by third quarter they would have to have narrowed down, by virtue of a second-year assistantship assignment and, for a few, choosing a thesis topic.

On an individual level, the first year students' self-understanding would grow in regards to skills developed in the assistantship setting and academic knowledge from the classroom. This would continue throughout the year, prodded by the second-year assistantship selection process.
The fourth theme of the first year had to do with the process by which the first three were discussed and monitored. First-year students were expected to meet on a quarterly basis with the program director and their academic adviser to examine their progress, receive performance feedback, and to discuss the future.

While the growth in self-awareness and field familiarity could continue into the second year, the program director portrayed that year in a much different fashion. The four key elements he listed were (a) classes and assistantship position, (b) thesis or comprehensive examination progress, (c) job search process, and (d) relationship with faculty adviser. Where the first year allowed the students to discover their abilities and learn field-related knowledge, the second year would witness an integration of the classroom and assistantship experiences, as well as a testing of one's limits and capabilities. This would culminate in a spring quarter decision about a job, Ph.D. program, or internship. The process of preparing for comprehensive examinations, while probably being stressed in the third quarter, actually would begin in the fall. Meanwhile, those students who had chosen the thesis option would be working in earnest that fall and doing their oral defenses by spring.

The professional job search would be actively facilitated by the program. In the fall there would be the first of a three-session job awareness and search series. The second would take place in early winter and the third just prior to the spring national professional conventions. For some Ph.D. students the process would culminate in seeking a third-year assistantship.
Finally, as was the case in the first year, all students would have the opportunity to meet on a quarterly basis with their academic adviser and supervisor to discuss their program experience. Hopefully these meetings would tie together the overall experience and help the students make sense out of all that was taking place.

The director stressed that evaluation was important for all people, from undergraduate residence hall resident advisers through deans, as its focus was the eventual growth of the students served by these staff. He claimed the evaluation process could improve performance of the student personnel assistants and help the organization decide whether or not to keep a staff member. It also provided for staff development programming and determining the type of supervisor needed.

Evaluation would be done in regards to three classes of variables. These were (a) job functions and related skills and style, (b) personal characteristics, and (c) context notions. The third referred to where one worked, and how "politically astute" one was in learning and adjusting to the realities of the system at hand. The director went on to say that there were two systems of evaluation, one for the Ohio State University residence halls and one for other assistantships. Each was geared to the idiosyncracies of those environments.

**Academics**

As noted previously, students were enrolled in four academic areas. There were both striking and subtle differences between them, as well as similarities. The Counseling Psychology degree was
portrayed as more thorough for counseling preparation than was the Counseling and Guidance degree. A counseling psychology minor could be useful if one were considering a Ph.D. in that field, or expected counseling to be a significant part of one's work. The first-year counseling psychology sequence, in which six students from the Student Personnel Assistant Program could enroll (including non-counseling psychology majors), included courses dealing with counseling theory, counseling diagnostics, and career development, all three accompanied by labs. The counseling sequence within the student personnel work curriculum dealt with only the first and third topics of that sequence. This provided adequate training for minimal counseling skills usage in a generalist type of position.

The interrelationship between academic and assistantship programs was illustrated by the requirement that all members of the Student Personnel Assistant Program take a group procedures course, regardless of their doctoral/master's status or field of study. They were also expected to take at least the first of a two-quarter student development theory sequence. These were courses that were requirements of the Student Personnel Work program as well. One aspect of the group procedures class was a two day leadership laboratory, which served, in a sense, as a major initial component of the Student Personnel Assistant Program orientation process early in August. (Non-assistantship students and those Student Personnel Assistants absent at that time attended a similar program early in fall quarter.)
All student personnel work master degree students were enrolled in the introductory student personnel work course. They also were expected to take the department's counseling theory course and accompanying lab, while the counseling psychology minors were enrolled in the parallel course offered by the Psychology Department.

The first quarter was a time for the students to receive grounding in skills and understandings basic to functioning in the world of student personnel work. It was reasoned that a generalist would require fundamental counseling skills to work effectively with individuals, not necessarily as a therapist but as a helping agent. At the same time, a major component of the student personnel work field would be working with groups in a facilitative/advisory capacity. This role, in reality, was thrust upon residence hall Student Personnel Assistants as soon as their undergraduate staff members, called resident advisers, arrived in September. It would continue with the subsequent arrival of student leaders, who would be heading groups of their peers--members of student government, judicials, orientation program--to be advised by the Student Personnel Assistants. For this reason the group procedures course was included in the first quarter.

The students would need to learn the foundations of student personnel work as a profession--its history, basic understandings, possible futures, and organizational settings and roles. In a sense, this was in anticipation of the organizational development thrust of the second year.
Finally, all students were expected to take six hours--two classes--from an area pertaining to the philosophy of education and research. In particular, it was stressed that the ability to carry out research was important to the student personnel work professional, and a two-course sequence of research methodology and statistics was available.

The second year of the program contained fewer required courses. All students enrolled in a two-course sequence dealing with the administration of student personnel work. From these offerings they were expected to gain a broader understanding of the role of the student personnel worker in higher education. One course was required that dealt with the culturally different student, and all students took at least one practicum. However, aside from the research/philosophy of education obligations not completed in the first year and the final quarter thesis/comprehensives requirement, students were free to choose other practica, independent study topics, and electives. From these they could explore their academic and career interests, and could apply the knowledge and perspectives they had gained. In fact, the students were not restricted to courses from within the student personnel work area or even the College of Education. They could (and did) choose courses from other Ohio State University colleges.

Housing Organization

Before moving on to the actual experience of the students, it is necessary to explain the housing system at the university. That is because a majority of the students spent their first year in that
organization, and many of the terms used by the students and author refer to that setting.

The housing division consisted of residence halls clustered in three locations on the campus. These were called "areas." Each hall or pair of halls, depending on size and number of students, was supervised by a hall director. This individual had, at minimum, a master's degree in student personnel work, counseling, or a related field. A hall director was considered an entry-level master's position, though there were individuals with additional experience. The hall directors were considered full-time professional staff, who were responsible for overseeing the entire operation of their buildings, from basic physical upkeep to the educational development of the residents. While the conditions of the halls and related administrative duties were often nettlesome and time consuming, the challenge for which they were prepared by their educational background was student development. Programs, counseling, and, in fact, the entire environment were expected to stimulate students' intellectual, emotional, and social development.

Student Personnel Assistants were the assistant directors in these buildings. Where the hall director supervised two buildings, each had an assistant director. In larger halls, two Student Personnel Assistants were assigned to the hall director. In small halls or complexes, only one Student Personnel Assistant was placed. That person was expected to assist the hall director in running the building or complex. How the duties were delegated depended on the particular staff situation and building needs. However, it is safe to say that
the Student Personnel Assistant, despite the degree of responsibility, was not an equal of the hall director.

In each of the three areas was an area coordinator, to whom the hall directors reported. Each area coordinator was assisted by an area administrative associate, a Ph.D. student in Student Personnel Work or Higher Education Administration who was also a Student Personnel Assistant. (The author was assigned in this capacity on the South Area.) The area coordinators, in turn, reported to the central housing office. There were several upper level administrators at that level, each with an area of concentration. Those included Food Service, Administration and Finance, Maintenance and Housekeeping, Contracts and Assignments (for placing students in rooms), and Student Development. The Director of Student Development, aided by two assistant directors and two Student Personnel Assistants (one Ph.D., one second-year master's degree student), supervised the area coordinators. Due to the size of the operation, which housed nearly 11,000 residents, there was a significant amount of centralized direction for the entire housing system, the final authority resting with the Director of Housing. He, in turn, reported to the Vice President for Student Services. The reader is reminded that the director of the Student Personnel Assistant Program was funded by the same vice president.

There were a few additions to the system. One of the areas, "Olentangy," had affiliated with it a few cooperative scholarship houses. These included one residence hall and several small buildings, both on- and off-campus. While they reported to a hall director, these
student personnel assistants occupied a different role, due to the small number of students and the physical arrangements. The students in these houses had a much greater say in the running of their buildings, and the student personnel assistants acted more as advisers than assistant directors. They did not have to advise student groups within those buildings, such as hall government, judicials, and security, and did not directly supervise student staff.

Several student personnel assistants were assigned to residence halls in four nearby colleges and universities. In those institutions they were considered hall directors. They had similar duties, but the actual significance of responsibility depended greatly on the philosophy and resources of the institution and the staff to which they reported. These were often smaller operations, but the residence halls were not unlike those at Ohio State University.

Finally, one first-year student personnel assistant was assigned to a sorority. Her role resembled that of the cooperative house Student Personnel Assistants. However, since the sorority was not affiliated with the housing system, the Student Personnel Assistant did not participate in housing system training.

Participants

The background of the students in the program is worth noting. Of the 27 in the first-year group, 12 had just completed their undergraduate careers. Of the other 15, seven had been out of school since the previous summer and eight for more than one year. Many had been disenchanted with their jobs and/or their academic majors, or they had left college uncertain of their career goals.
The participants learned about Ohio State University in several ways. Aside from reading catalogs, many were told by student personnel work practitioners on their campuses that Ohio State University had a program with an excellent reputation. In some instances these staff were ex-student personnel assistants. In a few cases the students who applied and interviewed had no inkling of this reputation. It was only after they returned home that they heard about the supposed excellence of the program.

A second contributing factor was location, particularly for the part-time and non-assistantship students. Several were working at the university already, or for family reasons needed/wanted to be in Columbus.

The students did not come from one particular academic field. They were from the social sciences (political science, economics, psychology, sociology), humanities (journalism, English, theatre, religion), applied science (biology, horticulture, medical technology), education, and business. It could be said, however, that there were very few from the last group, and that a significant number studied social sciences and the humanities. This diversity was seen in the non-assistantship students as well. Undergraduate academic performance was reported as approximately 3.2. Again, when comparing the non-assistantship students with the student personnel assistants, the differences were very slim. In laymen's terms, they were B-plus/A-minus students.
By their own admission, most students were not academically oriented as undergraduates. Most preferred active involvement with campus life and "got by" with the school work. Their enjoyment of learning was not matched by the motivation to achieve high grade point averages. While most ended up in majors which were consonant with their interests, a few noted actively disliking their majors by the time they graduated. Those who studied in the non-science and business areas did not see those majors leading to careers in those domains, but as personal academic interests preparatory to graduate study. Two students had entered graduate study prior to enrolling at Ohio State University, and due to their dissatisfaction switched to student personnel work. Overall, most students retained their undergraduate academic interests, or at least did not reject those interests outright when choosing student personnel work.

**Selection Process**

A study of the program at Ohio State University must begin with the selection process, as it was the point at which the students began interacting with students, faculty, and staff. This process began in earnest in the winter. Hopefuls applied separately for academic admission and inclusion in the Student Personnel Assistant Program. For the latter, candidates submitted both a brief application and autobiographical statement. Those who merited secondary consideration were invited to visit the campus, where they were interviewed by the program director, students, faculty, and professional residence hall staff members from Ohio State University and the nearby colleges which
participated in the program. When interviewees stayed overnight they usually roomed with a current Student Personnel Assistant. Depending on the latter's schedule, the candidates could attend class sessions, parties, and informal social gatherings.

While the process was similar for many applicants, there were a few notable exceptions. One candidate interviewed with the program director at a national convention. Two interviewed with graduates of the program who lived near their homes, and a fourth interviewed over the telephone. Of the seven students who began the year without assistantships from the Student Personnel Assistant Program, only two had actually been invited to interview. Of the other five, two did not apply for assistantships due to family and job commitments.

Late cancellations made available three assistantships spaces in the summer, and two candidates were interviewed in early August. This took place as close as a few days before the first official meeting.

It appears that the selection process itself contributed to the decision to enroll. Most applicants recalled a very positive impression of both that process and the people they met. In particular, applicants cited the "objectivity" and enthusiasm of current students about the program. Several recounted their discussions with their student hosts about coursework, program dynamics, and faculty. It was also interesting that the off-campus schools were reviewed with mixed emotions by some applicants. While some wanted the small school experience, concerns were felt about the competence of the student personnel work staff at those institutions.
Negative impressions were not limited to non-Ohio State University settings. A few mentioned frustration caused by administrative scheduling errors surrounding their visits. The program director was experienced as "intimidating" by a few applicants, either due to the interview with him or from expectations built by his reputation. A few had concerns about the residence halls in which they might be placed due to exposure during the visit to campus. However, most said Ohio State University was their number one choice after the interview.

One interesting facet of this process was the "moral dilemma question." In the course of interviewing candidates, the program director posed a question in which the interviewees were asked to make a moral judgement. Reactions to that experience varied from "being fun" to a sense of being intrigued. One was "impressed," as this was the only interviewer to get beyond "superficiality." Another felt it was "questionable" to be asked to answer a personal question of that nature. The author also learned that three students had expected to face that type of question because other Student Personnel Assistants had told them that such would take place.

Student Personnel Assistant Orientation Period

Initial Encounter

The author's active research began with the arrival in mid-August of most of the first-year participants. In addition to the master's degree student personnel work students, this group included three Ph.D. students, four counseling psychology majors, two counseling and guidance students, and one student in higher education administration. They all were summoned to campus so they might take part in a month
long combination of assistantship, housing, and academic orientation training activities. While classes would not begin until mid-September, assistantship responsibilities would be thrust upon them much sooner. The Student Personnel Assistants assigned to Ohio State University residence halls would be training and supervising undergraduate resident advisers within three weeks. Those placed in local colleges would have similar duties, but much sooner. As previously noted, the students assigned to cooperative scholarship housing and sororities would not have resident advisers to supervise but would be working with student leaders who lived in those settings. Thus the initial exercises would provide training and a frame of reference upon which the assistantship students could base their subsequent assistantship activities.

The program participants had actually arrived during the previous week and varying degrees of orientation to their residential environments, the campus, and Columbus. This depended on the availability and inclination of their supervisors and other students.

At the first meeting, the program director presented expectations for the orientation period and the two years at the university. Without specifics, he noted the major events that would take place during the next month. Second, he introduced the process by which program participants would interact. Four groups of ten were formed to discuss "who am I," "my most enjoyable experiences," and "I'm good at doing." He structured these groups by having each appoint a "scribe" and a "timekeeper," allowing four minutes per person to respond to these three items. This was followed by the selection of partners and an
hour-long "dyadic" (paired) encounter, guided by a booklet which provided open-ended statements similar to those mentioned above. When the pairs returned, they introduced their partners to the entire group, but only after the director modeled the introduction style by doing so with the author.

Next, the director behaved in a fashion that would be repeated or approximated by faculty and staff throughout the year. He employed what was called the "structured group methodology." He informed those in attendance that a certain activity was about to take place, its goals, and how it would unfold. Then the students would engage in the planned exercise, one that would cause them to discuss issues and/or attempt to learn and use skills related to human relations and organizations. After the activity, the author reviewed with the group that which had taken place, and together they determined the underlying value or message. This was concluded with statements summarizing the learning or symbolism of the exercise.

Associated with this teaching/training style was a particular style of language, what one might call jargon. The author was familiar with these terms due to his relationship to the program, but interviews brought out this issue without the author's prompting. This was particularly true of students who enrolled in the group procedures course but who missed the original leadership lab. Several noted how confused they were by the language used by that course's instructors during the first two sessions, and only after going through the lab did the words make sense. Later in the year, particularly in interviews, the author learned how students tired of the use of
what they felt was an excessive reliance of the program on both the structured group methodology and the use of jargon.

What were some of the terms, techniques, and tools associated with this style? The author has already written about the general format. Students were often asked to break off into pairs or small groups to discuss issues, later to return to consolidate reactions and opinions. The discussion of the experience was called "processing," a way of examining what was meaningful in the experience. It also afforded the participants an opportunity to express any lingering feelings that might be troubling them. This was particularly important if the experience brought about conflicts, emotions, or uncertainty.

While there were several terms associated with this style of training, certain others merit inclusion at this point in the discussion. Group leaders were often called "facilitators," as their role was to enable the discussion to take place, as opposed to commanding it. Other terms that the students grouped in this category were "workshop," "significant-other," "dyad," "feedback," and "consensus." Once exposed to the introductory counseling class, some phrases used to enhance interaction with clients became common, and soon tiring. Chief among them were phrases such as "I hear you saying," which was a way of telling a client that you understood him/her, and "empathy," non-evaluative concern shown a counselee.

Techniques and tools were closely related. Students quickly learned about the use of newsprint and easels for presenting information and listing of key points from group discussions. Magic markers were generally used along with the easels, and the completed sheets
were usually affixed to the wall with masking tape. Workshop participants often wore name tags, an attempt to assist acquaintanceship. While this program certainly did not have a monopoly on this instructional style, the students frequently commented on what they saw as the proclivity of people associated with the program to employ these tools, techniques, and terms.

The author also noted a direct attempt by the program director to stimulate a sense of support for and by the group. He mentioned a picnic that would be held later, encouraged students to sit together at football games by buying tickets together, invited the students to attend an open house at his home, and indicated that some second-year assistantship students would be joining the group at lunch time and providing tours of campus that afternoon.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the author noted what he would call "instant intimacy." Through the structured exercises, the students were expected to tell people who were then strangers about themselves, progressing from names and geographical data to statements in which they shared opinions of each other and talked about personal strengths and weaknesses. While the ground rules established that one could refuse to respond to any item, the purpose was clearly to get acquainted as closely and as soon as possible. There seemed to be a message that personal openness and communication were desirable.

The director also noted that the leadership lab, in which all would participate beginning the coming Monday, would actually start one of their academic courses. It would be their one common class and would involve "structured group/organizational interventions," which they
would use throughout the orientation period. In other words, not only was openness desirable as a human environmental condition, but the methods by which it could be achieved were aspects of the official academic and assistantship programs.

The orientation process continued with lunch with eight second-year student personnel assistants, followed by an afternoon which combined payroll paperwork and tours of campus and nearby shopping facilities. That evening a party was held by a second-year assistantship student, to which were invited hall directors and Student Personnel Assistants, who at this point were being called "SPA's." This was the first of what would be called "SPA parties," events which would allow students to socialize, share "war stories" from the residence halls, and provide support through the difficult adjustment to life as a graduate student. (From this point on, the author will refer to the assistantship students as SPAs.)

Initial reactions to the first few days were varied. Those who commented about the initial session noted how it allowed them to be "open right away," provided "instant friends," and made for an easy early adjustment. The party stimulated positive comments as well. On the other hand, errors or difficulties with housing arrangements caused stress for a few, and those SPAs who had no students or staff in their houses and residence halls felt alone and somewhat unhappy. Overall, the initial few days seemed to be received positively.
Leadership Lab

Three days after the initial session, the first major activity for program participants took place--the leadership lab. For two days--morning, afternoon, and evening--they engaged in a series of human relations activities with three major purposes, as stated by the program director. They were (a) to learn leadership dynamics, behaviors, functions, and processes, (b) to learn workshop design and facilitation, and (c) to prepare for similar workshops during orientation.

The director was careful to note that this was not a personal growth, encounter, or "T-group." As he had said during the initial meeting, this was the beginning of the one class all SPAs would take come fall quarter.

Joining the program director were the two assistant directors from the Student Development Office, one who would continue as an instructor in the fall group procedures class. They were joined by a master's degree student who had graduated and was about to begin a Ph.D. program at another institution.

The two-day schedule was then presented. The first morning consisted of an explanation of the underlying concepts to the type of learning they would be facing--experiential learning--followed by norms for their sessions and an "acquaintanceship" experience. An acquaintanceship exercise was a structured experience which helped members of a group or class get to know each other beyond names, hometowns, and residence hall assignments. Finally, each participant filled out a personal development inventory, which consisted of a list of behaviors they wished to "work on" during the lab. These they clarified with their dyadic encounter partner from the previous Friday.
The afternoon activities introduced the students to two types of group activities they would see and use throughout the two-year period. An "energizer," a five minute exercise in which participants engaged in a structured activity to get their attention focused, was first employed. The next two activities were variations on a theme--group decision-making and competition. In both sessions, the lab leader gave goals for the activity and then read the instructions. After the groups engaged in the specific activity, the results were reviewed and discussed. The reactions of the participants to this experience were solicited, and then the lab leader summarized what meanings could be gleaned from this experience.

In addition to the emergence of the workshop leadership style and associated terminology, students were exposed to the use of self-assessment instruments which they could score and interpret at once. In the first evening they were handed a personality inventory which they completed, scored, and were taught to interpret. The results were discussed with partners and related to work in residence halls, on staffs, and to the student personnel work academic program in general. Finally, in concert with the educational method described earlier, the day ended with an informal evaluation of the completed events by the entire group. Many then went, at the instigation of the program director, to a local pizza establishment.

The morning of the second day provided participants with the first major opportunity to learn about and practice two profession-related roles--consulting and teaching. Following a "lecturette," a brief lecture, the participants broke into groups to attend
"miniversities," brief presentations about identified subject areas. One topic was "relaxation," led by one of the first-year master's degree SPAs. Participants were asked to listen, join in the activities, and give comments.

The afternoon was spent with two exercises which related personal style with group activity. This combination allowed the group members to use the consulting skills taught that morning. The lab leaders had thus taken the previous day's lecture about decision-making and collaboration and interjected the effect of personality and style.

The final evening was a two-hour "feedback" exercise. Feedback was described as a very important activity. It meant telling others how their behavior appeared, thus allowing them to make changes or continue desirable habits. The key to feedback was that it was non-evaluative, hence only descriptive. By giving feedback, the participants had the opportunity to apply the human relations skills and principles taught during the first five segments of the lab.

Following this exercise the director placed the entire group in a large closed circle. The program director asked them to make non-verbal contact with each other, and he expressed the hope that "you'll all be friends, colleagues, and teachers." This was followed, upon his suggestion, by milling around the room and expressing any last comments, which he called "unfinished business." Several people then proceeded to hug each other and exchange comments.
System-wide Staff Development. After the leadership lab, students entered into the housing orientation process. Actually, this was not experienced simultaneously by all SPAs. Those working at Capital, Otterbein, and Ohio Wesleyan, three of the four local colleges and universities associated with the assistantship program, reported for duty earlier in August. Therefore, they were participating in residence life orientation and staff training programs before the leadership lab. For the SPAs at Ohio Wesleyan University, this bore particular significance, as they had already formed some fairly firm allegiances prior to meeting the Ohio State University SPAs. Combined with the distance between that institution and Ohio State University, this may have prevented these students from becoming an active part of the latter's social environment.

The Ohio State University housing senior staff orientation began immediately after the leadership lab and continued through Labor Day, when student staff members arrived. During the orientation the SPAs joined hall directors, area coordinators, and area administrative associates in a series of sessions where they learned about the physical operations of the halls, the professional staff roles and responsibilities, programming, judicials, and cultural issues. They also engaged in intra-area team-building activities and prepared to run their respective complexes.

The initial housing session included all hall directors and first- and second-year Ohio State University SPAs assigned to residence halls. The program began with the introduction of all staff, including upper-
level housing administrators, and a review of the organizational struc-
ture. The Director of Housing presented the Division of Student Ser-
ices mission statement and asked the group to note where they fit
into that picture. He stressed that the two missions of the housing
operation were to meet bond holders' needs and to make residence halls
the best possible for "living-learning" environments.

The Director of Student Development, next to speak, explained the
role of Student Development within the housing superstructure. She
stressed the importance of communication, problem-solving, honesty,
creativity, and hard work. This was followed by materials which
depicted decision-making lines and ten goals for the year.

The first content-oriented session was an introduction to the
judicial system, led by the three area administrative associates and
three hall directors. At this session the group was presented a broad
view of that system--its philosophy, general structure, mechanisms,
outcome statistics, and training procedures. The educational mission
of judiciaIs was emphasized.

The afternoon session, led by an assistant director from Student
Development and assisted by a second-year SPA, began the housing
system's attempt at team-building. The agenda included (a)"Introduc-
tion," (b) "Team Energizer," (c) an assessment/prediction instrument,
(d) "Break," (e) "Lecturette," (f) a group task, (g) "R.A. Workshop
Design," and (h) "Evaluation." The goals for this session were
(a) "Define Terms and Norms," (b) "Beginning to Create an Atmosphere
of Trust, Openness and Collaboration in Team Areas," (c) "Inter-team
Sharing," and (d) "Work on a Real Problem."
Each group first discussed how well they were working as a team and predicted how the entire group perceived those dynamics. After a brief presentation by the leader about problem solving, each area broke into subgroups to discuss an actual problem in the housing system. The results of their discussions were presented to their area groups. Following this, materials on team-building were handed out, and an evaluation of the afternoon completed.

The next morning was split into two halves. In the first segment the Director of Student Development explained the roles of the staff throughout her particular section of the housing system. After reviewing how and where decisions were made in the organization, each area discussed a current issue—the draft of the new alcohol policy. The entire group then reassembled and watched the senior housing group discuss the same problem.

A short break was followed by a session of resident adviser evaluation. Again, it combined an initial presentation, small group discussions, reassembling, presentations of results, and group decisions. That afternoon a model for such evaluation was presented to the entire room, followed by area groups critiquing that information and presenting their critiques to the entire gathering.

Activities similar in nature took place in the following days, including additional judicial system training, a program on cultural awareness, and an afternoon with the housing administrative staffs—Food Services, Housekeeping and Maintenance, Contracts and Assignments. In the last of these, the SPAs were introduced to the room contracting and assignments system which would occupy a great deal of their time,
effort, and attention. They learned there could be a problem: Too few beds for the residents could be made available. The South Area halls would have to house their extra students in specially designated extra beds called "TEs"—temporary expansion units. While this would evolve into a major problem, at this time the focus was on how the housing assignment process worked.

Intra-hall Staff Development. Throughout this period the SPAs worked with their directors and within their areas to ready themselves to open their buildings to residents. In each area the staffs met to develop goals for the year, learn how to carry out their plans, and prepare for the upcoming staff "retreats." Retreats were planned time periods where groups left their customary place of work/residence and travelled to another place. They would spend that time dealing with specific issues, such as team development, conflict resolution, program planning, or evaluation. The SPAs received additional training that would prepare them to run residence hall security systems, handle judicial responsibilities, supervise student office managers, and train resident advisers. Meanwhile they were learning their roles in the residence hall. It was a period in which long hours were spent, often from eight in the morning through late in the evening.

With the arrival of the resident advisers, called "RAs," and resident office managers, dubbed "ROMs," the SPAs were thrust into a senior staff role. The initial experience was RA retreat, a two-day series of human relations experiences similar to those comprising the leadership lab. The retreat was the start of a two-week period during
which the SPAs would collaborate with hall directors in training the RAs and ROMs for their jobs, through a combination of hall-specific, area, and system-wide training programs. The topics included counseling, assertiveness, group advising, cultural awareness, and additional administrative matters such as check-in procedures for arriving residents, room damage inspections, and duty schedules. SPAs also had to prepare for selection and training of security staffs, advising hall governments, and overseeing the work of orientation assistants. The last of these three were students who volunteered to arrive early so as to assist residents in moving in to the building. Fire and safety regulations and procedures had to be learned, along with the room assignment process. The SPAs continued to work from morning to late evening in a combination of meetings and training sessions. It was a period of physical and mental stress, and despite the voiced concern that people not be "burned out" by residence hall opening, the author personally observed and experienced the symptoms of fatigue throughout the system, particularly on South Area, where he was employed. Interrupted only by a one-day academic advising group meeting, this was an intense period of job preparation.

Official Program Welcome

A meeting was held on August 17 that brought together all first-year SPAs and their supervisors. (This program was repeated on September 8 for those who could not attend the first meeting.) The purpose was to provide an official greeting by the university and the units comprising the Student Personnel Assistant Program. At this meeting were the program director, the Vice President for Student Services,
and the Dean of the College of Education. Scheduled but unable to appear was the faculty member representing the Psychology Department.

In his opening remarks, the vice president stressed the "excellence and uniqueness" of the Student Personnel Assistant Program, noting the cooperation between the academic departments and the practicing unit of Student Services. He noted that several faculty in Student Services had appointments in the College of Education. Finally, he placed a challenge to the new students to apply theory to practice in unique ways, and thus enhance the quality of education.

His remarks were followed by the Dean of the College of Education. After echoing the sentiments of the vice president, he explained the directions in which the College of Education was heading, relating those to the broader concerns of American society, such as technological growth and international issues.

The dean was followed by the assistantship program director, who spoke on behalf of the Psychology Department. He emphasized that the quality of the Counseling Psychology program, claiming it was "second to none," one of the best in the country. He spoke briefly and in a general fashion about relationships between graduate students and faculty, and stressed that the quality of work relationships was important, involving "candid dialogue and trust."

At that point began formal development of relationships between SPAs and their supervisors. They were asked to spend an hour in teams with a dialogue booklet, similar in format and content to the dyadic encounters held the first morning of the summer. The participants discussed how they functioned in work settings, due to personality,
style, and past experience. This discussion was the precursor to the formalization of job duties and related performance expectations, along with the explanation of the ongoing evaluation system. The group then reassembled for the director's presentation of the actual assistantship program.

**Student Reactions**

How did the students feel about this orientation period? In general, it appeared that most felt more comfortable with their overall situation as time progressed during that period, making acquaintances during the leadership lab and gaining greater understanding and sense of confidence in themselves in the assistant residence hall director role. While having a hard time feeling close or on a par with upper level administrators, they grew in comfort in their professional relationships with hall directors in their respective areas, and their status with regards to RAs. While some recognized they were and felt like "low man on the totem pole," they seemed to feel more like a legitimate part of a professional staff, able to give comments and suggestions at meetings. Yet there were still several who had difficulty seeing a difference between themselves and students, especially RAs, and would not change until after school started.

**First Quarter**

**Academics**

**Group Procedures Course.** Technically, fall quarter began with the SPAs went through the leadership lab in mid-August. Through that experience the students were exposed to the terminology, philosophy,
and processes which they would be employing in this course. (This class was often referred to as "888," which was its course number in the university catalog.) This was the only course in which all first-year SPAs would have regular contact as a group for the entire two years of the program. It contained a mixture of SPAs and non-SPAs, part- and full-time students, master's degree and Ph.D. candidates, and all four academic majors. However, not all part-time student personnel work majors were enrolled at this time, due to work/class time conflicts.

The course was "team taught" by the assistantship program director, one assistant director from the Student Development Office, and a Ph.D. student serving as the program director's graduate assistant. The students were instructed in structured group workshop designs, which included purposefully constructed and strategically chosen human relations experiences, lectures, and human personality and behavioral inclination instruments. A series of human relations topics were covered, one per week, each presentation in the structured workshop format used in the leadership lab. Students formed groups of three to five members each, and each group was responsible for designing a complete classroom experience/workshop. In other words, they were the teachers of their respective topics. This meant they had to meet as groups a sufficient number of times to research their areas, plan the session, select the educational experiences, and design the format. Other course requirements included related weekly readings, designing and carrying out a workshop for a non-class group, and a final written project in which students had to diagnose a human relations problem and propose a workshop to ameliorate the situation.
The initial two classes were presented in a traditional lecture format. The students were introduced to the concepts and language of group leadership and workshop design. Each of the topics to be covered in the subsequent class periods was briefly explained. The teachers declared that it was necessary to go through the leadership lab to really understand what was being said in these sessions, and they acknowledged that for those who had yet to do so these lectures would not make much sense. In fact, several students who were in this category corroborated that prediction by noting their confusion during the lecture which preceded their leadership lab. One, in fact, said, "It was like they were speaking in a foreign language." Another was so upset that she contemplated dropping the course, and only after reassurance by the teacher in a private meeting did she decide to "stick it out."

**Introduction to Counseling Course.** This was actually two courses—a lecture and a corresponding lab. In the lecture, which included quizzes and a multiple-choice final exam, the students learned about counseling theories and the role of the counselor. While discussion was encouraged through questions posed by the instructor, the teacher/student roles were clearly separate and traditional.

The labs were weekly sessions in which subgroups of the lecture section met with the instructor and an assistant, the latter being either a second-year master's degree or Ph.D. student from the counseling or student personnel work programs, to learn counseling techniques and to practice in controlled role-playing situations.
They learned basic communication/counseling skills such as listening, paraphrasing, and empathy reflection, and eventually were asked to integrate them in more complete role-playing situations. There appeared to be some attempt to integrate the theory learned in class with the techniques practiced in the lab, especially the theory of Carl Rogers. This style was known as "Rogerian."

**Introduction to Student Personnel Work Course.** The introductory course, a third required course of the first quarter, was taught by a current Ph.D. student who worked as an assistant dean of students at a four-year college in Ohio. The objectives of the course were (a) to produce basic understanding of the higher education environment through discussion of its history, structure, and goals, (b) to produce understanding of outcomes of higher education and how student personnel work impacts on those, (c) to lead to familiarity with the literature and sources of student personnel work, (d) to produce personal, meaningful definitions of student personnel work, and (e) to produce awareness of the different competencies one must have to be an effective student personnel worker.

This course was taught in seminar fashion, with topics leading to group discussions of field-related issues. Often class was broken into discussion groups which later returned with lists of reactions to the questions at hand. Case studies and provocative questions were provided, which allowed for impromptu role-playing, debates, and consensus formation. There were also some class segments devoted to lecture. The students were assigned papers and projects, and had a
final paper to fulfill the course requirements. Field trips to neighboring colleges were scheduled as well.

In a sense, this was a survey course, one intending to cover the broadest range of topics which, when combined, would lead to a definition of student personnel work. In addition, students were encouraged to integrate their personal styles and values to produce impact as student personnel work professionals.

Interestingly, the instructor was prone to interject his own biases about the field. In particular, he suggested a lower status for student personnel workers in higher education organizations. He emphasized how faculty "looked down" at student personnel workers and questioned their legitimacy. What emerged was a course very different from the introductory counseling or group procedures courses, wherein the instructors presented some basic theoretical or practical "truths" by which students were to orient their thinking and subsequent learning.

Reactions. Several interviewees noted with consternation that the introductory student personnel work course instructor was "negative." As one said, "I wasn't ready to have him have us question student personnel work. I wanted to know what the field was before I started questioning it." Others, on the other hand, welcomed his approach. Typical of their comments was the one of the student who said, "It's good that he has us think about these things, because it's realistic."

A second complaint about the course was the "lack of substance." Several commented that they had expected to be told clearly what student personnel work was, that is, what jobs it led to, and to receive information that was "practical." There were joined by a few
who said that the course was a "waste," simply busy work. On the other hand, there were those who felt the lack of precise structure and control was a positive aspect. That allowed them to talk, share ideas, and think. Finally, a few cited as positive the opportunity the course provided to talk with professionals in the field and to hear their perspectives on student personnel work.

While students in their interviews voiced concern about the "negativism" of the professor and the lack of clear definition of the field, they were not hesitant in making judgements about the field as they saw it and how they felt it ought to be. There was also an increasing tendency on their part to initiate comments and interact with each other about these issues, rather than directing their comments only to the instructor. These discussions were usually stimulated by questions he would raise that demanded self-examination, such as "do we need expertise?" These usually led to a series of comments and reactions, both analytical and personal in nature, about desirable roles for student personnel workers, as well as a sense of mission for the field, that is, what "we ought to be doing."

While some students complained about the lack of substance in the introductory course, no such comments were heard about the counseling class. Most noted the significant amount of work involved. Indeed, the format was not of an open-ended seminar. Rather, it was a traditional college classroom, with the instructor lecturing to the students who listened, took notes, and occasionally asked questions. The instructor, in fact, often placed lecture outlines on the blackboard. While the students did become more willing to critique
comments made by the instructor as the weeks passed, the basic student-teacher relationship remained constant. There was no question that the teacher was the expert, possessing factually substantiated information, while the students were the novices.

The author was not permitted to observe lab sessions, since the students often used personal concerns as the topics for counseling role-playing situations. The instructor, in describing the lab during the first class meeting, said it covered "basic counseling and interviewing skills." By interviewing skills, she meant training in skills fundamental to the counseling and helping professions. This would not be "heavy duty counseling." From interviews with students it appears they were broken into smaller groups with second-year master's degree and Ph.D. students as their leaders. They were introduced to the basic components of the counseling relationship, learning each separately through modeling and practice. They were video-taped in more complete role-playing sessions at the beginning and end of the quarter for comparison purposes.

When reviewing the comments about the course, the results were not surprising. Several found the lecture portion to be demanding, both content and workload-wise. Several indicated they like the instructor's style of teaching and found the material interesting. One student, who had been a political science major as an undergraduate, remarked that this class was more of what he was used to in regards to instructional methodology. Another student, who had characterized herself as extremely "practical," found this course to be without focus. Another complained that the objective tests were "ridiculous." Overall,
however, even the very pragmatically-oriented students, several who had complained about the lack of substance in the introductory student personnel work class, were satisfied by both the content explicitness, teaching style, and usefulness of the counseling course's material. Even those who welcomed the introductory student personnel work course instructor's seminar style were complimentary about the counseling class.

Reactions to the group procedures course were mixed. Some saw the skills and practice useful and practical, as they would have to do similar work in their residence halls. Some found it attractive in that it required personal involvement, similar to the counseling lab. Others found it tiring, as they had been through so many similar activities that they were, in the words of one student, "workshopped out." Some others wanted to learn other ways of doing workshops other than the standard method in that course. Two students, both political science majors as undergraduates, preferred a traditional lecture style of teaching.

Some interesting comments came from two of the non-SPAs, who had never been exposed to this style of learning before. They reported feeling very lost, terribly confused by the jargon. Once they went through the leadership lab they felt more at ease with the class.

Assistantships

After the systemwide housing retreat, in which they began assuming the supervisor's role of trainer, the SPAs became increasingly responsible for such duties while planning for the upcoming year. Meeting
with area staffs—hall directors, other assistant directors, and the area coordinator—more firmly entrenched them in the senior staff role. As RA training concluded, along came student leaders, for whom the SPAs would assume an adviser role. Then came opening, and the final group of players arrived—the residents. From that point on their job revolved around all these groups, including supervision of student staff, advising student groups, co-planning and leading residence hall operations, serving as a team member on an area staff, and attending systemwide training meetings. They also attached different significance to those roles, depending on their relationship with their hall director, feelings of self-confidence, prior work experience, age, and type of housing organization in which they worked.

When the undergraduate students arrived, the switch, in a sense, was turned on. While the experience differed depending on the building, opening the halls meant anything from angry parents to psychological or criminal crises. In the South Area, in particular, over-assignment of students to certain floors meant facing irate students and their parents, and having to support beleaguered RAs. Working in that particular area, the author knew first-hand how stressful and difficult that role was. However, colloquially speaking, the SPAs were thrown in the river and had to swim immediately.

As the quarter continued and the initial check-in process was completed, SPAs began to assume their normal duties. While differing between halls, they had the following common responsibilities: (a) co-supervision or assistant supervision of student staff, such as RAs, security, office workers; (b) training and advising of student
groups, such as hall government and judicial board; (c) administration, that is, room assignments and transfers, physical problems, maintenance; (d) counseling, that is, intervening in roommate conflicts, managing crises, attending to personal concerns; and (e) senior staff obligations, such as area meetings, housing system training, and hall staff meetings. On paper, serving with a hall director and perhaps a second SPA in the supervision of daily operations of a residence hall/complex meant 20 hours per week. In reality, it could grow to 40 or 50. The students lived in the buildings and were easily accessible, and the demands of the job could seem like they would never end. Furthermore, the students felt a great deal of responsibility for what took place in their halls.

An interesting factor which entered into this situation was the influence of a second SPA. By separate acknowledgement of both team members, there seemed to be very different personal orientations to work and relationships with others. Where one SPA would be administratively oriented, the other would see him/herself as more counseling oriented. In a pair, one might rely on planning, while the other depended on more "instinctive" decision-making. Usually this was seen as both positive and negative. That is, the SPA would acknowledge how this combination benefitted the complex, while occasionally expressing frustration with the differences.

At this point in the study it was too early to write conclusively about the significance of these pairings. The author did speculate that depending on the role of the hall director, these differences could have diametrically opposed effects. On one hand, the students
with a strong preference for helping and counseling might be limited to that role and not grow administratively. Depending on their self-confidence and maturity, they could have had difficulty getting beyond the "friend" role with students and/or RAs. This could possibly have retarded the emergence of a sense of self as a senior staff member and professional, as well as reinforcing one's interest in non-administrative roles and positions. On the other hand, a director who skillfully combined the strengths of his/her staff by making them aware and appreciative of their differences could have influenced the SPAs to take on some of their "opposite's" roles.

Second Quarter

Second interviews with the first-year class took place during the middle to latter part of the second academic quarter. By that time, the students had been exposed to significant portions of their courses. They also had been through at least the beginning of the second year assistantship experience, social interactions, academic experience, and feelings about student personnel work. In addition, he concerned himself with the second-year selection process. These interviews also exposed the participants' views of their just completed quarter, as well as their sense of the future, which for the first time was informed by actual program experience.

Academics

Second-quarter scheduling placed most students in the same classes. They were required to take two courses, and most took one of their required general education courses--the second of a two-course
sequence consisting of research methodology and statistics classes. They were not at the point where they could do much choosing or exploring of academic options.

**Student Development Theory.** In a common class the students were studying student development theory. Theory had been advertised as a foundation of the program, upon which the profession was or should be based. This, in point of fact, had attracted several participants to the university. The author made it a point to question the students about their initial reactions to this material.

In this class the students were learning about four major theories. In the words of the instructor, this first of a two-course sequence would provide a "rigorous" look at theory. The second would focus on what one could do with this knowledge as a student personnel worker. He urged them, with what were admittedly his biases, to know the theories well and to study them outside of class. With notable animation, he said that there were "amateurs" in the field, those who did not know theory. The class met once per week, and took place in a traditional lecture format.

**Career Counseling.** This class was the second in the two-course counseling sequence that most student personnel work majors took. This particular class focused on theories of career development, models of career counseling and related decision-making, and counseling strategies and methods. The didactic component of this course, as so-labelled in the syllabus, consisted of lectures, first by the instructor and later by student teams. To supplement their reading
materials, the instructor had the students complete two vocational interest inventories. The experiential component was a lab, which in this course was an assignment to teach an undergraduate career planning course or a "Freshman Early Experience Program" seminar. The latter was for students who were education majors and were spending time observing public school classrooms. In the weekly seminars they were to discuss their reactions to those sessions and consider their feelings about being education majors. In the career planning class, the students were led through a sequentially designed course of career exploration exercises. Hopefully these would help them clarify their career or academic choices.

Participants' reactions to the second quarter coursework were notably consistent. They were very positive about teaching the career planning class, finding it enjoyable, and noticing an increasing confidence in experimenting and re-designing parts of the syllabus. At the same time, they were less complimentary about the regular lecture segment, finding it less exciting and interesting. They were also enthusiastic about the theory class. They found student development theory to be exciting, opening their eyes to a new world, but one of which they were not totally in command. Said one student, "It's fascinating . . . a new world . . . don't know enough to be critical of it. I'm still taking it in and sorting it out . . . important aspect of my professional development." Another commented, "It's new. I'm seeing more and more value as I learn more. Now I can use it in 270 (the career planning course). I see kids at different Kohlberg (moral development theoretician) levels." A third student said, "It allows
you to know where someone is and deal with them, from the 'plus one' perspective." The amount of coursework required in this course was a causative factor in what some students described as a more demanding quarter than the first. However, as one student stated, "This is what I came here for."

**Assistantships**

Along with their coursework, the students were spending a great deal of time in their assistantship assignments. By the time of the second interviews, they had served at least six months. During fall quarter they had been learning the responsibilities of the positions and facing the daily decisions and problems they entailed. During that time all had the opportunity to implement the group workshop exercises taught in the group procedures course. They had assumed the multiplicity of roles indigenous to residence hall work. The manner and degree to which those roles were taken depended on the setting, the preferences of the supervisors, the SPAs' own interests, and, when applicable, those of their co-assistant director. For example, those SPAs in the scholarship houses at Ohio State University did not face the disciplinary problems that confronted their colleagues in the standard residence halls. They also did not have RAs to supervise. On the other hand, they faced daily house management problems with housekeepers and cooks, which were very different from anything experienced by those colleagues. In some residence halls the directors were very administratively oriented. Hence, one of their two SPAs, the counseling-oriented individual, found him/herself focusing on individual residents' personal problems.
When queried about their general feelings about their positions, the students gave mixed responses. Only four individuals were decidedly negative. In two cases the overriding concern was the relationships with the supervisors. While others cited some weaknesses of their supervisors, those concerns were not brought up when asked about the job as a whole. The other two very negative students were concerned about administrators at other institutions. Neither felt their jobs or these staff gave them much to do. One was also very unhappy with her supervisor's leadership abilities.

Certain individuals were noticeably positive about their experiences. Two were particularly exuberant about both their growth and their hall settings. A third was enjoying the job more than expected. He was pleased that the groups he was supervising or advising were functioning well, and that their diversity was forcing him to make use of different leadership styles. Finally, two felt their scholarship houses were better than they had seemed in the fall. One cited new opportunities, group work, and working with new officers. The second had been able to overcome what she termed resistance to her presence, and now she reported a much more positive relationship with the students.

Interviewees were asked about the degree of responsibility they carried in their positions. The clear majority felt they played a significant role in running their buildings. While many thought as early as fall quarter that they could do their directors' jobs, no one felt totally equal to or more important than their supervisors. It was interesting to note that among those reporting the highest sense of
responsibility or importance, most were the only senior staff member in the building, either from off-campus settings or scholarship houses. While some of these felt their jobs were not as demanding as they might have liked, their sense of importance was not diminished.

A second group could be said to have reported medium degrees of responsibility. They saw they could make decisions, act autonomously with certain groups, or have a part in all decisions. They tempered their comments by noting that the buildings could run by themselves, could be safe and sound if they were not there, or that they had not had to make important decisions. Another of this group noted that she was not very important to the house but was important "behind the scenes."

The only two who reported low levels of responsibility were very unhappy with their relationships with their superiors. One felt he was not given enough responsibility, and the other felt that the hall director was the person with the ultimate authority, thus reducing her importance. These were two of the people who also were quite negative in their overall feelings about their jobs, and these were the same reasons used in those comments.

The remainder had mixed feelings about their assistantships, and for a variety of reasons. Negative comments were due to frustration with perceived student apathy, style conflicts with directors, distaste for living in the hall, and a perceived lack of challenge. On the other hand, they found things they liked, such as a specific advising/supervisory responsibility, individual projects, the variety of their duties, the ability to work around or with their supervisors despite differences, and the "fun" of the work.
Second-Year Assistantship Selection Process

A major feature of the Ohio State University program was the assistantship program. It gave the students the opportunity to obtain second-year placements which related to their individual interests, needs, or professional aspirations. Mid-way through the second quarter, at a meeting for first-year SPAs, the program director explained the purpose and mechanism of the selection process. They were informed that there would soon be a period during which they could attend information sessions and interview with prospective supervisors. Towards the end of the quarter those offices would process the results with the program director after receiving the students' prioritized lists. Every attempt would be made to place students according to their interests, trying to find appropriate matches between students' and supervisors' needs. Placements would be announced upon return from spring break.

At this meeting the director presented written and verbal descriptions of the available positions. Students then mingled with representatives of several of those offices, asking questions about the positions at hand.

While the official period for this process was February and March, the selection process and second-year positions were on most of the students' minds much earlier. The specificity with which most thought about the positions varied, and so did the efforts they made to learn about them. Some recalled deliberately observing second-year SPAs or talking with them about their jobs. Another said that on the first day of orientation, second-year SPAs gave a tour of campus.
of campus and two of the first-year students were asking such
questions. Only a small number had given little or no thought to
this process until it was officially introduced in winter.

A major factor underlying this awareness was the reported
"controversy" over this process, as declared by second-year students.
Several first-year SPAs said they had heard how competitive their
predecessors had been, both in classes and elsewhere, and vowed not
to follow in their footsteps. They seemed to feel that people were
not acting too competitively thus far, though a few cited what they
felt were instances of "brown-nosing" or "sucking up to supervisors."

However they behaved, they certainly did arrive at the winter
meeting with some ideas about what positions interested them. Each
student was able to point to two or three sites which held particular
interest for him/her prior to the meeting.

The meeting and subsequent interviews did appear to affect their
choices. Most students added several options and eliminated others.
They now had a clearer idea of what the positions involved and the
identity of the people with whom they would be working.

How, then, did the students feel about their peers' behavior?
Several voiced concern about the competitiveness they felt they were
now seeing. Said one, "We said we wouldn't be competitive, but we are." Another commented, "There has even been competition for grades and attention. In 888, people said positive things about each others' workshops, but whispered on the side, 'God, that sucks.'" Another added, "People chum up to supervisors and to ______ (program
director). That's politically motivated." One student said, "People
are really talking about this . . . 'have you set up your appointment . . . done your resume?"

Of equal concern were the selection criteria. People were somewhat distrustful of what they had been told. "I'm not sure," said one SPA, "if the process works as described. I've heard last year was all pre-determined. I'm not sure. ___ (program director) puts his favorites in the best jobs. I feel there are political maneuvers. They'll try to go by preferences, but politics will play a role."

Added yet another, "At first I believed about our preferences. I can see that's not possible, and that's produced competitiveness. I'm disappointed in my own competitiveness. This is like the real world."

In short, the group did not appear to go into this situation blindly. They did not welcome competitive behavior, but they seemed willing to accept that such could take place and that the system could not work perfectly.

The second-year students expressed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the process and the behavior of their peers. They claimed the system was inaccurately portrayed by the head of the assistantship program. They felt he had promised it would simply involve the matching of students' interests with the best settings for those interests. Instead, they felt what actually took place was political, with rumors and leaks. This was accompanied, they said, by a great deal of competition, and relationships were strained irreparably. The other result, said several, was that people were hurt of "screwed" by the process. Their comments in this area probably were the most emotional of all those encountered in this study.
Witness these remarks by one disgruntled student.

The process seemed okay as I was going through it, but what I heard from friends later, I thought less of it. I believed the preference stuff. I believe matching does take place as (program director) says, but there are politics with regards to ranking by supervisors. Not necessarily due to how well SPAs did on interviews or their records. Sex discrimination, people buying into rumors floating around about peoples' behaviors, abilities. Rumors weren't checked out--they were assumed to be fact. That really hurt one person's chance at a position. Now I realize it's part of the organization, any organization, but that's still not adequate justification.

Another student was particularly bitter. "The process sucks," he said. "We were led to believe it's goody-goody. Politics--pulling strings for certain people, (supervisors) demanding certain people. (program director) has to give in, because those departments have money."

Some talked about the competition. One student had these sentiments.

I didn't want to compete for positions and lose friends. People would 'round about,' ask you what you were interested in. One person had resumes printed on special paper and wouldn't tell others this so he could have a special edge. When I told a couple of people about my assistantship they didn't talk with me for three days. There's been, I think, a permanent effect.

Another SPA recalled his experiences in the following fashion.

Lots felt competitive. You kind of figured that certain people would get certain jobs... really wanted them. I'd put myself out of the running in those instances. People were being secretive. They'd say what they didn't want, but not what they wanted. But you could figure it out. I made up a list of who I thought would get what, and I was pretty accurate. There were some unhappy folks.

A third student probably summed up many students' feelings on this matter with these comments.

I was confident, cocky. I became competitive. We didn't talk about where we interviewed, how interviews went, what
we wore, about the questions, nothing. Division arose between my friends and between others, too. I didn't interview for Women's Services because I didn't want to compete with (another student). We lost closeness, ... not regained, even now. Now there's gossip, such as UVC (University College) getting who they want, the Counseling Center wanting a male. We expected all our priorities would be significant, because this would be our learning experience, just like we chose profs and classes. It was more real-world than portrayed, and they should have said so.

Not everyone claimed to have felt as strongly or negatively as the students just quoted. A small but noticeable minority did not seem to worry about where they would be placed, and they did not care to compete so vigorously. One of these students explained this in the following manner.

I would have been happy with any of my first three to four. The process was rushed. Others felt disappointed. It was tough to compete with people you see everyday in classes. After I heard the results I was almost afraid to ask people what they got. I was afraid how they felt, hard feelings.

Another student talked about the emotion he saw. "Some people were very nervous," he recalled, "not me." People were uptight. Some people got into it emotionally, seeing it as a turning point in their lives." Said another, "People made a big deal out of it. That led to a tremendous lot of competitiveness. I didn't share that sense of competition. It was important, but not life and death."

Finally, one student took an almost detached, wry look at what he saw. "It was comical," he commented, "how people got bent out of shape. I figured we'd all get something."

When the actual announcements were made for the first-year students at the beginning of spring quarter, most were pleased, getting their first choice or an option relatively high on their list. Only
a few were dissatisfied, but they tended to feel better after finding out more about what the positions entailed, or after thinking about what benefits could still be garnered from the experience.

The competition they hoped to avoid did not cast a pall over the announcement of assignments. Due to the satisfaction with which announcements were received, the disappointment and jealousy that could have surfaced never did. There seemed to be, instead, a concern that others were satisfied/happy with their assignments. As one said, "I was pleased. Most seemed happy, and feelings were not hurt."

In one case where two were competing for the same position, one said, "I was only worried about the person who wanted my assistantship. I thought it'd feel odd to interact with her. It ended up not being a problem, as the person came up to me and congratulated me."

One student did portray another side to this particular time period. She said, "I felt awkward talking with others, not knowing how things worked out for them. But I didn't feel guilty, like taking something from them, but I was afraid they might feel that way."

Another added, "I was happy for those who got what they wanted. I didn't go around telling everyone about me."

Third Quarter

Third quarter marked an important transitional period for the first-year students. By the middle of the previous quarter they had established themselves both in the classroom and in their assistantships. While not acting restless, they were beginning to think more seriously about the future, in particular the second year. The assistantship assignment process did not signal an end to their first
year, but it allowed them to consider what they needed and wanted from the upcoming year's experience. During their second interviews they told the author that the second-year position would have the greatest value in skill development and learning. Practica would enable them to explore career-related interests. As second-year students had told the author, first-year courses and assistantships taught them basic knowledge and skills. The second year was one for applying this learning in new settings and determining possible career directions.

A great deal took place since the second interviews. Upon returning from spring break and a national professional conference, they learned about their assistantship assignments. With only one required course—the second half of the student development theory sequence—most were free for the first time to choose electives and practica. Furthermore, preregistration for summer and fall quarters presented them with opportunities for planning and experimentation. Meanwhile, as assistantships offered them the challenge of spring-related hall problems, there was an increasing awareness that a year and its related responsibilities were coming to a halt. Finally, for those considering a thesis, this was the time to make some choices and commitments.

Academics

With the exception of some part-time students with time restrictions, all student personnel work majors took the second half of the theory sequence. Counseling psychology minors took the third of their
counseling sequence—a course on career counseling—along with its associated lab. Most students also took a general education course. The others chose from among several options, which included counseling practicum, teaching the undergraduate career planning class, independent study and, most prominently, a course devoted to studying a prominent cognitive development theoretician. Among the other electives chosen were course dealing with educational administration, the community college, adult development, preparation for teaching the undergraduate career course, and ice skating.

**Student Development Theory.** This course was aimed at teaching the students ways of applying theory to practice. Interspersed among lectures were student presentations about theories and projects demonstrating the application of such theories to practical situations. Certain models for such application were presented to inform these projects. Finally, a major design paper was assigned in which students were expected to develop "an instructional or workshop program for both teaching an important skill and stimulating psychological development." This could be considered a thesis proposal if the student so desired.

**Seminar in Cognitive Theory Development.** Most noticeable about the cognitive development theory class was its seminar format and class composition. This was the first significantly mixed group for the first-year students, consisting of first- and second-year master's degree students and Ph.D. candidates. Meeting once per week, they gathered to critique an established theory and develop a manual for
the administration and scoring of a related assessment device. Class members were asked to evaluate others' reasoning from a "professional" perspective, determining the developmental levels of comments. The first-year students witnessed second-year and Ph.D. students offering suggestions and criticisms in a manner not unlike that of the instructor. Adding to the collegiality was the roundtable setting, even the coffee and donuts brought to class by the instructor early in the quarter. While this was a course, it also resembled a professional seminar or staff conference. One went home, read, and came to class ostensibly prepared to work in a team to offer judgements and to prepare a professional tool. The author regretted not being able to spend more time with this group. In retrospect, it was most likely ripe for insights into the emerging professional self-concept development of first-year students, as they got to see and join the more advanced students in a quasi-professional role.

The author found the students' reactions to the student development theory class interesting. Some criticisms were directed to the beginning of the quarter, which several claimed was "slow to unfold." They were anxious to learn how to apply theory learned during the previous quarter, and it did not seem, to them, to be happening quickly enough. Several commented during the second-quarter interviews how they still wanted to see how it was possible to use theory. They were not as of yet totally convinced of its utility. Instead, they were treated to a period where, to their dismay, they had to briefly review the theories from the previous quarter in short lectures for which they were responsible.
Around the middle of the quarter, when these interviews were taking place, that which the students were awaiting was provided—the models for implementing theory. Their reactions were mixed and not very strong. At the time of these interviews they really had not had sufficient opportunity to learn and use these processes. Had these interviews taken place later in the quarter, their more considered and informed reactions might have been available.

Assistantships

Most students reported that assistantships had ceased to provide new challenges by this time. They knew how to manage their responsibilities long before the onset of this quarter, and there was not much interest in becoming involved in any new major projects. They were faced with certain types of problems endemic to the spring of the year in residence halls, and some voiced a commitment to easing the transition for the next year's SPA. While focusing on closing out this academic year, they were looking forward to the summer break and the beginning of a new assistantship assignment.

Fourth Quarter

The author began his fourth quarter interviews by asking second-year students how it felt to be at that point. First and foremost, there was a definite sense of confidence and comfort, bolstered by a feeling of "knowing the ropes." The students felt they had accomplished something by having made it through the rigors of the first year. Now they were at what felt like a higher level or next step. While there was not necessarily a sense of being promoted from grade A to B, they
did feel they had moved beyond the first year. That was caused by or the result of a better perspective on what had taken place during their first year.

The following sample of their comments should illustrate these points. One student said, "There's a great difference compared to last year. I know what the program is and what I'm doing. I'm more comfortable at OSU, I know peoples' names, offices. I feel like a veteran, less intimidated."

A second student offered her perspective on being a second-year student.

Now I think first-year SPAs would see me like I saw second-year SPAs last year. There's something good about knowing now you know the system a little better. I see a lot of first-year SPAs struggling with a lot of the things we struggled with fall quarter. Now I say reassuring things to first-year people that were said to me. Second-year SPAs would say, "Hey, I'm in the program, I'm not totally dedicated to student personnel work. I'm into it, but it's not the only thing in the world." You question things in your first year-- why am I even here? Now you know it's okay. You realize you've learned a lot.

A third student revealed a great deal of confidence from having completed the first year. He exclaimed, "I feel great. Cocky. I know OSU finally. My feet are on the ground, a year's behind me. I know I can do graduate work. I'm content. I know the university, resources. I have confidence in myself."

A fourth student, one who had experienced great self-doubt in the first year, demonstrated a new sense of confidence.

It's hard to believe I'm here. It feels good. There's a hierarchy, like in undergrad. I've been through it. I notice that people will say, "I'm a second-year grad student." It means you're on your way, you're proud of yourself, too, as you're still in the program.
Academics

In the fall, all second-year students in student personnel work took the administration course. This was the one class about which they commented most frequently in their interviews. It was dramatically different in content and purpose than anything they had taken to date. It provoked reactions, both positive and negative. The instructor attempted to challenge the way in which his students thought about student personnel work and its broader organizational context—higher education. The students were not simply learning strict organizational theory as written in a text. Instead, they were challenged to think of human behavior from different perspectives, and in turn consider the roles and mission of student personnel work in alternative fashions. In the process, the instructor challenged the "idealized" image that many students had about student personnel work from the previous year. In some ways this resembled the challenges made by the first-year students' introduction to student personnel work instructor, who argued, sometimes to the students' resentment and dismay, that student personnel work enjoyed no respect, privileges, or status. The administration instructor was carrying this point to a more abstract and complex level. He had the students question whether the ascribed noble mission of the field was, in truth, what truly motivated its members. By bringing before the class organizational/sociological definitions of the behavior of student personnel workers which contradicted or at least questioned the validity of the espoused values of the field, those which the students for the most part internalized from the first year, he forced them to question what they were doing and why they were doing it.
As a result, the students were encouraged, almost forced to consider a new perspective. They were now asked to step back and simply observe what took place in higher education and derive new meanings. The instructor implored them to trust their own senses, not to simply apply meaning to organizational behavior based on the dictates of some formal theory. In addition, he suggested that to understand student personnel work, one could turn to non-field literature. In his discussions he compared student personnel work institutions, such as residence halls, to non-student personnel work organizations, such as nursery schools. He included books written by people from other fields and read their passages to stimulate students to think differently about student personnel work. He asserted that people in the field were controlled by their jargon, and how they had to move out of the structure of student personnel work or higher education to understand themselves better. In short, he was asking them to think about how they were thinking about about what they were doing, rather than simply accept what they were taught.

Fifth Quarter

The second interviews with the second-year students took place when the reality of leaving Ohio State University was becoming more apparent. The job search process, punctuated by two upcoming national conferences, would soon begin in earnest. Except for the second of the two-course administration sequence, all required courses in the student personnel work program had been completed. The students' assistantship assignments were no longer new and would soon be reaching their apogee. The exit process had not quite begun but was not far off.
The author learned that virtually every student personnel work student was enrolled in at least one practicum, with several taking two. In addition, they signed up for specialized courses and independent studies. Some took remaining general education requirements and and a few took business courses. Their plans for the final quarter, where the only requirement was completion of the thesis, comprehensive examinations, or a case study, showed these same trends. Practica, general education courses, and personal interests dominated the choices.

**Administration Course.** Two courses taken fifth quarter are worth special attention. One was the second of the two-course sequence in student personnel administration. In the first of these the students were encouraged to observe the higher education organization, unencumbered by theoretical predispositions. In this manner, suggested the instructor, they could develop new frameworks for understanding organizational behavior in higher education and the meaning of student personnel work. While some students were bewildered and/or uninterested in this approach, most were receptive to the opportunity to go beyond the conceptual structures developed in the first year.

Now, in the fifth quarter, they were asked to take this new approach and apply it to a real-life situation. They were to become interventionists, assisting some group with a problem they were having. This, explained the instructor, might be a very legitimate role for student personnel workers. The author noticed that the students' interactions with the instructor continued to grow more casual and personal in nature, and that discussions of a collegial nature would
merge. The quarter ended with each project team presenting to the class the results of their interventions, as well as facing discussion and questions about those efforts. The instructor joined in, and he seemed to enjoy the challenges be placed before the project teams. In a sense, these very much resembled case studies.

Practicum Seminar. The other class observed with some regularity by the author was the weekly seminar attended by practicum students. The author had no preconceived notion of what light it might shed on the students' professional socialization. It was a small group of nine people, but because most people were in practica, he felt it important to see how those experiences were being perceived.

The professor geared the course towards enhancing the students' sense of professional growth through the weekly group discussions. Inronically, she had the class read Becoming Professional by Bucher and Stelling (1977), which had significantly influenced the author's early investigation of the topic of this dissertation. By developing professionalization-related questions for the group to mull over and discuss, the author was, in a sense, conducting interviews for the author. He found himself scribbling his notes at a furious pace to keep up with the conversations. In fact, in one humorous incident, he was writing so hurriedly that the class stopped for a moment and laughed at his predicament.

According to the syllabus, the objective of this particular practicum seminar was to broaden the students' experience and knowledge about student services while obtaining a more in-depth understanding of one particular service. This would afford them an
opportunity to gauge their degree of commitment to that aspect of student personnel work.

In addition to their actual work duties in the offices of their choice, the students were expected to write reports on three articles from professional journals related to the practicum site, as well as one on the Bucher and Stelling (1977) text. They kept a journal of their practicum experiences, submitted a final report, and attended a joint conference with their supervisor and practicum course instructor.

The weekly meeting of these students with the instructor saw the discussion of both their practicum experiences and many issues underlying their anticipated membership in the field of student personnel work. These included questions such as "how do we define student personnel work?", "am I a professional?", "what is/should be the role of theory in student personnel work?", "how do I see undergraduate students?", and "what is the future of this field?". These issues were often prompted by the instructor, though occasionally would rise naturally from the ongoing discussion. The instructor also scheduled presentations by two university professionals from the field, one with national prominence, and one meeting with two recent graduates of the assistantship program, who spoke of their current experiences in the field.

The author found these weekly sessions, of which he was able to attend six of ten, to be perhaps the richest, most stimulating and exciting observational opportunities he encountered in the entire study. The form and substance of these classes allowed the students to express in some depth their current feelings about student personnel work in a manner not unlike the interviews conducted by the author. Furthermore,
the input and reaction gained from their peers led to the consideration of broader issues, personal and professional philosophies, concerns, and some apparently meaningful self-disclosure. It was an opportunity to assemble feelings and perceptions, both current and past, into integrated statements about their interpretations of the field, their theoretical postures on its practice, and their sense of belonging and commitment. Their comments sparked differences of opinion, but the collegial spirit of the class, fostered by the group facilitation expertise of the instructor, allowed for the emergence and acknowledgement of the broader issues underlying those differences, issues on which each student stood on some point of a continuum with regards to personal clarification or resolution.

Assistantships

A great deal of the discussion in this set of interviews centered around the assistantship experience in the second year. As arranged by the structure of the program, the students were assigned to a wide variety of settings, ranging from residence halls to the administration offices of colleges within the university. They served as academic advisers, counselors, programming specialists, general administrative associates, and residence hall directors and assistant directors. In these positions they found themselves assuming both familiar and new types of duties. A major change from the first year, something several commented about, was the fact that most were now in offices, as opposed to residence halls. They reported to supervisors who ranged widely in understanding and commitment to student personnel work. For many, the nature of their relationships with undergraduate students changed by
virtue of the move out of residence halls, something which will be covered in greater detail later in this chapter.

By the time this set of interviews took place, the students were feeling established and comfortable in their assignments. Several indicated that they had become responsible for significant projects and were in the process of managing their completion or continuation. Those with regular duties had by then learned what the expectations were, and they felt they had overcome any initial confusion and mistakes. In other words, they were feeling capable of providing the desired services. In addition, they felt accepted as legitimate members of their offices, to whatever degree of staff responsibility they had been given.

Many commented on how they were using some of the skills learned in the first year, both from classes and assistantship duties. They were advising groups, planning and organizing programs, counseling individuals with academic, personal, and career problems, and handling administrative duties. In addition, many were conducting group human relations training, writing newsletters, doing research, and contributing to policy decisions. They were interacting with students, student leaders, student personnel work administrators, faculty, parents, members of the city community, and administrative staff from a variety of campus offices. Some were supervising students and/or clerical staff.

**Sixth Quarter**

The author's last interviews for second-year students began immediately after comprehensive examinations were given and continued through graduation. Only two exceptions were individuals who remained in the summer to finish their theses. These interviews included
several questions which had the participants reflect on the impact of the entire year and the overall program. Questions about future goals and professional matters were also raised.

The final academic quarter was, for these students, a mixture of competing influences. While still enrolled in classes and practica, and responsible for their assistantships, they were confronted with the challenges brought forth by comprehensive exams, theses, and the job search. The job search took on particular significance, given that most students attended the national professional convention just prior to the beginning of the quarter. While preparation for the job search began prior to this convention, it was at this time that the students could apply and interview with deans, housing directors, and other staff from other institutions for "real" job openings. These interviews, in turn, would set in motion follow-up procedures which involved their time, energy, and attention through graduation.

Academics

In the academic realm, this quarter resembled the previous one. Students once again were enrolled in courses of their own choice and interest--practica, electives, and independent study. There were no required student personnel work courses. In fact, only one student personnel work course was offered for the second-year people. The only "required" courses were general education offerings, which some students still had to take to fulfill that particular curricular obligation.

The diversity of other courses chosen was significant, demonstrating the wide range of interests in this group. These included subjects such as marketing, developmental theory, professional ethics, black
studies, and independent study on battered wives. Several students were enrolled, too, in a program through which they did counseling of people caught driving under the influence of alcohol. This had attracted interest and involvement for all three quarters. Finally, a small number continued with their theses.

From discussing this with the students, the author sensed that coursework was chosen both out of interest and with the feeling of wanting to be finished with school. In other words, they needed to take a certain number of credits to graduate, and so they chose courses which seemed interesting. Few took practica, which also suggested a decreased interest in substantive career-related exploration at this point. With the importance attached to completing comprehensive exams and looking for a job, academics were pretty much an afterthought for many. These observations were corroborated by the participants' comments, in which they indicated they were wrapping up the year and had less energy and interest in academics than in the previous quarter. They were not feeling as much like students as in the past.

Comprehensive exams were one remaining hurdle. For the first time, students could opt to do an extensive case study in lieu of sitting for the more traditional exam. The few choosing that option enrolled in a seminar offered by the department as part of that duty. Their reasons varied, from fear of big tests to a genuine desire to integrate their learning in a final product that would be more meaningful than simply answering test questions.
Their comments indicated that this exercise had been successful in that regard. One student noted her reactions in the following manner.

I felt good about my paper. It made me look at the problem from all perspectives. It forced me to look at things before acting—read, go back to early learning, think—and caused me to realize how much I learned in the program . . . to know how to locate all those materials, versus having that on the tip of the tongue.

Reactions to the comprehensive exams were mixed. Most students found themselves beginning serious preparations three to four weeks before the test date. Most met with their advisers to discuss what would be the focus of their exams, in order to tailor them somewhat to their individual interests. Some felt there had been value in reviewing materials from the two years of the program, as well as value in organizing the responses to the questions when actually taking the test. It reminded them of how much they had actually learned. A significant number, however, felt there had been little value to the experience, especially the test. It had not, as hoped, pulled together their two-year academic experience in a meaningful way.

Job Search Process(27,593),(983,991)

The students' major preoccupation during the final quarter was the immediate future, and thus the job search process. From the time they began their tenure at the university and, in fact, when being recruited, they had heard that a major benefit of this program was the success of its graduates in securing employment after graduation. Perhaps spurring that interest was the series of three meetings, beginning fall quarter, during which the job search, convention, and interviewing processes were discussed. The last of the three included mock interviewing.
Most began their job search campaigns around the time of the first national student personnel work, the annual meeting of the American College Personnel Association, usually referred to as ACPA. In January, a meeting had been held by the assistantship program director during which the procedures involved with the conference placement program were explained. Immediately after that, a book of resumes to be published by the program and dispensed at the convention was compiled. Cooperative travel and hotel accommodation plans were discussed as well.

Many reported reading materials and organizational publications such as the ACPA "Guidepost" and the "Chronicle of Higher Education" in search of job vacancies. They sent letters and resumes, and they hoped to pre-arrange interviews to take place at the upcoming conference.

A few students began much earlier than this, either out of concern about getting a job or due to special needs created by self-imposed geographical limitations. Several indicated that geographical preferences or cooperative planning with their spouses or fiancés limited their job search parameters. This reality curbed their job search enthusiasm or simply limited the scope of their investigation.

While first-year students attended the conference to get a feel for what went on, the second-year class went primarily for the interviewing opportunities. Several regretted not being able to attend more presentations and to participate in the entirety of the conference experience. Nevertheless, several noted that the convention reinforced their feelings of belonging to the field.

Most students were offered interviews at the convention. Those with limited geographical or job preference options found this more
difficult and frustrating. However, the majority interviewed for a variety of positions. From these original contacts many were invited to campuses for follow-up interviews, and as of the end of May, seven of this group reported having received and accepted offers. Others were awaiting results from on-campus visits or were still looking for initial interviews.

**Acclimation and Progress**

**First-Year Students**

As they passed through six quarters of school, the students' perceptions of their relationship to the program, people, university, and the world of student personnel work changed. Most noticeable was their adjustment to being graduate students, acclimating to the many demands that were placed upon them. As this took place, their confidence grew and they realized they belonged.

Self-confidence was the result of many interwoven elements. Ability to manage the workload created by the assistantship and classroom chores certainly reinforced the feeling that they could survive in graduate school. At the same time, increased understanding of the components of the field of student personnel work, combined with improvements in related skills, allowed the students to feel they had not chosen erroneously and could succeed in student personnel work when the time came to enter the workforce. Being able to carve out a social niche composed of students, staff, and people not in the academic or assistantship program reminded them that they could also remain attentive to their personal needs. What emerged was an increasingly integrated sense of school, career, and life.
Despite the seemingly inextricable bonding of the elements, the author was able to focus on the general sense of acclimation that evolved through the two years. The students' comments provided excellent illustrations of how they were feeling as each quarter came and went.

The first year was a time for orientation and acclimation. Depending on their backgrounds, the students were faced in different degrees with a new geographic region, state, city, institution, housing system, type of residence, curricular domain, and status (student). Furthermore, they were expected to shed their undergraduate identity and see themselves as professional members of an organization.

For most there was not a profound fear of the new situation. Yet, to varying degrees, they were concerned about "making it." For some that concern was mostly with handling the academic rigors they associated with graduate school. This was especially true for those who had been away from higher education for a while. For those who were still somewhat unclear about the field of student personnel work, there was the need to make certain this was the right choice.

The summer orientation could not answer their questions about academic matters, but for the SPAs it did help them feel more comfortable about being in the general setting. They had discovered that there was a peer support base for the year to come. Preparation to assume assistantship responsibilities was intensive, and not until students arrived did they really know how it would feel to be the assistant director or director of a hall. As their reactions and later recollections indicated, it was not until the first few weeks of fall quarter had passed that they began feeling a little more settled.
The first quarter was a dynamic time, one where all facets of their existence were being expanded and tested. They were learning what the field was, both in the classroom and in their jobs. They were being trained and given opportunities to use new skills with "real" clients. As residence life staff members, they were facing challenges from students, staff, and parents. As senior staff, they were asked to join with the professional full-time staff in making decisions about their buildings and contributing to area and systemwide policy considerations.

When the first quarter interviews were taking place, they were not quite certain of where they stood. In the halls, despite having handled some responsibilities already, the students were still quite tentative about their success to date. As the quarter progressed and finally ended, they grew increasingly comfortable with their status.

Second-quarter interviews began shedding some light on these dynamics. The first quarter, it seemed, eliminated most fear of survival and belonging. Looking back, the students felt that the first quarter had removed much of the uncertainty about student personnel work. They claimed to have gained a broader, less naive view of the field. The introductory student personnel work course had helped them see some of the underlying issues, the diversity of services and settings, and professional roles. They had also gained a clearer understanding and appreciation of the counseling function.

In the residence halls, most reported feeling comfortable in their staff roles sometime during the fall. This did not come from success in dealing with a major episode or crisis, but the daily opportunity to
handle the regular variety of responsibilities and problems. They noted improvements in handling what were personally difficult aspects of the jobs, such as budgeting time, administrative duties, and informal interaction with students. Some were able to cite specific situations where they successfully handled severe situations, such as irate parents, abnormal behavior by residents, and floor conflicts. Another student noted her success in using subtlety in directing students to see a previously resisted point of view. Furthermore, they had grown to understand what it meant to be a senior staff member, as compared with an RA. The learned more about how the organization functioned on a daily basis and how decisions were being made therein.

Successfully handling these challenges left them ready and eager to move forward. They had heard about the upcoming student development theory course and were anxious to begin. The opportunity to teach the undergraduate career planning course was also being anticipated with some excitement. They also were eager to explore more about the field and themselves, to build upon the foundation that the first quarter had provided. They hoped this would lead to a clearer sense of the field.

When asked to describe their current feelings about the program, the students were in a kind of intermediate place. The novelty, fear, and initial excitement of first quarter had worn off for most. Said one SPA, "I'm more settled in. It's not new anymore. The novelty wore off near the end of fall quarter." There seemed to be a sense of comfort. Having made it through the first quarter and half of the second, they knew how to handle the academic burden in combination with the demands of the assistantship. A routine was already established and most had the feeling of command over their residence hall assignments.
Depending on their appraisal of their assignment, they were feeling more or less anxious to get on to the rest of the year and another challenge. One student who was very dissatisfied with her assistantship was looking ahead. She commented, "I'm looking intensely for things in the program that will help in the future. I had been passive. I need to make choices. I must define what I need to get and what I need to get out of it."

While expressing questions about the future, those questions were not specific. Second-year assignments had not been made at this point, and there was no real sense of what would be in the future. Electives had not been chosen to any significant degree, so they had not had to make any critical choices. There seemed to be a comfort, with only a few expressing needs for looking far ahead into the future.

The author found it interesting to speak with the non-SPAs. They, too, had a greater sense of belonging than in the past. However, they still felt somewhat "on the fence," in the words of one. For those who had felt serious doubts about their academic abilities, that fear was mostly alleviated. One commented as follows.

At the beginning of the first quarter I felt overwhelmed. I only felt that way this quarter a couple of days at first. I'm feeling a little better about how to write papers . . . it's still hard for me . . . . I do feel I belong.

A second student provided these remarks.

I feel in the program, even if on the edge. I see the same students. But I feel out of stuff, not being a SPA. They get information faster. I don't like that . . . . I feel progress in the right direction.
A third student said, "I'm in a program, but not part of it. The kids in the residence halls are. I haven't committed myself. They see how it fits together."

As much as they expressed some progress, the non-SPAs did not feel complete membership in the program. Previously they had felt like they were only taking classes. By second quarter they still felt a division between themselves and the SPAs, even resenting what they perceived as an advantage to the SPAs in receiving information about the program. Nevertheless, they were feeling some progress.

Finally, when the author asked the students what was left for them in their jobs, the mood was relaxed. They seemed to be more concerned with the second-year assistantship assignments and finishing out the first year. There were individual challenges ahead, such as specific program plans, commitments to ready the halls for their successors, and making additional strides with recent breakthroughs. However, the major sense was they had survived and acclimated themselves, knew their jobs, and could move ahead.

Overall, the observations and interviews carried out winter quarter revealed a significant sense of progress. Buoyed by the orientation, first quarter, immersion in student development theory classwork, and feedback from their experiences in the residence halls, they now had a clearer sense of what student personnel work was and was not, and they were more aware of their own skills. They still had some uncertainty about the precise jobs that existed and how well they would fit into those areas. However, they seemed to feel that the reasons for which they chose to come to Ohio State University and study for this
field were confirmed to an acceptable degree. That was apparently more important than knowing exactly each job that might exist and what they would do.

Of greater importance was the sense of profession-related competence. Development of skills related to their jobs, such as problem solving, group advising, counseling, and administration, was very important, and they recited their accomplishments willingly. At the same time, they looked forward to testing those skills out in a second-year position, learning new ones from their supervisors, and polishing themselves for the year beyond. Learning about options in the field was important, but not nearly as important as personal and professional skill development.

By their immediate post-graduation goals it was evident they were not worried at this time about exactly what they would do. They either accepted that it would be in residence life or that they would figure that out later. Having the skills, professionalism, and experience to handle whatever came their way seemed to be of higher priority at this time. Of course, the lack of opportunities in the field, as made clear by the introductory course in student personnel work, may have quelled any urge to be selective. However, the author sensed that the major contributing factor to their future orientation and needs was not the job paucity but their current self-awareness and demands of the program. First-quarter they learned how to work in the halls and began developing group and staff relationships. Now they were in the midst of those involvements and were seeing some of the fruits of their labors. This initial confirmation, along with goals in the student development theory
and career planning classes, appeared to command their attention at that time. They represented, the author speculated, their initial assessment of professional progress. That assessment was most likely in the form of questions such as "can I handle the decisions and make the groups function?", "can I understand student development theory?", "do I feel confident enough to confront others, especially those challenging me?", and "can I delegate and act on my feet?". This was the initial phase of professional development and affirmation. It appeared to be the current standard of self-evaluation, and entrance to the professional field still felt a long way off.

While the third quarter was a continuation of the second for the theory course and assistantships, it was also a time when the students realized they had made it through the majority of the year and would soon be focusing on the future. Their reactions were varied, but as a whole demonstrated a sense of achievement, completion, and weariness. They seemed to feel more in control of their lives and more willing and able to incorporate their personal needs when managing their time.

Most of the full-time students were feeling tired from the strain of the previous two quarters, and they saw this quarter as less demanding academically. At the same time, they were increasingly confident of their ability to handle academic matters. Many described themselves as less worried about their coursework and increasingly flexible with their academic time management. A combination of factors—the willingness to procrastinate, better use of time, and more selectivity with readings—were a reflection of this mood. Some people found themselves choosing readings based on their interests. A few noted that quality,
not deadlines, motivated their work on assigned papers. There did not appear to be one exact point in time when their confidence and habits changed noticeably. Yet, third quarter, as a whole, was the time when they realized they had weathered the storm, both in their work and assistantships, and thus they could ease up.

The non-SPA group, particularly the re-entry women, felt the difference. For them, first quarter was a struggle. Second quarter confirmed that their performance had not been a fluke. One noted how she still worked as hard as before but was less motivated by fear of failure. A second offered these comments.

I was afraid at first, the myth of graduate school. I'm okay now. I have a consistent group around me. The work is not as overwhelming as I thought. I can handle it. I was insecure in the fall. If I missed a class I was hyper. Now I'm ready every day and write often.

However, for this group there was still a feeling of being different. In addition, several were anxious to do things that would allow them to feel more a part of the field. Some wished they could have assistantships, but they knew their family obligations made it impossible. They were hoping that practica would at least fill part of that void. On the other hand, SPAs wanted to refine and expand their already established sense of the field and their part within. More will be said about this shortly.

The types of changes mentioned by the non-SPAs were not limited to that group. Said one SPA, "I'm less tense about what is grad school. It's familiar now." A second added these comments.

I worried at first. During first quarter I got everything done on time. It was awful. Now I'm less concerned about 'when' as opposed to the quality. I learned to put off school-work for the dorm. I never had had a paper late in my life.
A third student commented in the following fashion.

Half way during winter I learned what was expected in papers, how to balance time, and became less nervous about papers. There's not much to do this quarter. I'm not very studious anyway. I used to think you had to do all the readings, but that's impossible. I've learned how not to read everything. I've never been a person to let studies interfere with my personal life.

A fourth student added an enthusiastic note to this issue.

I'm more flexible. I let work go by the wayside. I have greater interest in articles I don't have to read. I'm more organized in my studying. I try to make papers really good. I started winter, after I did a paper where I didn't just answer questions but did a variation. I got a positive comment from _____ (theory class instructor), and that was an inspiration. _____ (second-year student) and I are friends, and we discuss my work. That encourages me. Showing it to colleagues makes you want it to be good.

These last two quotes demonstrate a subtle difference within the general development of confidence. On one hand, some people, tired from the overall program and less worried about their survival, were more willing to let their personal needs for social and personal time be addressed, at the sacrifice of thoroughness. Others, freed from the fear of deadlines and work, were excited by the content they were facing and stimulated to read and perform to learn more. The latter were also represented by the comments of one student who noted, "I'm enjoying school more now. I'm learning for myself, not for teachers." Said another, "I have greater dedication now, due to being in what I want. I have to study to keep my GPA. I have better habits now. I study every night. I like school now."

The comfort theme permeated the participants' remarks. They were tired but not displeased. Not only did they feel they were in a good place personally, but they felt they had increased in competence. One
student stated it in this fashion.

I'm focusing on the current and myself, though I usually look further ahead. I'm half way through. I'm not ready for it to be over. I'm excited because of my thesis topic. I'm just realizing that I have good ideas. Next year will be more theoretical in nature. I'll take theory and use it. I've grown more this quarter. I have new perspectives. I'm excited about the program more, but mellowed out more. I've been reflective about what all this means to me. I think a lot of where I want to be. It's painful at times.

Another student echoed the notion of temporary peace.

It's nice to know I have an assistantship next year. Lately I've been wondering what I'll be doing next year at this time. I feel secure now, probably less than then. I'm familiar with class instructors and their styles. But I'm tired. I'm glad I'm not taking any summer classes.

A third student was thinking ahead as she considered the year that was being completed.

I'm relieved the year is over. I'm down in energy. This has been the easiest quarter academically, but I've been down in motivation. I'm tired. As for the future, I grow in spurts. I need time now to integrate. I want to choose, negotiate, and try out new stuff. Next year will be a stabilizing year . . . continuing to learn but relearning this year's stuff. . . . There's been growth with (area coordinator), learning from him. I enjoyed it, but it's been stressful.

Finally, a fourth student's comments warrant inclusion. "I feel good," she said. "I'm settled down. I feel more purpose. I realize why I came, and I belong. I see the relationship between the house and classes."

As suggested before, the feeling of belonging was especially important for the non-assistantship students, particularly those enrolled on a part-time basis. First quarter they had expressed reservations about being part of the program. They perceived and resented a difference between themselves and the SPAs, and they felt like second-
class citizens. With few exceptions their friendships and personal lives were totally separate from those of the SPAs. When asked now, however, to comment on their status at this point in the program, their remarks were noteworthy. Said one, "I'm in the middle. Grad school is not central to my life. I'm extending the program to add courses. I'm in a program, have a direction, since winter quarter. I'm more stable."

One woman, who had expressed severe reservations about belonging and about her own academic abilities, showed both a new, growing confidence but also retained some continuing doubts.

I feel good where I am. I enjoy the coursework and what I'm doing. I have greater confidence and competence. This summer I'll think about what I want. I feel competent (academically) just this quarter. By succeeding winter quarter I realized it wasn't a fluke. I feel in a program, as I have more interaction and I better know other students. I know the instructors better now. My current focus is looking to next year. Just recently I've felt that. I want next year to gain a sense of where I'm going. It seems I should know. Yet I really only have a little exposure to the college. I don't know what a dean does. I feel like a lost soul. Where do I look? What do I read?

A second woman from this group, who had been somewhat reserved in her earlier opinions, was now more positive.

It feels good. I like it. I have a better idea of stuff each quarter. I have different ideas of goals since I started. I know more people now. I feel I'm in a program, because I have to take certain courses.

Another non-SPA, one of two who was given an assistantship during the year, shared a noteworthy perspective.

Completing (student development theory instructor's) sequence led to continuity which led me to feel in the program. Constant classmates led to a base. Being in the program (Student Personnel Assistant Program) does put you in a network for information, that is, advice on who to take
classes from, good books, etc. I feel now I have come from a holding pattern. I have earned the right to be here. Nobody ever said (before) "we feel you're good." I was just admitted to the program but had no assistantship. I was just continuing in the same old job. An outside sanction makes one feel better about oneself and the field.

A statement by yet another part-time student added more useful information.

I am in a program. I didn't feel it fall, but by last quarter I did. I felt some meat to the program. Theory is the basis of the program. Fall quarter didn't have that orientation. I do feel momentum.

When asked to comment on what they would tell prospective candidates, the students offered a wide range of suggestions and reflections. They stressed self-reliance and the ability to get through graduate school. There would be a lot of work and a lot one could learn, they said, and one had both the freedom and responsibility to set one's own goals and structure. There was diversity of people, topics, and options to face and learn from. Personal growth was seen as important, too.

There were also evaluative comments about the Ohio State University program and its personnel, both positive and negative. The university was portrayed as a good place but not perfect. It had nationally known figures and good courses. However, instructors were not as available as desired, and the university was not necessarily "the best." Overall, the assessment was positive.

In summary, the third quarter was not a time in which the current assistantship required or took as much concern or attention as it had before. Increased self-confidence, comfort, and concern about the second year, along with a general decrease in energy, allowed the SPAs
to relax somewhat. They had proven what they could do, and they learned what was possible from their positions. Now they were looking to stretch themselves in the second year. Several intended to or had already spent some time with their new supervisors to talk about the upcoming assistantship. Yet, at the same time, they were not becoming attached or significantly involved with that new setting. They were content to finish out the first year and spend a little time with friends and in personal pursuits. Everyone felt the need for a second-year assignment, even if a few were anxious for the second year to be over. They knew there were things to be learned, the amount and focus depending on personal progress and needs, and were finishing out one year in anticipation of a second.

The meaning of this as pertains to their student personnel work socialization is unclear at this point. The author speculates that, as with their general feeling about student personnel work and the university program, they had reached a point where their initial reasons and feelings about the field had been more or less confirmed, by both information and practical experience. They had learned the rudiments of a theoretical, scientific foundation which either justified or confirmed the gut-level personal feelings which motivated them to pursue this program. While they acknowledged problems in the field and unresolved ethical issues, they were content at this time to accept their reality and that they could still identify with the field. The personal impact that potentially could come from an ethical crisis or major disappointment had not been faced, and so they did not appear to have truly lost themselves in a state of questioning and confusion to be followed with a reconstructed or redefined sense of belonging.
That is not to say, however, that they had merely gone along for a year with no socialization progress. As it was pointed out on several occasions, the program forced students to consider their own developmental status/progress, and to think about their values, interests, and goals. In that sense some real progress had been made. Reasons for being in student personnel work had been reassessed and redefined in terms of more recent knowledge, experience, and skill development. Second-year experiences would most likely lead to a deeper consideration of the ethical and longer-term commitment issues which were described during the first year. With no yardstick as a measure, the author cannot state that the "expected" or "normal" degree of progress had been made. Rather, he can say with confidence that the marked movement was seen, along with a sense that more was still to come.

It was with an eye to the future that the author closed out the first-year interviews. He inquired about the students' academic plans. One area of concern was the thesis. He found that a little more than half did not plan to do one. The major reasons given were dislike for research, lack of time, or having no "burning question." Of those who responded affirmatively, some had settled on a topic while others were still deliberating. Their reasons for undertaking such a project were several, including liking research, seeing its helpfulness towards pursuing a doctorate, and its being a good learning experience.

Future course plans were discussed. While the majority did not plan on a summer program, a significant minority did. Summer was a time where a few required courses were offered, so students could
choose offerings for more personal or practical reasons. Several indicated their desire to take practica and thesis credit. Other courses were from a variety of topic areas.

The author also asked them to indicate what fall courses and practica to which they were looking forward. Nearly one-half were uncertain, not having given the question much thought prior to the interview. The courses they did cite were several, the only prevalent ones being the administration sequence and higher education administration. The rest reflected, based on knowledge the author had of the students, individual academic interests they had both before coming to this university or developed during the first two quarters.

On the other hand, it appears that much more prior thought had been given to practica. This did not surprise the author, given the students' viewpoint that assistantships were for testing out skills, not career areas. Practica, it seems, were seen as fulfilling the latter need. A significant variety of places were cited, many which were also assistantship sites for their peers. These included unions, central housing offices, student affairs administrative offices, and career development/counseling settings. The students wanted experience and knowledge about these settings, as opposed to learning skills. For many, these choices allowed continued pursuit of previously held or newly acquired interests. For a few, it was a chance to explore areas with which they had not had much interaction.

The students also discussed their aspirations for their second-year assistantships. Much like their comments during the second quarter, they cited five major criteria. Chief among them was the desire to
develop specific skills learned in the first year, as well as gaining new skills. These included administration, counseling, programming, group leadership, and research.

Secondly, they were concerned that they be in positions which had importance, autonomy, and variety. The third and almost equally significant concern was with professional development and a broadening of perspective. Some were directly concerned with making themselves more marketable for post-graduate employment. Others wanted to test themselves, to see if they could succeed professionally. Fourth, in this group were those who wanted a greater familiarity with the field and a more sophisticated awareness of organizational dynamics.

Finally, a significant factor was the type of supervisor. Several participants voiced a need to work with a supervisor with whom they could be close and from whom they could learn.

While students had an eye to the future, very few were interested in an assistantship as a way of testing out specific career interests. Several, in fact, came out and stated that the assignment was not for that purpose. They were apparently acknowledging the need to enhance the skills they had acquired, develop new ones, get a sense of their competence in these areas, and determine goals for the future.

Second-Year Students

Interviews with second-year students during fall quarter actually preceded those with their first-year counterparts. The author did have some concern that this might be inadvisable, as the information may have affected how he questioned or perceived the information provided by the latter. However, he did want the first-year students to
have some time and experience under their belts, so he chose to speak with the returning students first.

The foci of these discussions were these students' general impressions of their first year in the program and their basic orientation to the second year. Little time was spent with the details of their current classroom and assistantship experiences; those would be deferred until the next quarter.

The results of this strategy was an interesting excursion into the evolution that took place in a year's time. In combination with these students' current orientation to school, profession, and life-in-general, it afforded the author what would become a multiple view of their experience. Earlier, in mentioning his research strategy, he noted the advantage of following two groups simultaneously. This was one of these benefits. Perhaps, in retrospect, it would have been advisable to interview first-year students first during fall quarter, and then gain the perspective-laden viewpoint of the second-year group. Certainly that point can be argued. However, the author was diligent in using the questions originally designated for the first-quarter students before any interviews took place.

The second-year students' recollections of the previous year strongly resembled that of the first year class. They found that they had become increasingly selective about what they read, had relaxed about their schoolwork, and had come to place less and less emphasis on grades. While they felt there had been much work assigned, as sizeable number had not found it as hard as they had expected. Finally, there was a sense of satisfaction and growth from the
academic experience. Courses were perceived as interesting and helpful, especially student development theory. The one noticeable exception was the introductory student development course. While a small number felt it had broadened their view about the field, most were critical, feeling it had been uninteresting and lacking in content. That was striking in comparison with reactions to the same course by the first-year group. While several of them had resented what they saw as premature negativism about student personnel work by the instructor, it appears that he had taken a much different tack in teaching the course, and that certainly stimulated some thinking and strong reactions. It appears that the previous year's instructor had presented the course in a less personal fashion, sticking to a more disinterested information dissemination posture.

The students' first-year assistantship experiences were also reviewed. They were, perhaps, as a group slightly less enthusiastic about this element of their education. Several felt it had been a negative experience, again particularly those at non-Ohio State University residence hall settings. They were unhappy about what they saw as a lack of challenge and responsibility. On the whole the group were still fairly positive about the first-year assignment, citing satisfaction with the autonomy, supervisory responsibility, and learning that took place. Several did note, not necessarily in a complaining tone, that being a SPA had meant being lower in status than a professional.

Not unlike the first-year students, the second-year class saw the final three quarters as a time to learn, apply, and polish skills. They would prepare for the future, gaining a better sense of their options
One second-year student made these comments.

I'd like to see a coming together of the different parts. Last year's classwork was really people-oriented. I knew by some experience that student personnel workers deal with politics, systems, as in organizations, too. I wanted more information and experience in dealing with that.

A second student was concerned about a direction. "Primarily a direction," he said. I had many areas opened up due to the first year. I want to find answers to questions raised during the first year. I want to develop a commitment for the next couple of years."

Similarly, a third student said, "Perspective. Breathing room to look back at last year and to think about futures. Right now a Ph.D. is an issue. Should I take coursework, and if so, what coursework this year for that?"

A more practical need was verbalized by the following student. "Good experience missing from last year," he said. "Programming experience. Good supervision. Challenge and support. Feedback. Administrative skills. Managing people. How to deal with pushy people. Confidence. Working with people who work for an office."

Finally, one student underscored a more general need. "A continuing sense of confidence being built, different ways to work with students and the organization, leadership styles," she said. "More competence in being a professional."

As for their assistantships, they were mostly concerned about the quality of the work setting, the opportunity to get experience in specific duty areas, and the types of individuals for whom they would be working. Assistantships were not seen as testing sites for career interests.
The author also noticed in the second-year students a definite desire to focus inwards. The first year, particularly quarters one and two, had placed on them many external demands. With the successful completion of several required courses and the management of the assistant director role, they were allowed for the first time to choose what they wanted. The second-year assistantship process allowed them to focus on their interests and needs. Registration for spring, summer, and fall began opening more options for them to pursue. The confidence attributed to their successes was seen in their willingness to choose more selectively among required class readings. As the author will show later, they became more assertive in reducing their social networks to allow greater personal satisfaction. Indeed, the locus of control had been shifted.

This state of mind was seen in the students' willingness to consider new viewpoints about student personnel work, as reinforced by the first administration course. The instructor stressed that one should discover and create a personalized relationship to the field of student personnel work. The students, still early in the quarter, were beginning to accept the legitimacy of the new perspective he was offering. A few noted how the points raised by this instructor gave definitions and form to concerns they had had during the first year. One noted how he had always felt there were ways to think and act in student personnel work other than those presented by the structured experience and student development foci. This class was perhaps confusing but was seen as reality. Where the introduction to student personnel work course had troubled many first-year students by its frankness about the field, the
message of the administration instructor was accepted, even welcomed. It gave academic legitimacy to the vague feelings they had held. It perhaps helped explain why the second-year selection process had taken shape as it did. The reality that student personnel work was not an ideal world with ideal people was certainly clearer and easier to explain. As one student said, perhaps he was still idealistic, but no longer was he naive or ignorant. There was both a greater sense of self-confidence and solemnity. The students acted as if this were more serious business, as opposed to fun and games. They also now worked in offices, as opposed to residence halls which, they would note in later interviews, were more formal in atmosphere. The students could see, too, that the values they held and interests they retained went beyond student personnel work and higher education. While they had not quite redefined their commitment to the field, it appeared that such was forthcoming.

During second-quarter interviews, the author noticed a continuation of this theme. He asked the participants how it felt being a second-year student. Their responses gave increasing evidence of a more perspective-laden view of their experience. While they did not necessarily have a clear sense of where they wanted to head in the future, their viewpoints and feelings seemed established. In a sense, they had by now "seen it all" at Ohio State University, and their reactions and feelings, as expressed in the interviews, seemed less spontaneous and emotional, but more reasoned and retrospective. There definitely seemed to be a sense that they had reached a certain point and were now looking both back and forward in a more disinterested,
critical fashion, along with the confidence that perhaps must accom­
pany or allow such a posture.

When looking at the second year to date, the two most commonly
voiced sentiments were increased comfort and confidence, and a decrease
in the effort required to get by in the program. They felt less pres­
sure academically, having been through the ropes and having success­
fully faced the challenge of first-year coursework. With this behind
them, they were beginning to look to the future and what would take
place after graduation. Where first-year coursework had been new and
exciting for many, the second-year student personnel work classes had
provided more perspective rather than content. The students had
approached this year intending to discover how their skills and know­
ledge could be applied in new settings. Similarly, the coursework
provided practical opportunities--namely practica and independent
study--and new frameworks with which to look back and rework old
assumptions and knowledge.

Their confidence was represented by the following two statements.

I feel good, 'cause the end is near . . . also because of
having a year under my belt. I'm more aware of what's
going on on campus, and that makes me more confident as a
resource person. First-year people ask me questions . . .
that feels good. I used to put second-year people on a
pedestal. Now I'm able to look at things more critically
and within the organizational framework, . . . how they
affect other offices. I don't accept things as readily.

I'm more critical of information, versus just accepting
everything. I'm looking forward to spring and graduation.
I have more confidence. I have been through four quarters
and know the in's and out's of juggling schoolwork. I'm
now getting oriented to narrowing down. I am clearer of
who I am in the profession. My interests are clearer than
in the fall.
A third student, one who had been constantly worried about her academic performance, found reason for optimism. She said, "I'm cautiously optimistic. I'm less anxious. I got a "B" this summer and didn't die."

By this point, many had a better sense of the field and where they stood within. Their interests and commitments were more clearly defined. A broader view of the field and roles within had been gained, at the same time allowing for clarity of individual interests. These comments serve to illustrate these points.

My focus has been on my job. I enjoy working and not having to study when it's over. I have a feel for what's after graduation. I have a greater awareness of the field, and thus greater comfort. I went into the year to get a broader exposure than just residence halls, and to use first-year skills.

I don't feel a mission with regards to student personnel work. I don't feel elite, even if I were supposed to. Now I know what I enjoy and feel competence in--counseling. Now I know, versus just having a sense, that teaching and training are two good areas. Now I know it's important to be around people with different orientations, because I want to learn from them.

I feel better about disagreeing with people. I used to be real "jolly," ... didn't make waves. I'm more assertive and confronting. ... more practical use of counseling skills this year. I feel better than I did last fall about student personnel work and the program. I realize not everywhere's as bad as last year.

While their perspective had been broadened, they simultaneously had sought to narrow their interests so as to make choices about what to do after graduation. The students apparently were not living in a vacuum constructed of classes and assistantships. The increased focus on self and friends, both in and out of the program, pointed to the lack of strong psychological borders between program membership...
and the "outside world." The intense immersion in such a culture was perhaps more in effect during the first year. One student's comments give a partial illustration of this phenomenon.

I have more concern with the future. I have more autonomy from the SPA group. During the first half I was concerned with getting accustomed to my SPA job... the second half towards leaving, the job search process, decisions. There's been stability but greater ambiguity. I especially feel the shift this quarter, from getting established, to the future... putting my resume together... in committees for workshops for convention interviewing. I'm realizing June is coming.

During the last interviews the author asked the participants to sum up the second year. They felt it had added perspective. That is, it created a balance to what had been learned in the first year, giving a broader view of the field. Instead of focusing on theory, individual counseling and residence halls, their horizons had been expanded to include sociological/organizational perspectives. For those who had questioned the strong theoretical emphasis of the first year, this was a welcomed "other" perspective, answering a nagging concern that there had to be another viewpoint other than student development theory, residence halls, and structured experiences. For some it was an eye-opener. One student put it in this fashion.

It added balance, plus a broader picture of student services... our role and ability to work in a university setting. The first year seemed all residence hall perspective. What I learned was positive--the resources and opportunities beyond residence halls. I saw better how student services relate to the academic setting.

Another student said, in relation to this issue, "Less naivete. I learned about political and organizational systems. I used to focus on students. Last year, I believed everyone liked each other, worked together, had the same goals. Not so."
Finally, one student said, "Eye opener, especially from ___ (administration instructor). A lot of what we do is for us, not for students. Also, seeing that playing the game is real necessary. Seeing residence halls from outside the system."

The students also noted that the focus of the second year was more skill and career oriented, versus academic. There was the opportunity to apply learning and knowledge gained during the first year. There was a sense of building upon those factors as well, developing new skills, and polishing and becoming increasingly confident in old ones. In addition, they were free to focus on their interests, specialty areas, and preferred skills. As suggested earlier, with reduced academic requirements, increased choices, and a splitting apart of the entire assistantship group, the focus was more individual. That is, the students had become more "me" oriented. Feeling free to take that stance, they were able to grow as they had hoped, resulting in greater confidence in their abilities and their appropriateness for student personnel work. There was an increased sense of belonging. The following set of comments illustrate these notions.

This year was built on the first year's learning. There's less information this year. Not all new. There are new experiences job-wise. Group skills. I tried to focus and specialize, plus some new learning. I explored some personal interest areas. I feel confident as a result. It reinforced my beliefs about students and the university. I was willing to expose those beliefs. The increased insight to the field allows future planning.

Very different than the first, due to perspective. We're much more on our own this year. You are specializing on what you want. It was spent deciding how I feel I fit into the field, my commitment. There are changes in my feelings this year. In the first year you're brainwashed and don't question things. You're more aware the second year about the field.
The second year's a positive experience. I developed my self-confidence where I needed to grow, what I can do. I refined my skills—programming, administration. I'm less apprehensive to jump into situations. This year really opened my eyes about the organization, money, bureaucracy, et cetera.

It allowed me to develop competencies and refine competencies and skills learned last year. Last year I learned to take a stand, communicate clearly, took on responsibility and autonomy. That was new and uncomfortable. I developed this year and have more comfort. I work with the professional staff and get people to do things. I'm more comfortable in front of a group. I refined academic/intellectual stuff. I was exposed to a lot last year. I re-looked at it this year. I was defining and re-defining my interests. I was helpful to first-year people with academics, theory course. I feel I know that material and can be helpful.

In the first year, I was asking "what's going on here? What are residence halls doing? What is organizational stuff?" I didn't like being called a SPA, or care for many groups. I liked classes' information, counseling. I wasn't sure what all it meant. This year pulled it together. I have a better sense of what is important about what we do and why I think it is important. I have really grown a lot.

Focus on on-residents. I have more comfort talking to bigger groups. It's been a year to prepare to be out of school and in a full-time setting. Emphasis on becoming professional. My professionalism increased as I dealt with a greater number of offices. I learned to understand how students saw one as a staff member, not just a graduate students. My confidence increased. I tried to focus on becoming professional.

While students grew in self-confidence, part of the significance of the second-year perspective was the awareness that they would continue to grow, along with feeling ready to take a full-time job without feeling they had to be completely prepared. Their confidence seemed to bolster their readiness of the next challenge. There was a true sense of belonging to the field, that is, being suited for the field, at least value and skill-wise. The following student, one who had felt many self-doubts throughout the three interviews, demonstrated this progress and "comfortable uncertainty" about the future.
Most core stuff was done the first year. This year I could do more I wanted and was interested in. I wanted to study more in counseling. I became aware of what I wanted to learn and the people I wanted to study under. There's so much I want to know . . . I've done a lot of wondering about where I fit in. Am I really good at anything? I wondered if I could have done this job (assistantship) two or four years ago. Maybe I could have done it then, but I can do it better now.

Finally, the author asked these students what they would tell prospective candidates about the program. They were fairly positive, saying it had been a learning experience, one that allowed a meaningful combination of school and assistantship, and one that allowed the freedom to learn about oneself and define one's options. It had been a good practical learning experience. As several noted, one had to rely on oneself in order to benefit the most. One needed to initiate one's own learning, and the options were there. One could grow both professionally and personally from the experience.

Relationships

Studies of professional socialization have invariably included an examination of the social network of the student population. As the literature review noted, students have often relied on other students for information by which to guide their academic behaviors. Relationships with peers, certainly, were only one facet of the overall network at Ohio State University, which included alumni, faculty, staff, undergraduate students, family, and friends outside of the program. Within the program were SPAs and non-SPAs, Ph.D. and master's degree students, students in different majors and minors, and first- and second-year students. Undergraduate students were both staff and residence hall occupants, advisees, and, in counseling
practica, clients.

The author had no idea in advance what significance an examination of the participants' relationships would reveal, if any. However, given the density of this network, it needed attention. He did not have the opportunity to observe and record their social behavior, so he had to rely on their accounts of those activities as presented during interviews.

The questions centered around two themes. One pertained to the participants' overall lives at the time of the study. "Who," the author inquired, "do you spend your time with, how do you spend that time, and what do you talk about?"

The second issue was more related to the profession and the roles one may occupy within. The author asked the participants to talk about relationships with and impressions of supervisors, faculty, academic advisers, college and university officials, students and student staff, and office staff (when applicable). His interest was in how these professionals-in-training saw their status relative to these populations, and what influence, if any, those people might have had on their emerging professional self-concept.

Pre-Admission

As the author noted, contact with individuals associated with the program began for some even before they applied to the university. These people noted that they had met and worked for alumni who had encouraged them to apply. However, the majority had their first contact during the selection period in the winter and spring prior to matriculation.
As some noted, the time they spent with their SPA hosts on the Ohio State University campus contributed to their decision to attend the program. Those who engaged in these hosting duties recalled enjoying this opportunity, trying to provide an honest appraisal of the program for the interviewees. Despite the current students' busy schedules, they did manage to pay a fair amount of attention to their guests. The applicants usually stayed in their hosts' apartment and, depending on the latters' schedules, were escorted through the campus. They attended parties, informal social gatherings, meals, and even classes.

Through his interviews, the author discovered that some candidates were even made aware of the types of questions they might face. In particular, they were told to expect a "moral dilemma" questions from the assistantship program director. This was a hypothetical situation where the interviewees had to make a choice which gave a glimpse of the level of moral reasoning they were using. The author did not ever learn if all students were given such advance warning and, if not, for what reasons such inconsistency existed. Nevertheless, it appears that the currently enrolled students made a real effort to make the applicants comfortable, even to take them under their wing. Those treated in this fashion expressed their appreciation for the candidness and helpfulness of their hosts, and it seemed that they were attempting to pass on that good will when their turn came. When asked by the interviewer what they would/did tell applicants, the participants, even those who had strong negative feelings about the program, would emphasize both positive and negative points. They evidently felt the
program, with all the weaknesses they saw, was of high quality, and thus these applicants should be given that information. Since the students were aware that the program was fairly selective, it is safe to assume that they expected that those who were asked to interview had reasonably solid credentials. The author hypothesizes that by interacting as they did with the applicants, the students were attempting to help the program attract good candidates, while at the same time providing a balanced appraisal. In fact, they may have reasoned that an honest discussion of the program's attributes would attract rather than discourage worthy applicants.

It is also possible to speculate that, due to this early experience, incoming students expected a social network which would be supportive and friendly. Whether such an expectation would have affected their reaction to the first days of the orientation is beyond conjecture.

Orientation Period

The notion of a support system characterized by open communication was developed as soon as the applicants arrived at their first meeting. At that session they were introduced to a large group of fellow first-year SPAs. Immediately after being introduced to the entire group and a smaller group therein, they were broken into pairs to engage in an hour-long "dyadic encounter." These two-person teams would remain intact throughout the ensuing leadership lab.

Contact with others broadened the first Friday evening, due to the initiative of a second-year SPA, who sponsored a party. At this event the students met each other as well as other second-year SPAs. Spouses were included, too.
The leadership lab allowed the students to watch and interact with an entire group, but with particular focus on a small group of five or six. From introductions through personal evaluations and feedback, this group would be the SPAs' first significant primary group. In later interviews, a few recalled that initial group and noted how some friendships developed and persisted from within. Most students indicated a general receptivity and identification with the entire assistantship group as a result of the two-day program. Many remarked that they were comfortable in approaching anyone with a question or concern.

However, at this time the structure of the program mitigated against a continued strong large-group identity. Geographic factors contributed to this change. Off-campus SPAs returned to their respective colleges to engage in their housing training programs. This reduced their contact with the Ohio State University people drastically. This was especially true for the students working at Ohio Wesleyan University, who were a 45 minute drive from Ohio State University. By their own admission, their focus, professionally and personally, became the people at the former institution.

When housing orientation at Ohio State University began, the primary focus for the SPAs became fellow area SPAs and directors, especially the residence hall senior staff team. They were very busy discussing their jobs and planning how they would work together during the year. Whenever time permitted—during meals, breaks, evenings, and weekends—these teams met to learn about their buildings and to plan policies. This relationship was formalized, in a sense, at the SPA/director-level session late in August, where the process was set in
motion by which specific goals, responsibilities, and directions would be negotiated and written in contractual form.

What one sees, then, is the emergence of primary relationships—director and SPA, SPA and fellow residence hall complex SPA, and SPA and other area SPAs. Actually, it appeared that complex SPA relationships were not as significant as area-wide SPA relationships. In interviews, the students noted their personal differences from their complex SPA partners. While they were able to work together, their negotiated duties would differ. That, along with personality differences, may have prevented these from becoming primary relationships. Rather, the students seemed to become attracted to other SPAs in their areas.

While the area and complex relationships were developing, the systemwide focus was diminishing in strength. There simply was not enough time to maintain close ties with SPAs from other areas. Occasionally at meals the author would notice SPAs from other areas sitting together. However, not until classes began could they do so on a regular basis.

Next the RAs arrived. The SPAs' reactions to these students varied, depending on their feelings about age, previous residence hall experience, and self-confidence. While they did not necessarily become "one of the gang," (though some did), this was a period in which the SPAs did expand and redefine their social environment.

Towards the end of the RA orientation period another group of individuals entered the scene. These were student officers and workers. Orientation assistants, student government leaders, security and office workers, and judicial commission officers returned early to prepare for
the quarter and to receive training to initiate their respective responsibilities. Depending on their particular assignments, SPAs could interact with some or all of these groups. By then they had learned those groups' roles and planned some formal meetings. While they were rarely acknowledged as primary, significant relationships of a personal nature did develop in a few instances.

This process culminated with the arrival of building residents. Again, SPAs defined their stances and relationships with students differently. In general, it is safe to say that several still identified with being a student, and they found themselves engaged in personal interactions with the residents as the year progressed.

This is a study, in a sense, of individuals brought together into a group and then breaking into smaller aggregations which changed and remained loosely coupled for two years. The first few days of the program not only gathered them in one place, but to some degree they isolated them from significant outside contact. The leadership lab, in particular, forced them to meet and know many of this group, with various degrees of intensity. As interviews would later reveal, this was the closest they would be as an entire group. Many noted how they were thrown in a situation together and had an immediate support group. "It was easy," said one. "You had instant friends." Said another, "You could be open right away."

There were deliberate attempts to foster the sense of group support throughout the leadership lab and orientation process. The program director made a persistent attempt to get the SPAs to go out for pizza on the first of the two evenings of the leadership lab. They were
invited to his house for dessert one evening that summer. The program made it possible for all SPAs to get football tickets together. In short, there was recognition given to the desirability of bringing people together in group activities.

Overall, though, the reader should be struck by the basic reasons behind the socialization and group formation processes at that time. Here were students from diverse backgrounds—geographical, educational, and personal—brought together in a relatively quiet campus during the middle of August, and exposed to a series of experiences which were new for many. Very quickly they were expected to get to know each other on a rather personal level, probably atypical for their normal lives in terms of the speed at which it took place. There were told they were special, different, and had a special mission in the university and society. They were immersed in a month-long series of programs which forced them to learn a lot of information. They were also told they were no longer students but on a par with "grizzled veterans." The intensity and continuity of that experience, the ongoing focus of one general topic, and the new language and technology certainly made possible not only a physical but a kind of psychological isolation from the university and society.

Despite this commonality, the students were not totally immersed in the group. To begin, most were forming relationships simultaneously with their supervisors. The hall directors had been the first to greet and orient them to their new surroundings. This was the beginning of a relationship that would become increasingly significant during the orientation period.
A second factor was the differences within the Ohio State University housing system, which became evident as soon as housing orientation began. The SPAs working in scholarship houses saw that many of the discussion that took place were not important to them. They did not supervise RAs or have judicial systems, and both topics were covered extensively during the training period.

A third factor, as noted earlier, was the structure of the Ohio State University housing system, which separated SPAs into their three geographical areas. As soon as classes started, they would also eat in separate cafeterias.

A fourth factor was the curricular structure. Most residence hall SPAs were student personnel work majors. However, a few were counseling psychology majors or minors. Before school began these factors were of minimal importance. Later their effects would be felt.

The result was a complex array of influences and allegiances which inevitably resulted in subgroups of many different sizes and content. When school began, the second-year SPAs returned, adding yet another factor. In addition, the new student personnel work students without assistantships would join their classes. The initial geographical and psychological isolation caused by the leadership lab was significantly altered.

While on-campus SPAs were closest with their area mates, off-campus students found their ties closer with their own institutions. As the first quarter progressed, several off-campus SPAs from different schools became close with one another, perhaps sharing a sense of commonality.
First Year

When the first quarter began, the temporarily separated Ohio State University SPAs were reunited by their common classes. This enabled friendships dictated by personality and interest similarities to flourish to a greater degree than during the concentrated isolation imposed by housing orientation and RA training. At the same time, the counseling psychology SPAs and minors took the introductory course offered by the Psychology Department, while the others enrolled in the one taught through the College of Education.

Between classes and during lunch the students met, as they noted, most of their conversations centered on "SPA talk," as they called it. That is, they would discuss their assistantships, problems in the halls, hall directors, and related matters. They also spoke a great deal about their acclimation to the university, classes, progress made on their group procedures course assignments, and how they were doing with their readings. Their lives were extremely busy, and there was comfort in their commonality.

At the same time, it was not long before people were beginning to tire of what they felt was the narrow focus of their existence and topics of conversation. Several mentioned their desire for non-SPA talk. They had personal lives which had been ignored to a great degree. This would be a trend and theme that would be seen in both first- and second-year classes.

However, for the first quarter, especially the first six to eight weeks, life was eating, sleeping, and breathing "SPAdom." Such was seen at SPA parties. Despite claiming that they were tired of shop talk, these parties were replete with such talk.
Not all the students were SPAs. As they reported in their interviews, it was clear to them that they were not part of the SPA group. Only one felt quickly that she was a part of that group, and she was the youngest, only one year out of college. The others expressed varying degrees of separation, with accompanying levels of concern about that status. While some noted they had been developing relationships with non-SPAs, all but one felt outside the SPA group.

Several factors contributed to this separation. Certainly their program orientations were different. Non-SPAs had academic orientation two days before classes began, and the program lasted one and one-half hours. Those in the group procedures class had to wait until the third weekend of the quarter to go through the leadership lab. None from this group went through any of the housing training.

Secondly, they noted that classroom discussions, both formal and informal, centered around SPAdom. The instructors used examples that referred to residence hall situations. Between-class discussions often dealt with current residence hall problems. One non-SPA said, "I felt a patronizing attitude from a SPA, who asked if it were okay to talk about residence hall stuff." Another commented on the cliquish behavior she saw. "They all break at class and talk together and don't include you," she said. "They go out for a beer after class. I miss that. . . . Other non-SPAs have said that to me."

The author could begin to see, however, a small difference within the non-SPA group. The full-time students were beginning to have more contact with the SPAs and were becoming more integrated. One said, "I still feel in the outside group. I don't go out much with them,
though a bunch from the counseling class (with me included) go to lunch after class. At lunches there's talk of how they're doing personally and in their SPA jobs, . . . coursework."

Those enrolled part-time and married, or working full-time at the university, tended not to become involved as much with the SPA group. Their allegiances were to their families and their jobs, and while they expressed their sense of distance, they seemed content with their priorities.

The greatest concern of all non-SPAs had to do with what they saw as a disparate sharing of program-related information. SPAs, they felt, had more immediate access to the program director, who was also an instructor in the student personnel work program. They would hear of impending courses and program-related deadlines more easily as a result, felt the non-SPAs. This led to significant amounts of resentment in several of these students.

While structural arrangements created relationship opportunities, it was not long before personal attractions entered. Initially favorable impressions at the leadership lab and early meetings were followed up when the students were able to get settled enough in their daily routines. Relationships transcended all structural boundaries. While the focus of relationships was still area-related, interests and attractions allowed and caused new relationships and mixed groups to develop.

Second-quarter interviews created a picture of the groupings that had developed. It appeared that no significantly large groups or cliques formed, except for the SPAs as an entire group, as they were seen by the non-SPAs. The non-SPAs, when asked with whom they tended
to associate, pointed to each other or non-student personnel work people. This was especially true for those who were part-time and/or married. Said one, "People at work. My husband. In the program, people like me--home, work, school--like ____ (name of student). Said the person to whom she was referring, "I'm closer with people more like me--married, older. I have nothing in common with these kids. I'm in a study group with ____ and ____ (two non-SPAs)."

A full-time non-SPA noted that he gravitated towards the non-SPAs, especially the other full-time (and unmarried) ones. However, he also cited some closeness with several SPAs, especially those who tended to share similar viewpoints about the world and who had intellectual tendencies. "I was uncomfortable," he said, "first quarter, at times, not being a SPA. "Not now. I feel friends and a part of them as much as if I were a SPA. (They are) very friendly to me."

What was more dramatic, however, was how these students were perceived by the SPAs. Only four times were non-SPAs designated as "close" by SPAs. This was well represented in a comment by a part-time, older student who said, "I really don't have perceptions of SPA students. A lot shy away and say nothing more than 'hi'."

As reported earlier, a noticeable trend was for students to feel closer with SPAs from their own geographic housing area. While they were not exclusive in this stance, this was prevalent, especially in the Olentangy and North areas. Both, interestingly enough, respected their area coordinators. South Area SPAs showed the greatest dispersion in their relationships, and they were in an area with a coordinator who was not once cited as a significant or respected individual.
A third group could be called the off-campus SPAs. The SPAs at Otterbein College and Capital University tended to spend time with each other, but did include a couple of others from Ohio State University. The Ohio Wesleyan SPAs tended to remain closest with their own campus population.

Finally, the SPAs in the non-traditional Ohio State University residential settings (scholarship houses) expressed a feeling of commonality. They listed each other fairly frequently as significant or close. They also felt somewhat close with the Olentangy SPAs, as their hall director was from that area.

The author also noted the grouping of counseling psychology minors. However, there was no strong sense of identity such as expressed by the second-year minors.

The author asked the participants to whom they would most likely go if they had a personal problem, provided they could and were willing to talk about it. Their geographical location seemed of much greater consequence in this instance. With few exceptions, they seemed to trust a student from their own setting. The SPA supervisors were listed three times, and a faculty member once. Non-SPAs mentioned faculty, co-workers, and "other students."

About what did participants talk? The reader will recall that shop talk dominated conversations through fall quarter. While saying they wanted to get onto more personal issues, the preponderance of discussion was still program related. As one said, "I try not to talk about the program, but it's hard. I'm constantly thinking about it."

Most prevalent was their concern about academics, especially second-
quarter. They compared notes on how they were progressing on the readings and assigned papers, along with how well they were understanding the materials. Several noted how they were able to gauge their progress in this fashion. At the same time, purely academic discussions about the materials outside the classroom were not frequently reported, unless such was part of a study group. More than one student commented that "intellectual" talk was disdained outside the classroom. Students seemed mostly concerned with surviving—keeping up, making deadlines, and understanding the theories.

For SPAs, the assistantship was almost equally prevalent in discussions. Students talked about how their jobs were coming along, sharing "horror stories," and increasingly referring to the second-year assistantship selection process.

Some personal talk was reported, but it was seen as a minor factor. People wanted to have such discussions, but they felt that the opportunity was not always available.

In summary, the students were very focused on their academic programs, particularly the rigors of the student development theory course. It presented them with an intellectual and time management problem. While they perhaps relieved the tension by sharing war stories about their jobs, supervisors, and others in the assistantship program, along with speculation about the second year, academics were most important. Their between-and within-class discussions, plus evening phone calls, allowed them to estimate their work progress and academic understanding. The different concepts they were encountering needed clarification, and such discussion allowed this to happen.
While there was some conversation about the field of student personnel work in general, this was extremely rare.

Despite the concern and occasional "bitching" about the academic rigors, there did not appear to emerge a "we-versus-they" mentality with regards to the faculty. The students were impressed by the instructional ability of the instructor, and they enjoyed and were fascinated by the theories. However, they did appear to rely on themselves and peers to help clarify the things they were learning.

One final point should be made. The author found it interesting that in only a few instances were relationships based on common intellectual predilection. Three of four individuals mentioned the intellectual nature of their relationships, that is, an interest in discussing philosophical issues related to both student personnel work and the world in general. It was noted that such talk was somewhat discouraged by other students. While these individuals were not ostracized, they were not joined in this pursuit by their colleagues.

Discussions during the spring revealed that the social network had evolved in an interesting fashion. For several reasons, including the continuing need to establish a life outside the daily press of class and assistantship work, the students had been narrowing down their circles of friends. They had been seeking relief from the constant reminders of their intensive program by attempting to avoid SPA-talk with classmates, as well as seeking to include personal content in their conversations. The reader will recall that by third quarter the students were exhibiting a kind of independence, focusing on personal needs, both in academic pursuits and in their overall time management. By third
quarter, then, the author learned how students who had limited their personal lives before were now seeking to broaden their network of acquaintanceships, both in and outside the program. On the other hand, those who had been active with the larger group tended to limit their time to those with whom they were closest and wished to know even better. Interestingly, the non-SPAs, feeling more confident in their academic abilities, were getting to know more SPAs, though still on a limited basis. Their principal attractions were still friends and family.

One constant was the interaction SPAs had with second-year students. The overwhelming majority reported little or no such contact. Only two indicated significant relationships, and two said they had "some." Whatever incidental relationships they had were due to interaction at parties, common work settings, or the fall counseling lab, which some second-year students served in as assistants to the instructor.

As one looks back over the year, it is clear that several factors, perhaps interrelated, contributed to the social network that evolved. Personality, interests, propinquity, status (SPA/non-SPA), academic program, and other sources of similarity all played a part. What one sees is not a set of strong cliques but loosely bonded informal groupings that seemed linked by membership in the assistantship program. For some, being a SPA did mean feeling part of a group. Likewise, it was seen as exclusionary by non-SPAs and some SPAs. For others, "SPA" meant people in the Ohio State University residence hall system. However, some felt it was simply associated with an assistantship that was a means to an education. Several saw it as less than professional, but
it was also considered part of an education that was for professional preparation. In short, there was no clear and significant definition of the program which drew all elements together, either mentally or physically.

The author noticed that there was no one place in which most activities took place. Students, classes, and assistantship assignments were well spread out. Allegiances were to students' buildings and acquaintances, not to a common environment. Given these factors, as well as the emphasis on personal meaning and individuality that evolved, the author was not surprised to see how the social environment emerged by the end of the first year. Perhaps the strongest common element was the concern that the group not be as competitive as had been that of the previous year's students. Once they saw how that turned out early in spring quarter, the final strong group identity element was perhaps eliminated.

Second Year

The pattern established in the first year was reinforced during the second. Unlike their first year, they were in a variety of classes, with only one course being required at this time. The students did report "catching up" with acquaintances before and after classes, but for many this was the only time when they even saw each other. Secondly, they were no longer part of the same housing organization, so shop talk meant telling each other how their different assistantships were going, not comparing notes on how their common housing-related problems were unfolding. Their commitments were now with their assistantships, related staff, and small circles of friends. Contributing, too, to
the lowered sense of commonality was the reduced work time. Most assistantships were non-residential, so students worked mostly during the day, and with more firmly established hours. They reported enjoying going home for the evening after a day of work and being able to pursue their own lives. They lived in apartments spread out in off-campus locations, which increased their opportunity for anonymity.

Most reported that a few friendships from the first year had persisted during the second, and these even had become stronger. However, just as many noted that those relationships had weakened. Those that did continue became more personal, including socializing outside of the work setting. A few reported new significant relationships, and a noticeable number of those were with people outside the program. The following set of comments combine to portray the second-year condition.

I have no social contact with people at work. Last year you wanted to know and be friendly with people. This year I accept my lack of commonality and am more self-centered. I don't go to parties if I don't want to. Last year I did to be sociable. There's less time available to be with last year's close acquaintances.

(There's) a lot of carryover from last year. I'm more attached with these four (students). I spend less time with the whole class, and lose contact with many. . . . reduced opportunity to get to know others. I don't make the opportunity to meet others. During the first year I got to know people first. Then I wanted to get to see Columbus and not talk about school. I realized other things beyond student personnel work were important to talk about.

I'm more isolated from any recognized group. I don't know what others are doing and visa-versa, nor do I care. Last year there was a greater sense of sameness and unity. Living off-campus has resulted in reduced access to others. There's fewer class contacts. The thesis makes for an independent effort.
When they were with their fellow students, the topics of conversation varied. The most popular topic was their personal lives. They also spent a great deal of time discussing their current jobs and talking about other SPAs or the program as a whole. Classwork was not frequently mentioned as a topic. This was not surprising, given the diversity of their courses and the reduced focus on academics. Talk about jobs and post-graduation plans was not widespread at this time.

As for personal problems, the second-year students confirmed that faculty and supervisors did not play a part in their most significant relationships. Fellow students and spouses/friends were clearly the first choice for assistance. Even with program-related problems, fellow students would be sought out first. Once again, the reader sees that while faculty, supervisors, and other professionals were admired for many qualities, personal and mentor relationships did not appear to take hold.

Second-year students reported very limited contact with the first-year group. A few, due to residence hall work or teaching of counseling labs, found themselves being asked questions about the program. One student, who had a strong interest in student development theory, found himself helping first-year students understand concepts being taught in the theory course. However, these were isolated examples.

Earlier in this chapter, the author noted that the second-year counseling psychology minors, while in their first year, had felt a close bond, due to perceived negative status attributed to them. While not spending much time with each other in the second year, they still felt a closeness to these peers and attempted to stay in touch, even if
only occasionally. The first-year counseling psychology minor group, however, did not feel this negative image and identified themselves as student personnel work majors.

After reviewing these results, the author considered their significance. It appeared that the program included a deliberate attempt to build and include a sense of commonality and support, especially in the early, most trying days. However, it was inevitable that this closeness could not resist the forces which led to separation. The author speculates that the program director must have anticipated this outcome. Furthermore, the program structure allowed and perhaps encouraged personal choice, beginning with second-year assistantship selection and third-quarter class registration. Students were encouraged to find their own meanings in the world of student personnel work in the fall administration course, and the second year was wide open to elective course selection. Reacting against the initial closeness, and encouraged by curricular freedom and a feeling of self-confidence coming from surviving the first year, the students became increasingly attentive to their own needs and those of their very close friends.

Program-related discussions did take place throughout the two years. In particular, students would gauge their progress by comparing notes on how much reading they had done or how far they had gone with their assignments. In the student development theory course they would discuss, both on the telephone and in some study groups, the readings and lectures, in an attempt to understand the complex information. They would also talk a great deal about the program—housing staff, instructors, the second-year selection process, even other
students. Discussions of the future were limited but did take place throughout the two years.

What is most apparent is that student relationships did not shape the students' professional identity to any noticeable degree. There never was a strong trainee-versus-professional mentality, nor a student-teacher split, even though those themes were heard on occasion. The students' identification was strongest with their jobs and, eventually, their friends. The latter was for personal reasons, not field-related causes. In short, relationship formation was an outcome, not a determinant, of the program in which they were enrolled.

Advisers

The professional socialization literature is replete with discussions of the relationships between students/trainees and faculty/supervisors. Many studies tell of how trainees learn from these people, sometimes modeling their behavior, other times rejecting it. Whatever the case, these are the people who are teaching and overseeing the trainees as they learn to assume professional roles and competencies. Without any inkling of what would be found, the author inquired about the participants' relationships with and perceptions of faculty and staff with whom they interacted.

Relationships with faculty and faculty advisers were similar and consistent throughout the two years: They were remarkable in their singular lack of significance. While some students had indicated that they had expected close ties as a function of the graduate school experience, the group as a whole did very little to seek or foster such relationships; nor, it appears, did the faculty.
The author was not well-informed on how advisee/adviser pairings were made. It appeared that students did not play any noteworthy part in the decision-making process on that matter. It is possible, given the students' career and academic interests, that they were assigned to faculty of similar dispositions. For example, counseling-oriented students would be advised by the faculty member who taught the counseling sequence. The author speculates that sheer numbers may have played the most significant role, however, in the assignment process.

How advisers went about fulfilling their obligations appeared to be a matter of individual choice. During the first quarter, two of the full-time faculty held periodic meetings with small groups of their advisees to discuss the program, their options, and, ostensibly, to ease their adjustment to the first quarter. One of these two faculty even brought second-year students to discuss second-year positions. In addition, that adviser did career exploration counseling with her group. It appears that the third main adviser kept his relationships purely on a one-to-one basis.

The author asked the first-year student during second-quarter interviews about their relationships with their advisers. In general, it appeared that advisers' roles were not perceived as significant, particularly with regards to course selection. Most students felt they could choose and schedule courses on their own. Advisers were seen as either too busy or unnecessary for this decision-making process. Several indicated they could and did go to second-year or first-year students with their questions. While they did officially need their adviser's consultation and signature to register for classes, several
said that they would get the secretary's signature if one of the advisers were not available.

With the three major advisers, students were mostly confident that they could go to them with a problem if such were necessary. Some noted that they had some concern about decisions they were facing, such as the thesis/non-thesis option, and these advisers were seen as concerned and helpful in that regard.

However, there was a marked negativism about advisers who were not regular faculty. The advisees saw them as poorly informed about the program and unable to provide help even with course selection. The students consistently went to other faculty and students to have their questions answered. While seeing these advisers as benevolent, the students nonetheless were clearly dissatisfied. One was frustrated to the point of saying, "I can't see myself doing a thesis under ___ (name of adviser). This is frustrating."

Those students who found their advisers to be helpful and concerned did not, as a rule, initiate visits with them for non-scheduling or class-related problems. Only two of the entire group said they actually deliberately visited for non-scheduling purposes.

The author was not surprised by what he heard. First, the curriculum was such that the students had few significant student personnel work course choices to make. Second, busy schedules did possibly reduce the advisers' availability. Third, group cohesion, especially in fall quarter, would have facilitated the reliance on peers for course-related advice. Second-year students, while not close with the new class, were a source of information that could give the "real dope"
about a teacher or a course. Even if a first-year student did not
know a second-year SPA, his/her first-year colleague across campus
might know one who might have some insights to share. While the author
was not certain if that process actually took place in that fashion,
it was highly possible. This is suggested by the comment made by the
instructor during the first session of the winter quarter student
development class. He stated, "I know there's a rumor mill about the
workload in this course," and that was immediately followed by a great
deal of laughter.

Second-year students appeared to be no different. The majority
reported having little or no contact with their advisers, and course
selection was often done after talking with friends. A couple con­
fessed they had signed their own course registration forms. Some
indicated their advisers were of no help or usefulness, but others did
find them very supportive and helpful regarding future plans and their
progress, both career and educational. Two indicated they wished they
had spent more time with their advisers.

Yet, while not spending much time with their advisers, in fact,
less than the previous year, for some there was a sense that their
relationships were qualitatively better. They noted that they under­
stood their advisers better, and the reverse seemed to be true as well.
There was greater comfort in talking with their advisers, even if such
did not take place as often. This was perhaps particularly true for
the one faculty member from whom the students took classes only during
the second year--the administration sequence.
Faculty

Relationships with faculty were of a similar nature. Most respondents indicated that they had very little-to-no relationship with faculty outside the classroom. At the same time, several indicated that they felt closer to, a better appreciation for, or better able to understand a specific faculty member. This was attributed to a combination of class contact and increased appreciation/comfort with teaching style. However, there was little or no sense that there were many significant, ongoing mentor or close relationships developing. Two students actively pursuing Ph.D. programs noted their increasingly close and informal relationships with faculty, both in and outside the student personnel work department, who in turn supported their burgeoning academic interests and educational plans. This phenomenon was for the most part limited to these particular students.

Relationships with teaching faculty were even less important to the first-year students. They did not show a strong interest in having such contact. However, when asked which individuals were most impressive, faculty members were the most frequently cited. In particular, the assistantship program director, who had taught four classes, headed the list. The participants then pointed to the chief housing administrator in their area, in other words, the area coordinator. Hall directors were also mentioned with equal frequency, along with first-year students. Second-year students felt similarly about the faculty, but unlike their first-year counterparts, they tended to see their supervisors as most impressive. Faculty were cited for reasons similar to those mentioned by first-year students—intellectual ability,
knowledge of the material, ability to present information in an enthusiastic fashion, and personal qualities such as openness, dedication, and sincerity.

Later the author will address the nature and significance of the participants' relationships with supervisors and other administrators. At this point some speculation about the meaning of what he has presented about the faculty and advisers is in order.

First, in the first year the students were learning new material and skills, and they wanted to be told what the field of student personnel work was all about. Two instructors taught throughout that year and were seen as the experts who would impart most of that wisdom. Less sure of their abilities than they would be later, the students were impressed with the confidence and teaching skill of the instructors. In particular, the assistantship program director struck them as a skilled and knowledgeable instructor who was also deeply committed to the field. These were strengths they did not have at the time and were thus admired.

At the same time, the SPAs worked mostly for hall directors who were not much older than them and, very possibly, with less impressive academic preparation. The superiority and expertise of these supervisors was attributed to their having more knowledge of the housing system, more experience with difficult situations, and greater polish. This had little or nothing to do with theoretical knowledge. Not long into the year many SPAs felt they could handle their supervisor's job with only a little more knowledge and experience. While supervisors were admired for some of their skills, very few, if any, were held on a lofty pedestal.
However, the instructors, for the most part, were not practitioners. They were academic faculty, first and foremost. While they could demonstrate skills that could be useful in a job situation, they did not actively apply them, at least in situations such as the students were facing every day. The students did not come to the program hoping to become faculty, and so these people were not role models. They were respected more from afar and admired for their academic professionalism. Furthermore, they were seen as shunning out-of-class relationships, or simply too busy to maintain them.

Finally, the students demonstrated a desire to act independently and to make their own decisions. They reacted against what they felt was excessive group cohesion by breaking apart and following their own paths. They soon found they could handle the scheduling of courses without adviser assistance. Furthermore, they judged some as being incompetent, and others unavailable. Rather than persist in seeking close ties with faculty, which they might have done if they felt such a need or desire, they simply got information from classmates.

Supervisors

First-Year Students. For several students, their supervisors were the first people they met when they arrived in the summer. Before long they were exposed to several upper-level administrators, some with whom they would work directly and indirectly for an entire year. During their second year, those not in the residence hall system served under office directors, faculty, and deans. Their appraisal of these staff shed some light on how they saw the field of student personnel work, what they valued, how they defined professionalism, and how they thought
about their own development.

The students' initial reactions to the hall directors varied. Most seemed to enjoy the interaction they had and saw their directors as supportive and knowledgeable. In a few instances the SPAs had to adjust to obvious style differences. Some saw their styles as different but complementary. While that took some getting used to, they were eventually able to appreciate the differences and work cooperatively. On the other hand, some felt an immediate attraction to their director's style and personality, and felt somewhat close.

The reasons given for their enthusiastic reaction to their supervisors were many. These included their observations that the supervisors were (a) knowledgeable about the organization, (b) genuine in their concern for students, (c) aware of how to handle difficult situations and groups, (d) flexible, (e) close and friendly, (f) very professional, (g) organized and efficient, (h) willing to give feedback, (i) willing to give autonomy and responsibility, (j) able to provide perspective when decisions were being made, and (k) committed to their work.

Most notably, several students stated that they had observed how their supervisors handled situations, either directly or indirectly, and could learn from such behavior. One student expressed it in this fashion.

I can learn from her . . . how to present a decision so as group will go that way . . . (I'm) not able to do that yet, so I watch her. I don't try to be like her but can learn with regards to supervision.
A second student said, "I pick up how she does stuff, subtly."
A third student added, "I have learned by watching her, but it's hard
to pinpoint." Even a student who was mostly negative about her super-
visor still found some admirable qualities. While she rejected what
she perceived as his "removed," overly administrative style, she
acknowledged that "his thinking is made very efficiently. I observe
him and try to integrate that into my style."

There were some negative sentiments expressed. Of the five who
were generally critical of their supervisors, only three individuals
were involved. In other words, there were only two supervisors found
lacking by two different pairs of SPAs. In one instance the pair
found the supervisor to be too administrative and inflexible. The
other found the supervisor to be giving too little autonomy and respon-
sibility.

By the second quarter the students had become more comfortable
with their supervisors. While they still admired them for the afore-
mentioned qualities, the students saw the relationships growing closer
and more personal as the year progressed. This, in turn, allowed them
to better understand their supervisors. Some noted how their differ-
ences complemented each other. While not necessarily typical, this
student's comments illustrate how one relationship had developed.

At first he was my boss. Now he's a friend and colleague.
By the fourth or fifth week he wasn't a supervisor. He let
me do what I wanted. He was good at seeing I could initiate.
I learned from him, what it's like to work hard and be stable,
seeing the bigger perspective, and considering wide possi-
bilities before a decision.
The students did not claim that their supervisors were mentors or commanding role models. Still, they did observe how these supervisors handled difficult situations. They would then reflect on how they could improve their own methods. In some cases they would try to incorporate in their own work a methodology employed by a supervisor. However, since much of what they wanted to improve was responsiveness to situational problems, what they appeared to be seeking was the underlying principle which guided the supervisor's behavior.

Skills, personality, and leadership style were three key variables with residence life staff. Students admired hall directors for their organization, availability, and concern for them as employees. Higher level administrators within the areas were appreciated primarily for their broad knowledge and perspectives about the university, as well as their ability to teach and help one learn and grow as a new staff member. One SPA noted how an area coordinator forced her to be prepared to support her arguments.

It was interesting, if not significant, that very few negative examples were given. Students were citing what they liked, not what they did not like. In only a couple of instances was it mentioned that one person was "spread out too thin." Two supervisors were portrayed as ineffective and weak.

It appears that students admired different facets of individuals, rather than establishing one person as preeminent. Most were able to cite more than one person, and their positive qualities were often different. A few actually said they tried to incorporate certain aspects of a person, or that they would like to be more like a certain
individual. This particularly referred to behavioral style within a professional role. Some noted that they actually watched others to see how they did things, and then they tried to improve their own skills. While the author could not observe them to verify, they did not appear to want to mimic an admired person.

Second-Year Students. Second-year students found themselves working for people in higher positions than hall directors. For the most part they had positive attitudes about these relationships. Often supervisors were seen as giving ample autonomy, responsibility, and opportunity to learn. It was also noted by some that supervisors were supportive and gave helpful feedback. In addition, the students felt they had learned from their styles, perspective, and knowledge. The following comments illustrate these sentiments.

I learn from her, not to be afraid of new things. She gave me responsibility. She's available for help. We're close age-wise, and so it's easy to talk about other things. She's a pleasure to work with. I learned how she works with student groups. She knows how things work in programming, ways of cutting corners, with regards to time management and efficiency. We also talk about and evaluate programs afterward, how we dealt with people, and so on. She asks for my feedback, too. She gives me feedback. I respect her opinion.

I've learned a lot from her. I'm impressed with her ability to work with such a diverse group. She can change gears and shift. She manages her time well. I have learned it's okay to get away from stuff, take some time off.

A third student added these remarks. "She leaves me to do my job," she said. "I keep her abreast. She has a broader perspective than just student personnel work. I learn from her style . . . keeping calm. She's a sounding board . . . understanding."
Dissatisfaction was also expressed. The students were capable of recognizing both positive and negative qualities in their supervisors' work, and not make purely absolute, single-faceted evaluations. The following are a sample of their comments.

I learned the need to flow with the organization, to ride things out. That's been real valuable. I don't see him get too upset. I've learned that everything's a learning experience. If you fall down, you get up. Negatively, I've learned he doesn't always put all cards on the table. He tells us only what he thinks he wants us to know.

He's a professional person. He has more clout. We don't have a social relationship. He leaves me alone in the hall. I haven't learned much from him, and he hasn't pushed that at all. I watch his style. He gets bent out of shape too easily.

I'm dissatisfied with him. He gives no supervision, which led me to flounder. I have no idea of even his broadest expectations. No feedback is given, and that resulted in me having less commitment. I did see his commitment to OSU. That's instructive, as others are low in that regard. He's creative and that's involved me. But he hasn't necessarily changed my behavior.

In the last quarter's interviews, the author inquired about who were the people these students admired/respected, and for what reasons. Supervisors were cited most often. Faculty received favorable comments, but less frequently. Finally, other Ohio State University administrators were mentioned. In all, it appeared that people were admired because of their positive attitudes, their personal and professional attributes, skills, supportiveness, and knowledge. There seemed to be little or no single-person "hero worship." Several admired different people for different things. One student expressed it in the following fashion.
I admire different things about different people. ___ (assistantship program director) is open to all people in the program. He doesn't play favorites. ___ (administration sequence instructor)--his critical thinking, what he reads and gets out of it. He knows what he believes. ___ (counseling sequence instructor)--does interesting research. ___(supervisor)--her ability to play the system and supervise.

Another student echoed this disposition.

There's no one with real influence. I've imagined myself as ___ (administrator in the College of Education), that is, seeing myself in administration, in an academically-oriented position. She's very professional, business-like, on the faculty. My interests are similar to ___ (counselor in the counseling center)--career counseling, counseling women. I admire ___ (administration sequence instructor)--his intellectual side. ___ (supervisor)--organized, professional.

The comments of yet a third student are also illustrative.

I wouldn't want to be "just like" anybody here. If I could put together a composite, it would be ___ (theory sequence instructor)--best teacher, good presentations, good readings, take home extra you could learn from. ___ (supervisor)--administrative style, very well organized. ___ (counselor at a mental health center).

It appears that the students all admired skills and qualities of which they wished to have greater command. In some cases they admired people who shared their own interests. Style, polish, and political savvy were admired and seen as worth acquiring. In some instances, people were admired for what they represented to these students--the young professional, the professional woman, a person in a position which seemed desirable for the students' own careers. Finally, as before, attitude--commitment, openness to others' and their ideas--were well received. In short, the students' own individual needs and priorities may have determined what they most highly valued when admiring others.
From these results the author can offer some comments. First, very few, if any, saw before them a single person who embodied all of the characteristics of the "ideal" professional, the person after whom they would model their careers. In fact, some were seen who were evaluated so negatively that they could have served as negative role models. Mentors did not exist. Furthermore, while selecting certain admirable qualities of different individuals, they did not appear to construct the ideal person.

While faculty were admired for their academic knowledge, administrators, particularly those higher than hall directors, were seen as having practical knowledge and organizational sagacity. By witnessing their behaviors, the students were very likely arriving at some notion of how they would behave as professionals, without any clear sense of how that related to specific offices or positions.

It should be noted that there originally appeared to be a potentially significant element of the program. As outlined by the assistantship program director, periodic consultation and direction from advisers was a planned component of the program. As explained in a pre-fall quarter meeting, students' advisers were to meet once per quarter with each advisee and his/her assistantship supervisor. At those times the three would discuss the student's overall progress. This was not intended as evaluation, rather an opportunity to help the student make sense of his/her experience to-date. It would also keep the adviser informed of the other half of the student's program-related activity.
However, this system did not emerge as outlined. First-year SPAs reported not having had more than one such session, and that those that were held did not promote deeper reflection or understanding. Second-year SPAs said they were not having these appointments, and they seemed very unconcerned about that fact.

**Professional Self-Concept**

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a description and analysis of how the students' sense of self as emerging student personnel workers developed. There were three major elements to this growth--career awareness, status, and identification with the field. Career awareness meant what they understood student personnel work to be, and what career goals they developed. Status included how they defined professionalism, how they assumed professional-type roles, their developing competence in those roles, and how they defined themselves. Finally, identification with the field was seen as their sense of belonging to the field, as evidenced by their expression of an underlying mission and commitment to student personnel work.

**Definition of the Field**

For many participants, a definition of student personnel work began to emerge before they had even applied to the Ohio State University program. However, as they admitted in their first interviews, they had very little idea of what the field was at that time. Their views were limited to what they had seen on their respective campuses--housing and student activities, for the most part--and discussions with student personnel work practitioners when considering their future
plans. A large number reported a pre-Ohio State University definition of student personnel work that centered on functional responsibilities, that is, working in housing, student activities, academic advising, career counseling, or general dean's work. A second large group was less precise. They defined student personnel work by the intended outcome of the work or the way in which it was to be accomplished. "Helping people grow" and "administrative work" were the chiefly used phrases. A few individuals defined student personnel work-related goals more specifically, or with a long-term path in mind. One cited the desire to work with cooperative education, followed by becoming a dean of students and then the head of a career planning and placement office. Thereafter she would earn a Ph.D. and do teaching and advising. Another cited the desire to return to his former institution to become housing director. A third claimed he would become a housing director, then take an administrative job, pursue a Ph.D., and then move on to the business world.

For the time they entered the program through their last quarter, these early concepts would be challenged and broadened in scope. They would learn not only what different functions and offices belonged under the student personnel work umbrella, but the issues, controversies, and difficulties facing the field and its members.

The information they gathered and assimilated came from a variety of sources. In required courses they heard definitions, discussed issues, and learned and practiced skills. In their assistantships and practica they came in contact with current members, and they saw how and why their offices and staffs behaved as they did. These
inputs assigned definitions to the field, both directly and through implication. However, they also interpreted that which they encountered. The outcome was a different view, one with certain feelings and commitments.

First Year. The leadership lab introduced the participants to the world of student personnel work as they would be experiencing it in the Ohio State University program. The definition of the field was not verbalized directly at that time. Instead, students learned that people in student personnel work had a set of values and a repertoire of related behaviors. They were exposed to a field-related language (jargon) and related processes which were distinctive. Very quickly they were given a taste of acting in the manner of a student personnel work practitioner. In their experiences they were introduced to and made to deal with field-specific issues. Finally, they were told, in effect, that shortly they would be responsible for leading undergraduate paraprofessionals through similar experiences.

More than anything, the first few days of orientation abruptly initiated students from a variety of backgrounds to a new field and its philosophy. They were told, in a manner of speaking, that the way to behave and be successful in student personnel work was to embrace certain principles of human interaction—openness, trust, directness, and intimacy. This was achieved through cooperation, open and clear communication, active listening, and consensus, as taught through the leadership lab. Almost instantly they were free to shed the rules of social interaction that had governed their previous lives, and to be intimate with others. Leaders immediately were called by first names.
From the first day, participants were encouraged to join the leaders in periodic "staff meetings" to discuss the just completed activities of the half-day and to give feedback. By the second day of the lab the students were teachers, leading "miniversity sections. There was a democratic sense that everyone could join in, and that the field could be partially defined in that fashion.

Soon after the leadership lab, the students began to hear about the content, goals, present, and future of the field. This commenced with an explanation of the Division of Student Services at Ohio State University. Included was the mission statement of the housing system. The Director of Housing said that the vice president of that division was "really into student development." Discussing the role of residence halls, the director said that a high priority was making residence halls the best possible "living-learning environments." He pointed out that this was important because of impending declining enrollment, scarce resources, and students' unwillingness to pay high fees. Reinforcing a comment by a first-year SPA that "we are the front line," he urged that the students "monitor the pulse of the halls." He then placed a challenge before them.

Are you providing the leadership so that students have a positive educational environment? You must instill that sense of responsibility in your RAs. You can impact students' development outside the classroom. Using compassion, understanding, and being a role model, you can assist the personal development of students who live there.

A presentation by the Director of Student Development reinforced these comments. She also noted that "problem-solving is what we are all about," and that problems "will be exciting and call for creative thinking." Dealing with these problems and issues, she maintained,
these students would work late hours and do some mundane work at times.

While hearing about some of the issues pertaining to student personnel work, admittedly within the housing framework, the students were actually learning that their focus was on processes, such as group leadership, problem-solving, advising, conflict resolution and consensus, and staff evaluation. The thrust was evidently experiential.

During the official program welcome on August 17, the first integrated view of the field was presented to the SPAs. They heard that educational quality meant applying theory to practice to produce growth, in and out of the classroom. This was related to what the dean specified as directions of the College of Education, as dictated by technological, social, and economic developments in Ohio and the United States. The sense of a special mission was certainly evident. The dean spoke of global issues--energy, population explosion--producing a complex world for which student personnel workers must prepare college students to live in.

The SPAs were provided some insight into the world of student personnel work through the assistantship program director's explanation of the curriculum. They learned that there were some basic skills and knowledge one should have--counseling, group facilitation, career development, research, student development--that could be applied. The practitioner would be aided by awareness of organizational dynamics. They were also told that a student personnel worker needed only minimal counseling skills, as compared with the professional counselor or counseling psychologist.
The explanation of the assistantship program brought forth an additional focus to the field. According to the program director, the assistantship program was preparation for one's first professional job, either as a generalist in residence halls or as an assistant dean in a small college. He was saying that most entry level jobs involved a variety of responsibilities, including some individual counseling, advising student groups, office administration, educational programming, team development, and handling of emergencies. No great priority would be given to any one role, but all would be played. In a sense, that was the essence of the first-year residence hall assignment, along with some of the second-year positions.

However, he continued, about one-half of the people in student personnel work focused on a specialty area, and he provided many illustrative examples. There were, however, knowledges essential to all practice in the field. These were counseling, human development, programming, organizational behavior, administration of organizations, and paraprofessional training.

When classes began the process of defining student personnel work continued. In the introductory class, the students were exposed to a broad range of questions and issues from which a definition of the field might be constructed. At the same time, through a combination of group discussion and encouragement by the instructor, the class was told, in effect, that a definition of student personnel work could be a personal one. He said, in the first class meeting, "Student personnel work is a uniquely professional experience. People see it and act differently . . . thus you must develop your own framework."
went on to say, "(This course) is geared to you and the meaning you derive from it."

Among the issues discussed in the course were the status of student personnel workers in relationship to the faculty, power and the need for legitimate power, and the necessity of dealing with issues, such as attrition, and using strategies, such as research, in a certain fashion (proactive) to establish legitimacy. In one instance, the instructor said that student personnel work was what no one else wanted to do.

Certainly the author's observations allowed him to record evidence of the strength of this message. Discussions about the status and legitimacy of student personnel work were noted. Often the instructor would challenge the remarks of the students who voiced optimistic opinions. He would appear to find negative sides to assertions about positive outlooks for student personnel work. This would promote further disagreement among the class members. In the end, he would tend to summarize by noting that the field was at a less than desirable point and needed to move in directions suggested by the students.

The instructor's published intention was to get students to derive their own personal meanings about student personnel work and their own frameworks for the field, seeing that the work of the field evoked consideration of personal values, and that it had very loosely defined content or parameters. As noted, many students had little idea of what student personnel work was when they first came to campus, and many still wanted to be told what it was. Among the issues and comments they heard during the first few classes were the following:
(a) student personnel work is hard to define, as it draws on many areas; (b) there is no definable area of knowledge that is student personnel work: it is general as an area; (c) it deals with the total student; (d) student development is an important part of the field; (e) we must make value judgements; (f) student personnel work is a helping profession, with applicability out of higher education; (g) the field has low status in our organization; (h) we are practitioners who are reactive, doing no research, teaching, or evaluation; (i) we are seen as support service by faculty, not central in function; (j) student personnel work deals with non-traditional areas; (k) it is a field where our titles—second-class—have changed over time; (l) we debate about what to call ourselves; (m) we are vital but seen by the core technology (teaching) as peripheral; (n) the field deals with things in an action-and feeling-oriented mode, rather than with hard research; (o) student personnel work is an applied discipline: we have referent power with students, along with reward and coercive power, but the major issue is getting legitimate power; and (p) student personnel work was formed due to faculty not wanting to deal with students.

As the course progressed, they were asked and told about possible ways in which student personnel practitioners could achieve a positive effect. The instructor indicated that total student development was an objective of the field, and that "we can deal with intellectual development of students." Later, the utilization of residence hall staff in teaching classes was suggested. In addition, helping teachers with their interpersonal skills, and dealing with remedial instruction, were said to be important. The stress was still made for faculty acceptance.
As noted often by the author, this was a study of how students became members of the profession they had chosen to enter. As he tracked their progress, he noted how they defined the field and their fit within. In his first interviews, he asked all students why they had chosen student personnel work, and what were their earliest notions of a definition of the field. However, even prior to those interviews, in the first session of the introductory student personnel work course, he was given a glimpse of both their definitions of the field and their motivation for pursuing a career therein. Small-group discussions provided the following: (a) "all aspects of student life, working towards development of a total experience producing an environment that assists the academic environment in working smoothly; development of the total student, in and out of the classroom; also, administrative support;" (b) "assisting and advising, individually and groups; non-academic for personal, social, career development; design systems for administrative programs;" (c) "helping profession, growth and development, educational institutions, social, academic research; research so we can do well at our jobs;" (d) "administration, developmental tasks, self-actualization; professional, helping students, facilitators;" and (e) "educational, cultural, experiential; students' growth, responsibility for own actions."

Additional class discussion evoked the following statement. "You don't direct their thoughts and actions," said one student. "They must accept the consequences for their own decision. We don't say what is wrong and right."
In retrospect, it appears that the introductory student personnel work class provided the students with an entree to the field from several perspectives. They did have the opportunity to learn about the types of offices that existed and types of issues that were covered. At a broader level, they were exposed to the organizational settings in which student personnel workers' offices existed. However, as noted, they were abruptly forced to deal with some harsh realities pertaining to the status of the field which they had chosen to enter. Also, the entire underpinning to their field was questioned by the instructor himself.

By the time their interviews began a month later, most reported feeling they had a better understanding of the field. One student commented, "I figured before you took a couple of classes and became a dean!" For some the view was broader. They could see the importance of relationships with faculty and the place and legitimacy of student personnel work within the world of higher education. Along with this, several acknowledged that they now saw the student personnel work was "not all roses," that the field was not "pure and selfless." Others mentioned a heightened awareness of the importance of special issues and skills in student personnel work, such as moral development, student development theory, counseling, and administration.

During the second quarter the students' definitions of the field continued to receive attention. In the student development theory class the instructor said, with great fervor, that student development theory was fundamental to student personnel work. He was concerned about amateurs in the field, those who did not use theory. The
materials being used in this course, he claimed, would be used throughout the students' professional lives. The students were also being given some historical data behind the theories. The instructor recalled how theory had been developed, and he spoke with respect about the significant people in the field who were involved in those efforts.

As for student development theory, the students responded in a very positive manner. It was seen as interesting, important to the field, and practical. Some seemed wholeheartedly sold on the value of theory, claiming they had used it with some of their residence hall work, such as judicial affairs, or could see how it could apply to the other realms of student personnel work practice. One said, "I love theories. I could study them all the time. I will use them in my future, especially teaching." Yet another added, "It's important from a research and classification standpoint, not just in and of itself. It allows you to know where someone is and deal with them."

Not everyone was totally sold on theory, however. The theme most often behind this caution was that student development theory was useful in understanding and categorizing behavior, but it was not "the" answer to everything. Said one student, "I don't put great stock in theory. I always question stuff. Student development theory is interesting, but I don't see a connection to practice yet." His wait-and-see attitude was echoed by a few others, who still could not picture exactly how it would be used.

When asked their impressions of the field in interviews, these students noted some changes from their earlier perceptions. Many now saw the field in a broader or different way. The emphasis on proactive
educational development was new and unexpected to many. As one stated, "I wouldn't have understood the notion of educational development of students then. Also, the notion of being passive." Another noted how she once had seen it "just as services." Now she was aware of the research and theory. One student remarked, "I used to see it as a 'fun' thing." Finally, another added, "I see it's a profession, not a job." They also felt they had a better grasp of the "reality" of student personnel work. They were more familiar with the diversity of functions, especially within a residence hall operation.

Along with these positive sentiments were some sobering awarenesses. Several commented on how they now saw incompetence and people with low commitment. Noted one, "There are many incompetent people at the OSU program. My eyes have been opened. Just because they have a master's doesn't mean anything." A few noted concern over the low money and a lack of student appreciation for their efforts. Nevertheless, this was not causing them to seriously doubt their commitment to the field.

Finally, some commented on how they did not see the field much differently than before. In fact, of those who remarked that they now had new perspectives, only a few said these represented drastic changes in perception. Rather, most seemed to feel they had a basic understanding of what the field was, but that now the breadth of the field and its developmental emphasis were clearer. The author can speculate with some confidence that at this point their reasons for coming to the program had been confirmed, and for only the three who
withdrew was the difference significantly disturbing. In fact, those who raised negative comments attributed the problems to the setting, either Ohio State University or the housing system, rather than to the field itself. Their new awareneses appeared to be received in a positive fashion, rather than as a major disappointment.

Spring-quarter courses, particularly the second half of the student development class, contributed to the students' definitions and perceptions of the field. In a sense, the instructor was telling the students that these were the theories and application processes that they needed to know to be professionals in the field. Fairly elaborate application models were presented for this purpose. Related to this, the instructor shared a concern about the field, that there were many people looking for "easy solutions." Instead, one needed to choose intelligently from systematic models. He provided examples of how such work had been done in the past at Ohio State University, and, for illustration purposes, began the first class of the quarter by bringing the students across campus to a residence hall where just such a current effort was in operation. Finally, during a class meeting later in the quarter, he discussed some ethical issues underlying the use of theory for planned interventions of this nature. In summary, the class was being told, scientific application of theory was the professional way of practicing in the field of student personnel work. This was how it could be done, and here were some ethical issues one had to confront in order to act responsibly.
For the most part, the students felt that the formal application model was interesting. One commented that it was "common sense." However, it was clear that they were not at a point where they could do much with it. They wanted more structure from the professor, along with practical examples. Reactions might have been different and more conclusive three or four weeks later. But as the interviews with second-year students showed, few from that group came away with a strong feeling that the formal application of theory was the way. Accurately predictive of their comments were the remarks of one student, who raised the question if there was enough time and money to do it. While they were ready to learn about how it was accomplished, they were not going to become absolutists.

Not all awareness of the field rose from classroom work. From their assistantships, the student became more familiar with how one segment—housing—operated. From these experiences, it seems they learned more about how one operated than where. They developed an awareness of how one occupied the role of a student personnel worker in that particular setting, as well as what development was still necessary before they could take their places with other professionals. The student personnel work courses presented them with information and knowledge, and counseling classes and the group procedure courses provided skills, but they wanted to explore other settings to know more about how those acquisitions were used. For them, knowing what student personnel work was also meant knowing where one belonged. It was to become a fairly personalized definition.
Second Year. The second year, in particular the two administration courses, gave the students a new perspective on the field. It removed student personnel work from the office of the hall director, student affairs dean, and financial aid counselor, and transferred it to the vice president for student affairs, the alumni director, and even the president of the college. The instructor showed the students how to understand why others in their college environment behaved as they did, and how that determined what student personnel workers did. Furthermore, he raised questions about student personnel workers' supposedly altruistic motives, especially those which the students claimed had been underlying their original application to the program. That is, the instructor suggested that student personnel workers might really be practicing their craft not for students' benefit but for their own. Indeed, the basic premise of the field was being questioned.

Rather than rebel, as some first-year students had privately done in the introductory student personnel work course, many welcomed the notions being set out for their consideration. They were ready and eager to see their world differently. Feeling somewhat limited by the focus of the first year and somewhat disillusioned by both the second-year selection process and some disappointing assistantship experiences, they listened.

This continued into the second administration course in this sequence. It was arranged, according to the syllabus, to "prepare student personnel workers to develop a learning environment and culture in higher education organizations and their subsystems." The students learned about different approaches to organizational development and
how these related to student personnel work practice. In the major project, they intervened in a chosen organizational setting and actually attempted to provide useful feedback to the client. They were expected to behave as problem-solving interventionists, which the professor said was a significant role that student personnel workers could play to "improve the quality of life in our institutions." The students were forming a much broader view of student personnel work than they had brought with them to the university. They were encouraged to see themselves as change agents for an entire system, not merely as counselors, hall directors, developmental specialists, or student advocates. Their new roles included consultant, organizational problem-solver, and interventionist.

When asked to comment on the second administration course, the most popular reaction was that it helped provide perspective about student personnel work. It was apparent throughout the quarter that the students were being asked to critique their own field, to think about and evaluate what they had learned, and to relate student personnel to society-at-large. They were also asked to comment on what it meant to be a professional and how they would handle ethical issues. Certainly their horizons were stretched.

Awareness of the field was also developed in several unconnected ways. The instructor would refer to literature in this field and its status, critiquing its content and worth. He also noted important names in the field, and he discussed directions the field might take in the future. In summary, this second part of the two-course sequence continued the students on the road to discovering their relationship to
the field of student personnel work, taking a more distanced, critical view, and encouraging them to develop a perspective-influenced sense of purpose and commitment.

Practica afforded the students views of specific offices in which they had some interest. The discussions during their second-quarter seminar contributed to their view of the field as well. They raised questions and discussed how different offices within the field dealt with specific issues, as well as comparing how one type of office might differ from school to school. They tried defining the field and considering its validity, noting how non-student personnel workers regarded their domain. They also had the opportunity to listen to the presentations by current practitioners, including two new members of the field. The latter, recent graduates of this program, commented on such things as working in a small college, the availability of professional development, how others viewed their work, adjusting to the full-time role, their new view of student personnel work and how it compared to their former perceptions, their goals for their second year on the job, and how what they learned at Ohio State University became helpful once they started in a full-time position.

One particular question, covered both in interviews and this seminar, dealt with the role and utility of student development theory. First-year students, during the second quarter, had felt that theory was important to the field, a foundation for practice. They also saw its value lying in providing a framework for understanding students' behavior. They had some reservations, mostly because they had not seen it put to practice, and wondered if it were practical to do so.
The comments of second-year students revealed a continuing commitment to the value of student development theory. They, too, saw it as a practical tool, one that provided perspective and understanding. At the same time, there was a change. The questions were not only about how well it worked, or if it was the answer, but also how well their approach would be received by future colleagues at other institutions. Also, how did one balance one's professional standpoint on proactive use of student development theory with students not wanting to be "helped?" They also grappled from time to time with the conflict they felt when they wanted to nurture/comfort students but knew from the theory that they should do otherwise. They were, in short, now considering the use of student development theory in a more complex manner. It was no longer simply an issue of technique or practicality.

The second-year assistantship contributed to the students' definition of the field. More precisely, they now worked directly with people whose viewpoints about the field were broader than those of the hall directors from the previous year. Several were in academic settings, and they saw how student personnel work was seen by non-members. Having an office, a nine-to-five job, and wearing more formal attire gave new meaning to the student personnel work role, too. In a few instances the students worked for people who were not student personnel workers. They began to learn how and why decisions were made in those settings, and for some students those were explained by the concepts being presented in the administration courses.
The students were asked to describe their supervisors as student personnel workers. Their comments shed some light on how they defined the field and its members.

She sees herself as one, but she's been out of school a long time and has not kept up. That's an important question, because (name of supervisor) is not developmental. If she were a student personnel worker, it would bother her. At the bottom line, she's a human advocate.

She's bright and has published a lot. I'm impressed with her. Her interpersonal skills are not that great. She's in a theoretical rut. She espouses other theories but is not open to their use in redesigning a course based on them.

He's very business-oriented, but his awareness is heightened about student development. I view a student personnel worker as available to students, but he's not. He's very professional...suit and tie. He's called 'Mr. (name of supervisor).

Not a traditional one, with regards to his degree. He doesn't see himself as one. But he's very current with the state of the art. I admire and would like to resemble him. He's philosophically committed to the use of classroom stuff...a teacher. I can learn from him.

Other remarks were presented as well. One student commented, "He's an ideal student personnel worker, but perhaps it's not real to be that way. He's such a dreamer and believer in people." A second remarked, "I have high respect for his philosophy of student development. Only, not my typical image of a caring person. Not really outward, approachable appearance." A third said, "She's an administrator. Highly competent...into the management side. I'm not sure of her developmental perspective...probably not student development. But she's eager to relate to people. A fourth said, "He does a lot he doesn't have to. He doesn't give feedback. He should have commitment to the people he supervises." Finally, the fifth commented, "He has
no student personnel work degree, but calls himself one. That angers me. But he does have experience, which is something better than classwork."

Apparently the students accepted that student personnel workers could come from non-student personnel work backgrounds if they espoused and acted according to certain principles and concepts. In particular, it was necessary that they care about others, be approachable, use student development theory as a base, and be current in the field.

There was some evidence that while the students recognized the acceptability of diverse backgrounds, they were less accepting of people who did not keep up with and/or strive for implementation of a student development perspective. It is also interesting that several saw being a student personnel worker to mean caring about students, being more a friend than an administrator, and being available to students. It was a kind of mind set. One could be professional (dress, appearance) and, separately perhaps, be a student personnel worker (have a certain attitude towards students and the field). This suggests that being professional was more a state of appearance and style, while being a student personnel worker meant having an attitude and sense of priority to student needs and development. Being a professional student personnel worker came from a combination of the two.

Actually, it was difficult to come to a clear conclusion about the meaning of their comments. The criteria by which they evaluated their supervisors were several, and they ranged in sophistication. From listening to and watching students over a full year, the author sensed that these criteria were a combination of what they had learned
and how they personally felt. How they saw the profession and, for that matter, the path they would attempt to carve for themselves, were most likely determined by those two factors. This issue will be examined at greater length later in the study, for it hints at a major notion regarding the professional socialization of these students. At this point, at least, it appears that the students have formed opinions which were affected by both factors, but that they had not yet tested and reassessed them. Perhaps that could only happen in a regular full-time job, and after a period of time in the field.

**Final Viewpoints.** In the last set of interviews the author asked the participants to reflect on how their view of student personnel work had evolved over two years. The students felt they were now more knowledgeable and realistic about the field. They recalled that their original reasons for wanting to be in student personnel work were centered around helping/counseling college students, and being in the university atmosphere. Several noted that they had little idea of what student personnel work actually entailed at that earlier time. While still enjoying the setting, they now better understood what the work and organization included. One student remarked, "I had rose-colored glasses, great expectations. I see reality now... less fun and games." Other comments included the following.

At first I was attracted to the college atmosphere, continual change, college age students. I was more idealistic then. Now I'm not sure I want to live and work there. I'm now tired of college students. I get angry with their childishness. I've narrowed my focus to working with returning students, those more serious about school. I'm more realistic now.
I thought you came out with a degree and that's what you were the rest of your life, that is, a student personnel worker. Most changes in my feelings are due to this year. I still want to do the same things, but the reasons are different. Now I'm aware of college student development, things that are valid, and I have a commitment to that.

It was all hearsay . . . vague . . . "counseling-related, helping profession, help people." Now I enjoy it and feel qualified. I enjoy the university environment, working with students, flexible hours, university calendar, taking classes. Now it means being a professional, not a helper. It's more a career than being helping-oriented.

Counseling, training. It intuitively felt right. I didn't know what student personnel work was. I was committed to my own growth and working with people in an educational setting. I have learned to trust my own intuition. Now I have a greater sense of why it was right for me. I hope students grow. It's education outside the classroom in an ethical manner. I can be creative and growthful in residence halls.

One student added these remarks. "In retrospect," he said, "I didn't know why. I realize now it's okay to look outside residence halls to get into the field. Now I see it's a field with many options, and I can shift."

Goals

First Year. As the students' definitions of student personnel work evolved, to what extent did their career goals change? The author traced this particular aspect of their development, along with the goals they set for their involvement in the program.

In their initial interviews, the first-year students listed the following reasons as contributing to their decision to enter this field. These were (a) working with/helping people/college students, (b) a positive undergraduate paraprofessional experience, (c) positive role models, (d) the college environment, (e) involvement with student activities, (f) coursework, (g) disenchantment with own field, and (h)
because of their own personal development. It was interesting that the
second and third reasons were cited quite frequently by SPAs but not by
non-SPAs. It appears that earlier involvement with the student per­
sonnel work establishment contributed to their movement towards the
field and the securing of assistantship positions.

The students' goals at that time were, as noted earlier, fairly
imprecise. They were guessing they would be heading into areas such as
housing, student activities, continuing education, and others, not only
because of a preliminary interest but because that was what student
personnel workers appeared to do. Very few directly related prior
academic or personal interests to their future in the field. One did
see his interest in recreation relating to continuing education or
student activities work. Another had gone through cooperative educa­
tion as an undergraduate and saw a future involving career development
activities, such as career planning and placement. However, most had a
wait-and-see attitude, expecting, it seemed, that they would find out
much more once they enrolled.

In summary, the major motivation for student personnel work seemed
to be a general preference for working with people, combined with the
positive experiences gained as paid employees of a university or in
voluntary student activities positions. Role models not only sug­
gested student personnel work as a profession, but they were inspira­
tions for students to seek undergraduate paraprofessional positions.
Given the students' needs for something beyond academics and their
penchant for involvement with others, it is not surprising that they
became active with campus activities and residence hall life. That,
in turn, led many to significant relationships with professional student personnel workers, who in turn suggested and encouraged consideration of student personnel work for graduate study.

During this same set of interviews the students talked about their current interests, whose clarification was being assisted somewhat by what they were learning. (They were also indicating what they preferred not to do.) There was for many a clearer view of the role of counseling. Some said they would prefer not to be a counselor, but could now see the importance of counseling skills in their work and the limitations therein. One student said, "I'd like to do academic/career counseling, but not mental health counseling." Others noted an increased orientation towards counseling, though not knowing just how they would use these skills.

Some noted specific likes and dislikes. Included were preferences or aversions to research, administration, and organization.

As regards to their futures, there were a variety of responses. A certain number felt a continuing interest/commitment to their initial career interest, but now with better understanding of what that entailed. Some were able to offer greater clarity and definition to what they would do as, for example, a director housing, or where they would do it, that is, type of school. While not having precise definitions of what they would do, several mentioned seeing the need now for additional, post-master's degree education. There seemed to be, as a whole, a willingness to explore broader or new areas in the field, as well as new functions, such as counseling, teaching, and research. They were not acting as if they were compelled to create narrowly defined futures.
Despite their growing awareness of the field, the students in second-quarter interviews were still uncertain and open about their short-term goals. Several indicated that residence hall work would be their first professional jobs, but only three claimed that as a clear preference. The others said they most likely would be in a residential setting after graduation, as this was where most entry level positions were. When residence hall positions were not cited, generalist/associate dean jobs were. A few did not indicate what they wanted, but they were certain that they preferred not to be hall directors. Two indicated that business was an option they could pursue.

Reactions to the question about long-term goals were mixed. As might be expected, students were unable to be precise. The author sensed that they were not ready to make clear prognostications, given their openness about short-term goals and their commitment to exploration and skill development in the second year. Several indicated that they had not considered this question, did not know, and were not ready to narrow down. Others did have a notion about the level of responsibility to which they might aspire—dean, director of a division, vice president, academic dean, even president. Attempting to earn a Ph.D. was mentioned as well, either as a prerequisite for advancement or due to interest in continuing their education.

The students did show some awareness of conditions they sought and specific functions they would like to see as part of their work. The size and type of institution was often cited. Others talked about teaching, publishing, and consulting, in addition to or as part of their work. Again, working outside of higher education, in business, was raised as a possibility.
Overall, then, it appeared to the author that the students, despite their awareness of non-student personnel work options, were fairly well committed to their program and to the immediate future. Their comments indicated a belief in the mission of student development in student personnel work, and their present goals demonstrated a commitment to developing within the field. Given their concern about skill development and awareness of the field, it is understandable that their long-term and short-term goals were open and imprecise. They were aware that certain hierarchies existed and that one must take certain basic steps to achieve higher status. Without the seasoning and exploration they expected in the second year, they were not prepared to project beyond these generalities. They seemed to accept this status and were not apparently anxious about the unknowns ahead of them.

In both second- and third-quarter interviews, the SPAs were asked what they hoped to get from the second-year assignment. Their responses were consistent, falling into several categories. Some wanted to deal with students directly, as opposed to being isolated in an administrative position where only special groups were handled. A second area of concern was the use/testing out of skills. Responsibility was an important factor, especially supervisory, as was the opportunity to work in a new and different setting and thus learn new things as a result. Finally, there was a need to grow in general and professionally.

The author also reviewed the students' reactions to their current assistantships when recording these data. He had wondered if they were prioritizing according to what they felt was missing from the first year;
or was the second year seen as merely a continuation of the growth experienced in the first? Actually, he found both to be true. Several wanted responsibilities or experiences that the first year had not provided. This was evident in students who were not in traditional residence halls, or those who had what they felt was poor supervision. They tended to want to further develop skills they had used or learned in the first year, or to use these skills in content areas which had been of interest to them either during or even before the first year of the program.

In the third-quarter interviews, the author once again asked the participants about their short and long-term goals. For the former they tended to indicate that residence hall work would be their starting point in the field. In some cases, again, that was out of preference, while in others it was what they expected to happen to them. They had learned that residence hall directorships were the starting point for a career in student personnel work. Plus, many of their hall directors (supervisors) had begun there. Some students said that they wished not to work in a residence hall. They, as well as others, talked about the generalist experience, becoming assistant deans. They wanted to keep their options open. Some said they simply did not know at this point. Finally, it was also interesting that several students mentioned settings and jobs which reflected earlier undergraduate interests. Overall, then, it was evident that while most students had some idea of what they could do, few were ready to make a binding commitment.
Long range projections were even more tentative. Most could not say what they could see themselves doing. As the question on commitment showed, they were not ready to say if they would be in the field ten to 20 years later. A few did say they aspired to higher level administrative positions, such as vice president or housing director. Mention of a Ph.D. was made on occasion. However, consideration of long-range goals seemed premature at this time.

As during the previous quarter's interviews, specific career-related interests were easier to bring forward. Students presented a variety of intended pursuits, things they enjoyed and hoped to make part of their work. No one or two functions predominated in these discussions, but for major themes were produced. These were (a) developmental work and related programming, (b) teaching, (c) a limited counseling role, and (d) specific functional areas, such as career planning, minority students, and residence halls. Simply "working with students" was not mentioned often, contrary to its prevalence when they entered graduate school. It was replaced by how one worked with students--administration, groups, teaching, research, counseling, programming, training, application of theory--and where one worked with students.

Second Year. The author found it interesting that in fall quarter interviews, the second-year students were still quite vague about their future interests and plans. They apparently had not given much thought to this question. They were able to list some interest areas as possibilities, including residence halls, student unions, orientation, continuing education, academic advising, women's centers, commuting students, associate deans, and "generalists." Several said they would
absolutely not work in a residence hall position. A few were considering Ph.D. programs. Also, personnel/business was noted in a few instances. As a group they were obviously diverse, and their responses were characterized by a tentativeness. It appears that returning after a summer's break, whether or not they had remained at the university during that time, did not bring with it a much different perspective about career goals than the one held during the previous spring.

The author also inquired about topics or issues that might command their attention in the future. Among the issues raised were "helping people grow," "raising others' awareness of students' special needs," having "impact on people," and "international education." Some students noted a need for personal satisfaction and professional development, along with a concern about a private life. Some primary concerns were about the field as a profession--its mission and credibility. The author sensed from these responses that some of the students were trying to integrate their personal needs with their concerns about the field. The following comments are witness to that notion.

I want personal satisfaction, enjoyment of what I'm doing. I want to have some kind of impact on people, even negative impact. If they can some time look back at something I did or said that will cause them to grow at least partially. That's one of my primary purposes for being in the field. Despite (administration instructor's) questions--"are we just pushing our values or that of the bureaucratic organization?" --I'm still hanging on to the fact that I can have impact on people. I'm still somewhat idealistic and feel I can have impact on the organization. My fear is I might not be able to. I was naive and ignorant about this earlier.

Staff development and commitment to their growth. A vague issue--how to make the field credible to the academic area. Tying it into academics, that is, blending the two spheres.
Education should be excellent, to the person's highest potential, and there's another arena to that excellence (Student personnel work)."

Definitely--liberal education. Also, the idea that student personnel workers are educators as well as faculty. We are in the process of education... International government, continuing intercultural type of education. It can be done in many ways by student personnel work, in a college setting if I can.

I never really thought about it. Help with a general overview of helping people. Grow intellectually, career, self-confidence, working with individuals, thus producing better well-rounded people. Caring about others and community, not the money one makes.

Raising others' awareness, like faculty awareness of chicanos. Sexual harrassment. Returning women. They need to know more to help these people... The higher you get, the greater conflict with my values. My private life is important, too. This concern is clearer now.

What was most revealing about these answers were those given to the same question by first-year students at the same time of the year. In essence, they were unable to respond to the question. In fact, they had a hard time understanding what the author was asking. They had simply not even considered this question, and they had very little or no basis from which to respond. This points to the effect of three quarters' experience on the participants. They had learned about issues and had been able to articulate some personal thoughts within those contexts. While some were still grappling with how to express these thoughts, they were able, without advance preparation, to offer some ideas.

When the second-year students' winter quarter interviews took place, some of the uncertainty about future goals had been eliminated. It was apparent they had started thinking more actively in that vein.
There had already been two meetings to discuss the upcoming job search process. The assistantship program director had explained the dynamics of the job market and the types of positions that might be available. Students had started preparing their resumes and were reviewing trade publications for job openings. With conventions not too far off, the reality of graduation and what came after was confronting them.

While many noted interest in specific areas--residence halls and individual student services offices--most were open to what they could do. Part of that was due to the recognition that jobs were not plentiful. Residence hall work continued to be seen as an "acceptable" first job. For some it was clearly undesirable, due to personal preferences and limitations related to marriage plans or current marriages. In addition, geographical limitations, both separate and in combination with relationships, influenced their expressed short-term goals. While most were optimistic that career goals would not be overwhelmed by marital obligations, they acknowledged the need to be flexible, both then and in the future.

Openness to the first job was not only a matter of practicality and compromise. Many students wanted a first position which did not force them into a speciality area. They seemed to be seeing the first job as one which allowed them to start in and explore the field further. Indeed, most comments about the first job were aimed not at the content area but at the types of duties, opportunities for growth and, especially, the type of work setting/people/organization. Organizing programs, working with competent professionals, designing workshops, advising groups, administrative duties, teaching, counseling, and academic
advising were among the interests cited. Opportunity for creativity, responsibility, challenge, and autonomy were considered to be important. Different sized institutions were also prioritized. Thus, while they did know of job areas that were attractive to them, they were really most interested in the quality of the experience they would get. That perspective resembled quite notably the one which governed their goals for the second year of the program. The second year, thus, allowed them to confirm their skills and increased their confidence about their suitability for the field as a whole. Now they wanted to work in a professional setting which broadened that opportunity to a full-time commitment. This would let them explore the field as real professionals and would assist their planning for the future. They recognized the drawbacks to the field and their own tentativeness, and they wanted to give it the "real test." The following comments illustrate some of their feelings at this time.

Perhaps union work. I want to use the skills from this year. I want challenge at all points. I want to work with a supervisor and group of people I can be loyal to and will work with and teach me. . . . trusts one to make decisions. It's hard to be specific about exact jobs. There's so many I can do--student advising, programming. I'm not very interested in residence halls. I'm not limited to any type of school.

Not a major institution like OSU. I'm more committed to the job duties and conditions than the setting. The first job should combine administration and residence halls to produce a rich situation, provide a variety of responsibilities, counseling, . . . developing professionally. I want ultimate responsibility for something. The first job is not for testing out a specific area. Rather, a starting point, leading to a decision later of where to go next. I want a broad-based experience.
Something that leads to an opportunity to work with greeks, student activities, advising groups. Fifty percent administration. Human relations training and organizational intervention with workshops. Opportunity to teach leadership, human relations training. Opportunity to be creative. I would go into housing. Will take entry level the first two years to allow for my marriage plans/goals. I want challenge.

Residence hall, in a university which offers class. A chance to teach classes. Location is a concern. Diverse responsibilities. Maybe combine greeks with halls. Ability to make changes in the organization. Support from fellow staff. Autonomy. Support for my decisions. Work with other professionals on their programs. People my own age. People like (university administrator), known in the field. A chance to test out student personnel work.

Other brief comments were offered as well. One student remarked, "I want responsibility, diversity. An assistant dean. No residence halls. I want a greater sense of the field, to confirm professionally if student personnel work is what I want. If "yes," I'll seek a Ph.D."

A second student talked about other options. "Positions must meet my criteria," he stated. "That pertains to geographical location, student development orientation. I'm selective. I could go to industry--career changes, unemployment workshops, alcohol counseling, personal counseling area. I have a general interest in helping other people adjust. . . . assistant dean."

A third student had fairly specific interests, but also accepted the possibility of having to stay with residence halls. She said, "I'd like to stay at OSU one or two years. . . . work in placement, if possible, or financial aids, or residence halls. A fourth student, on the other hand, had a very different outlook. "Leave Ohio," he said. "A totally new system. No specific job content-wise. I want responsibility, be it residence halls, counseling center, programming."
While the students recognized problems with the field, they were interested in at least testing out the field and pursuing a career at this time. They were able to articulate their needs and interests quite clearly, and had the awareness that they were only at a beginning point. The ambiguity did not seem to produce any noticeable anxiety, though that could have changed as graduation approached. The focus of the second year on self and professional development had seemingly resulted in an ability to articulate those needs with regards to the job search. The confidence in those skills and needs concurrently resulted, it seemed, in the patience and commitment to be open with regards to first job titles.

When considering long-term goals, they remained uncertain, as if they had not really given much thought to that question. Some said they could see themselves in some upper-level administrative position. Also mentioned were specific functions that advancement would allow them to handle—teaching, consulting, human relations training, and counseling. A few also indicated that a career outside of student personnel work was a possibility, in business or private practice. In other words, their current goals were to grow and test out their interests, but long-range planning was simply a matter of exposing oneself to situations that allowed more distant plans and commitments to emerge. This is not to say that everyone was this vague and uncertain, however. Witness the comments of one student.

Eventually I'd like to package and publish in book form an instructor's manual, a student manual (for human relations training). I'd like an administrative position dealing with things I mentioned about my first job, plus teaching, a diverse population, including business. After two years I
will have (name of organization) training finished and will be ready for associate or assistant director. I could go private. I'll get a Ph.D., especially if I stay in higher education.

Other comments were more typical of this group. "That's a difficult question," said one student. "I haven't looked that far ahead. It's easier to say what I don't want--administrative stuff. At times I think counseling, period . . . not necessarily in higher education, but in a mental health center. I don't know." Said a second student, "If I'm in student personnel work in five years, I'd like a job like my supervisor's (current). I'm not thinking long range." A third individual said, "Deal with women's issues in higher education. Perhaps become a dean with a master's degree." Said a fourth, "A Ph.D. Teaching. I always wanted to. I always wanted a higher degree... director of a program."

Finally, the following student summarized what many were feeling with his final words.

It's hard to think of a title. A title is restrictive. One example--dean of students/residents at my undergraduate college . . . or counseling/learning resources center director, with student and client contact. Or, (student life dean at Ohio State University) at a smaller school. Positions with an overall administrative component. It's as if you're forcing me to answer that question. It's not one I ask of myself. I don't think of a long-term goal right now. It's not natural now. I'm not concerned with that now.

Along with this line of questioning, the author inquired about the role counseling would play in the futures of the counseling psychology minors. The reader will recall that these individuals had felt a fairly strong bond during their first year. Among this group was a tendency to see counseling as an important skill but not a
career goal. Only one saw counseling playing an increased role in his career. The major sentiment was that they could better understand the role counseling played in student personnel work as integrated with other functions. The following comments illustrate this point.

I see counseling as a basic human communication skill. I didn't expect to work in a counseling center. But it's valuable. It helped me understand administrators I work with. Sometimes I stop myself and rephrase things better so I'm better understood. Originally I thought I'd maybe become a counselor. I won't.

It's a big part of my consciousness, as I'm considering my future. Less focus, though, because I have less class time there this year. I have other interests. I'm not sure I see myself in a counseling agency seeing clients. I want the background, but in combination with other things. Counseling fits in now more with student personnel work than I saw before.

In the final interviews the author asked the students once more about their short and long-term career goals. By then several had already been offered and had accepted positions. Others were still looking and experiencing different degrees of success in attracting employer interest. Regardless of their current status, they talked about what they had been seeking.

The largest single group had been looking for what might be termed generalist positions--assistant dean, for example. This would allow them to work with a broad population of students in several roles--adviser, programmer, counselor, group leader, and administrator. Some listed a housing position as their first choice, either because they truly wanted that type of work or because they expected that such positions were the most available. Others sought a more specialized position, such as placement or women's services. It was
interesting that a significant number opted for positions which were similar in nature to their current assistantship assignments; despite the fact they had not preferenced those positions to validate them as possible first job areas.

While most were open to a variety of positions, they were, as during the previous quarter, much more precise about what they wanted within a job. Job quality (variety, autonomy, opportunity for professional development, responsibility, types of duties, degree of student content) and type of setting (size of school, school's academic environment, the stress placed on student development) were seen as very important. They also felt the job was more important from a developmental perspective. A positive experience and opportunity to test themselves in a professional position was of high priority. The first job would allow them, thus, to test and confirm their feelings about student personnel work, the point from which they could make longer-range decisions.

There was no apparent change in their long-term goals as stated during the previous quarter. They were still uncertain, and basically foresaw a path wherein they would work for a few years and make decisions about their futures only after that experience. That might lead to a Ph.D. and then a higher level position. But as before, they were not thinking that far ahead at this time.

Their general goals for being in the field were still quite broad. Having a positive impact on students was the most frequently voiced intention. The importance of education and society's need for fully developed students was noted in a few instances. On a more personal
note, a small number mentioned that they had benefitted as undergraduate students from exposure to the student personnel work enterprise, and now felt that future students would, too. They were still attracted to the college environment, working with students, as well as the use of student development theory in that setting. They had a feel for desirable qualities of an educational setting and work environment, but commitment to specific issues and intellectual needs was still uncertain.

One student described her goals as "serving students, but behind the scenes." A second said, "I see the changes people go through and their unhealthy living patterns. I want to help them develop healthy living patterns."

Finally, a third student added these thoughts.

I'm good with people, how I communicate, listen, and understand. Thus that becomes a motivator for others' formal and informal learning. Higher education needs educators who can be supportive to academic faculty and the classroom. The "student development" idea bothers me--taking an okay person and trying to make them "better." It's hard to be committed to that, because it's saying they're "deficient," that is, not good enough. I'm not sure I agree. I'm still thinking about that. Perhaps I can be an educator to help awareness of differences. Different does not mean better.

Overview. When reviewing the unfolding of their interests and goals over a two-year period, what is most striking is the fact that the students, as a rule, did not become more defined in their short- or long-term job goals. Instead, they became more confident in not making a clear commitment to specific positions. They appeared to have learned that the field was very broad and that precise plans would have been premature. They seemed to have shown greater awareness of
the need for approaching the future with eyes wide open. They had a
good idea of their strengths and fundamental interests and values,
but they wanted to test those interests in a professional capacity.
While they were still motivated to help people grow, they had grown
to understand there was more to student personnel work than being a
good counselor or a good workshop leader, or simply to care about
others. From what they had learned in classes and in their jobs, there
were incompetent and uncommitted people in the field. They understood
how things other than student welfare determined important university
decisions. They also understood that even within the professional
student personnel work community their training might be viewed with
disagreement or suspicion. Because this was a field with questionable
stability, a discouraging job outlook, and low monetary rewards, they
had considered how their skills and values could be transferred to
a non-higher education setting.

The significant measure of their growth was, then, the broader
perspective and more detached view they had been able to take when
viewing their future. They were identifying issues that transcended
any one office or institution. Helping students was desirable, but
one could consider the role of student personnel work as one of pre­
paring "healthy" citizens for society. Interest in certain types of
activities, such as counseling, workshop facilitation, and administra­
tion, was being weighed against the type of institution and division
in which one could work. Jobs were being seen as composites of
different types of responsibilities. These positions, too, were not
just for the students' (college) benefit, but for how they could help
the new professional determine and make progress towards the future. Thus, they could look at student personnel work in a more detached manner, but could personalize their job search to include more personal motives.

Professional Identity

Status

The results reported thus far lead to the major questions around which this study was designed. How did the students view their status in relation to the field of student personnel work? Did they see themselves making progress from student to professional? Or, did some other category exist? The author's preliminary assessment, guided by the literature review, was that many factors could contribute to such development. One most likely had to know what the field was and have interests and goals which bore resemblance to those demanded by the work of the field. One also needed the skills in order to be accepted into the role of the professional.

Competence. Field-related competence was a high priority of the program heads, as evidenced by the deliberate relationship between the academic and assistantship components. Over the two-year period, the students reported improvement in skills such as counseling, workshop design and leadership, and teaching, along with growth in general functional abilities such as administration, leadership, and problem-solving. In addition, they felt increasingly capable of asserting themselves with others and using the information they had acquired through classes and assistantship experiences in a more confident
fashion. In a sense, they had internalized what they had learned and could respond quickly and without hesitation to situations ranging from disorderly students to conflicting staff members. Finally, there was an overall sense of being better in control of one's management of the work situation.

For first-year students, opportunities to learn and use skills were present almost at once. The reader will recall that in the leadership lab some participants presented a miniversity, teaching their peers about a specific subject. They also had opportunities to observe and critique the actions of individuals engaged in group problem-solving. This and the final group exercise were their first experiences in giving feedback, a process requiring direct and clear communication skills. Giving and receiving feedback would be a part of both years of the program.

During the housing retreat they contributed in a minor way to group discussions and the processing of educational exercises. Once RA training began, however, they joined their supervisors in planning and carrying out group training exercises in areas such as communication skills, counseling, conflict resolution, and time management.

First-quarter classes provided ample opportunity for skill development. The group procedures course required workshop design and presentation. The introductory counseling course trained them in basic helping skills. Both sets of skills were used in the classes and their assistantship assignments. During second quarter those in
the career development class became instructors of a career planning class. Finally, students who took counseling practicum spring quarter had the opportunity to serve as counselors to undergraduate students with genuine personal concerns.

In their winter-quarter interviews, most first-year students said they had been able to handle the basic requirements of the assistantship by late fall. They felt their weaknesses were in certain areas, such as confrontation and assertiveness. Only one student felt she still had much to learn. They cited areas of functional competence, and noted often how much they had improved. These areas included advising groups, supervising RAs, programming, supervising employee groups, counseling, and training. In addition, there was a general sense of being stronger, being in better control of one's use of management styles, interpersonal skills, better at information dissemination, and more trusting of one's own judgement. In short, the group sounded fairly comfortable with their current job status, more so than in the fall.

Reactions to the fall counseling course lab were similar and even more enthusiastic. Most were able to see how much progress they had made as counselors. Some noted that their pre-course confidence in counseling abilities were confronted by the reality that they still had much to learn. As one said, I came in thinking I was 'hot stuff.' I realized how bad I was. I asked long, complicated questions. I don't now." She and others voiced newly-found respect for the practice of counseling, seeing it now as something greater.
than simple common sense. Several felt it had had immediate impact in their work with students.

Winter-quarter interviews revealed that overall, the students had a clear sense of growth in work and classroom settings alike. Their increased confidence was reflected in a greater trust in their own judgements and willingness to confront others. One said, "I don't call (her supervisor) to ask all the time." Said another, "I challenge people more. I'm not so supportive." A third said, "I have greater ability to speak up for my idea, not to be controlled by ____ (area coordinator)."

Part of this confidence came from an increased knowledge base. Several noted a greater awareness of the overall university housing system and the residence hall. Said one, "I can better appreciate my supervisor's situation." They also had learned how to design and carry out workshops, and they had been able to put this into action.

A significant number spoke about their improvement in style. They had greater confidence in their ability to deal tactfully with others, to exhibit patience with students, and to be sensitive to "where others are at." Greater flexibility with rules and making decisions was one outcome cited. Increased confidence led to greater willingness to delegate responsibilities to RAs.

When working with groups, a significant aspect of most assistantships, they noticed the ability to lead discussions more smoothly and extemporaneously. It was mentioned that handling challenges, disputes, and group diversity was easier. A few students commented on how they were becoming more confident about altering the career development class format, instead of sticking to every prescribed detail.
The residence hall SPAs added that they felt increasingly competent in advising groups and individuals, such as hall council, judicial board, security, and RAs. They felt better at motivating groups to work effectively, and to more subtly direct group discussions.

Improvement in counseling skills was noted many times. Role-playing in class, and actual problem solving in residence halls, had made them aware of their improvements. One mentioned how she now recognized a counseling situation more readily and could use her skills appropriately. While one student noted her confidence in not letting clients ramble, thus getting to the problem quicker, another now found it easier to be patient in handling such situations. In both instances they had adjusted to initial shortcomings in their styles.

In the third-quarter interviews the author asked what the students saw as the overall value of their assistantships. There was a greater sense of self-confidence regarding decision-making, ability to rely on oneself in an emergency, confronting students, and challenging others. Handling RA staffs, student groups, and individuals was mentioned as well. There was now a sense that they had developed their own methods and styles of doing so. As one said, "I've developed my own style, not just being ____ (supervisor). I've improved as a supervisor, as regards to doing it my own way."

Comfort in the role of assistant director was an important issue. The reader will recall that by supervising RAs, many were overseeing people in a position that they had occupied themselves only one year earlier. One SPA, who had not even been an RA, talked about handling some troublesome staff members.
I've improved in supervising RAs, . . . dealing with the real shitheads. In the past I would have accepted their behavior. Now I look at it more objectively, as a supervisor, and see if it's appropriate or not. I have greater confidence as a result of confronting the staff.

Another comment was equally revealing. "I used to worry about being too much of a 'buddy," said one student. "I would refuse to go out socially. Now I can mix the two."

Field-related competence was of particular concern to the non-SPAs. Aside from teaching the career development class or the freshman pre-teaching seminar, they felt they did not have an opportunity to test out their abilities. Some longed for assistantships, but they felt they had to accept that commitments to their families precluded such opportunities. They hoped that practica would provide some experience "in the field."

One SPA had been a full-time student the previous quarter but without an assistantship. This individual provided a most revealing and fascinating look at the impact of that experience.

I have a different perspective due to the assistantship, plus the large amount of coursework. Things are making sense, falling together now. Due to the assistantship I feel in the center of things. I have more student contact. I see the relationship between students and Kohlberg stages. Things are seen in action. I use last quarter's counseling skills in roommate conflicts. I used to go home after school. Now everything is wound up in job and school. I know people better now. SPAs are not as cliquey as people said. The thinking process is stepped up, hastened, due to being in the program. When I was not in the assistantship program I just went home and did homework. I didn't really think of this as a profession as much. Now the perspective is different. I realize how fast this has gone by and that I'll have to focus on stuff soon; as next year will go fast, too. Now school and the job are melded together.
Finally, the author asked the first-year students how they viewed their overall growth during the first year. In general, the students expressed greater confidence in their overall development. Their comments were directed to specific skills and content areas, especially counseling. They saw themselves as capable of helping students with short-term, situational problems, rather than chronic, long-term issues. Several were able to compare their styles to those advocated by identified theorists.

There was a definite feeling that group skills had improved. A few also felt they had improved as instructors. They were more willing to think on their own, and thus they were more flexible as instructors.

Despite these improvements, there was a very clear acknowledgement of limitations and needs for improvements. Several commented on how they were not professional as counselors: They were just trainees. The need for refinements in counseling skills was significant. Some felt the need to improve in other areas, such as advising, mediating, and presenting information to groups.

What may have been most important was their clear acceptance of what growth they needed. While some may have been anxious to get the first and even second year over with, and while they felt they had handled the challenge of the first year capably, there seemed to be common agreement that a second year was very necessary. One student commented, "I've grown a great deal. I'm pleased with my grasp of student development theory. I've completed a lot. I'm glad it's a two-year program. I want a second year. I want practical experience
next year--workshops."

A second student added related thoughts. "It's hard to believe I'm half done," she said. "I will feel progress since my thesis is really along. The assistantship was not progress. I've improved in teaching. Learning coursework was progress. Next year I want feedback on my performance."

A third student commented about her confidence. "I have greater confidence in my academic skills, ability to do a thesis," she said. "I have come far, but I want more, especially theory. I have higher ambitions. Now I know I want to write and contribute. I've grown more. I have new perspectives."

Finally, a fourth student made these remarks.

A downhill stretch. The amount of learning was amazing this year. I can handle a lot. Perhaps I could before, but now I know it. I'm familiar now with the class part. I had no background--counseling skills, teaching. I understand a system this large, its positive and negative points. At first I wasn't sure what student personnel work was. I learned theory, how to intervene in growthful ways.

As both groups of students had hoped, the second year was an opportunity to test out and polish their skills in new settings. Practica, except for counseling practicum, did contribute somewhat to this growth, but much depended on the particular office situation. Students taught career classes, did alcohol counseling with drunk drivers, and assisted the instructor of the introductory counseling class in the lab sessions by training the students in basic counseling skills.
In the administration course, the students developed a different kind of skill. They were given the opportunity to consult with a group on an organizational problem and make and implement a recommendation for change. This was a new role for most, one which related to the broader perspective presented by that course.

The author first asked the second-year students about the value of their first year in the program. As had the first-year students, they saw definite signs of growth coming from the first year. In particular, they had a general sense of increased self-confidence and assertiveness. Among the signs of this development were better counseling skills, increased appreciation for administrative work, increased delegation to others, being more relaxed, confidence in supervising RAs, and more comfort in front of groups.

The counseling psychology minors were especially aware of their counseling abilities. They felt more at ease in confronting clients, that is, going beyond the passive reflection of feelings. They varied in their confidence in handling more serious problems and taking a client beyond the initial phase of a counseling relationship. It is clear they did not see themselves as therapists, but felt they had developed some effective helping skills. Furthermore, they were able to express quite comfortably and lucidly their shortcomings and limitations as counselors, as well as the limits to which they would care to extend their counseling duties and competencies.

One student expressed herself in this fashion.

I now know the questions and issues, how to work in the counseling setting. During the first year I developed information and resources. This year, . . . experiential resources.
I can go beyond just establishing a relationship. I'm not able to deal with psychotherapy, but I can handle someone with problems, both situational and in life (longer term). I'm a behaviorist, I suppose.

A second student offered these remarks. "I'm more comfortable using skills," he said. "Unconsciously, versus trying to. Sometimes I catch myself in mid-sentence, becoming aware of doing it. I use it with my workers, who come to me with personal/family problems.

The second year did contribute to the students' sense of competence. They felt more confident and capable of being assertive. They felt they understood the university and student personnel work better, and that that had contributed to their confidence. They believed their skills were improved, particularly in the administrative domain. Finally, several noted their increased ability to organize their own time and priorities more effectively. The following comments demonstrate the wide range of evidence of these points.

I've learned to narrow down, instead of trying to do everything. I know myself better as a decision-maker, administrator, et cetera. The job requires being organized, time-wise, with my thoughts. I had to be aggressive, get people to do things. I wasn't comfortable at first, as I was only a grad student. Why would they listen to me? They are professionals. I felt intimidated at first. Now there's still a long way to go, but I'm more comfortable with it. I've made progress in not getting over-involved, understanding myself.

Several other students' remarks are noteworthy. One said, "My organizational decision-making skills are improved. I don't get too excited. Instead, I'm more rational, take a broader perspective in making decisions. I'm more assertive in checking IDs in the hall. I'm faster with paperwork now."
A second focused on his administrative skills. "I've sharpened my administrative skills," he remarked, "such as letter-writing, memos, meeting deadlines. The importance of politics, saying 'hello' to higher-ups. Now I see more clearly the weaknesses and strengths of those at the top."

A third student talked about a better grasp of student personnel work. "I am now seeing business and student life aspects of student personnel work," she said. "Some people think that student personnel work people are flaky people with no idea of what it takes to make a university function. But I have a real good idea, like the constraints under which we operate."

These last two students both commented on their administrative abilities, which previously were weak. "I can give a framework to a major, definition-less project," said the first. "Prior to that, I didn't think I could do that, like handling details, keys, t-shirts. I'm getting better at figuring out what questions need to be asked."

The second remarked, "Some I've done well, other things not. I learned that last-minute stuff haphazardly done could lead to bad results. I need to plan and look at things carefully, as opposed to rushing."

In the final interviews, the author asked the participants to reflect on the entire year. Once again the same themes were heard. Talking about their assistantships, they pointed to the increased ability to use old and new skills. That contributed to and was accompanied by a sense of being able to handle themselves at work, an increased awareness of the university as an organization, and a heightened awareness of self. The following comments illustrate these points.
I learned what not to do. Learning from my own mistakes. With regards to my supervisory style, I learned you can't trust employees all the time. I have to be firmer. I should have been initially. I learned I like people to like me, which made it hard to be forceful. I learned how to be an adviser. My group processing skills were put all together.

I have greater confidence in my interpersonal skills, one-to-one, regardless of the context. There's a diversity of situations and people. I learned about a lot of new things. I learned about my weaknesses--dealing with details, dealing with monotony. I had a sense these were weak, and now that's confirmed.

Dealing with ambiguity in an unstructured setting. Learning to create structure. Working in an office with a secretary. Learning administration--to put together programs, coordinating dozens of things and individuals. Working with faculty and seeing how they feel about student life outside the classroom.

In general, the students had become increasingly self-reliant. They were not as intimidated by ambiguity or unstructured conditions. They felt more natural, relaxed, and confident in their work. It should be pointed out that much of what they referred to were general work skills and familiarity with the office situation. Learning how to deal with details, both procedurally and the importance thereof, could be said to be a part of most jobs, regardless of the field. Equally important, however, they were applying that learning in the service of field-related objectives. As their final comments indicated, they were feeling ready to try their hand at a full-time, professional position.
Role Assumption. In addition to career goals and related competencies, did the students form a sense of being a professional? That question includes several issues. What roles were they assigned during their tenure in the program? How did they perceive themselves in relation to undergraduate students, student staff, and professionals? How, in fact, did they define professionalism?

Despite their student status, the participants had many opportunities to act as a member of the field, especially if they were SPAs. Within six weeks of their arrival at the university, the SPAs were expected to assume a staff role which made them almost functionally equivalent with a hall director. In fact, in off-campus colleges they were hall directors. Immediately after the leadership lab they participated in a housing orientation through which the upper-level administrators said, in effect, that they were all professionals in the residence life system.

In the leadership lab itself there was a gradually increasing opportunity to attempt the role of a professional. The first day was not witness to much of that behavior. The participants were invited to attend "staff meetings" held by the lab leaders. There they could provide feedback on the just completed sessions, but only one or two chose to do so. While curious about why the workshop was constructed as it was, no critiques were offered.

During the first day, however, two of the lab leaders asked the students to talk about their "relevant professional experience," as well as serving as resources to each other by leading miniversity sections. On the following morning two of the students did just that.
In their role of session leaders they began to give evidence of professional role assumption. One of the pair encouraged participants to bring forward their knowledge and "share it with the group." She responded to questions as the "expert" and later did a lecturette, much in the manner of the actual leadership lab leaders. The other of the pair offered to provide copies of the exercises to any interested individuals. Finally, they attempted to process and close the session by asking the participants about their feelings about what had taken place.

In the afternoon session, subgroups were formed to observe and comment on others' behaviors. In their remarks they noted "concern for consensus," participants' visual communications, and how the group behaved. They also employed terms such as "clarification," "sharing," "reference person," and "harmonizing." One student commented on her own behavior by using a description just provided in the previous exercise. She called her actions a reflection of her "green" side.

While being observed, the subgroups were asked to plan an RA orientation. While at this time they could only fall back on their own RA experiences, they were being asked to engage in what was the legitimate role of a professional residence life staff member. Later in the afternoon, subgroups were given 15 minutes of instruction in how to provide feedback. After observing project groups, each person was then asked to sit with one individual and provide such comments. In his remarks about this sort of activity, the assistantship program director noted its relationship to the professional role by saying, "You'll all be teachers of students."
In the housing orientation at Ohio State University, the students were being assigned professional status, both verbally and through the training process. In his opening comments, the Director of Housing said, "You are professionals and must instill... sense of responsibility in your RAs. You can impact students' development outside the classroom. You are a role model... compassion, understanding."

In the afternoon, the professional role was handed over by virtue of the team-building activity. For the first time SPAs, hall directors, and area coordinators were brought together as team members and asked to provide ideas as equals. While not for that purpose, the author noticed that a second-year SPA was cast in the professional role by leading an energizer to start off the session. Next, one of the people presenting the results of the group task was, in fact, a second-year SPA serving as an assistant hall director. He was representing the discussion held by the entire area where he worked. While no content expertise was necessary to do so, the student was assuming a role that might have been handled by a hall director.

During the second day of housing orientation, the SPAs continued their involvement in field-related discussions with full-time staff. In particular, the session on staff evaluation procedures afforded them the opportunity to join directors in group discussions about the purposes of RA evaluation. The author noted that they participated quite actively with the other staff, offering opinions about professional-related practice. Presenting the results of these discussions were two first year SPAs, three returning SPAs (including one Ph.D. student), and one hall director. Again, while presenting information
on newsprint to a group did not necessarily make them professionals, they were engaging in one of the roles that were included in the repertoire of the professional hall directors for whom they would work during the year.

The arrival of RAs required the SPAs to begin acting as senior staff members. Depending on the director, and the SPAs' level of previous residence hall experience and perceived readiness, SPAs began assuming training responsibilities. They led or co-led sessions on advising, helping skills, problem-solving, and assertiveness. This was preceded by the introductory RA retreat, where they found themselves fitting in where possible, handling a minimal amount of exercise leadership. As a kind of support staff person to the hall directors, they added process comments and led some of the simpler exercises—acquaintanceships and energizers. As one person said, "I did the non-intense stuff." They seemed content to participate at that level, not feeling ready to assume responsibility for the more extravagant human relations exercises or lectures. One said it was "hard to be natural in asking questions and processing. It took more to do well than I had given it credit for." In short, not until they returned to campus with their respective staffs did they take on a complete senior staff role.

Not only were these students now placed in professional-type situations via the housing program. Very shortly they were told they were professionals, colleagues of full-time professionals. The Vice President of Student Life, in his opening remarks, cited the
partnership role of SPAs. He stated, "You are accepted as professional colleagues, with all rights and responsibilities. You represent the eyes, ears, hopes, and dreams of grizzled veterans." At the same meeting this membership and collegiality was reinforced by the staff encounter exercise, in which the hall director/SPA teams were assigned to talk candidly about their working styles, strengths and weaknesses, and initial expectations of their working relationships. Later they would meet to forge mutually acceptable job definitions for the SPAs that would allow them to serve as professionals and contribute as colleagues. While the students were learners, their evaluation process was arranged to be a review of negotiated roles and performance reviews.

The training and message given by the program leaders appeared to be aimed at nudging the SPAs to take on a more distanced perspective. "You have a mission," they heard, "to serve as role models for students, to understand their behavior and stimulate their development, so they can survive and prosper in society." Time and time again this point was made--"you are professionals and colleagues."

The assistantship was probably the most relevant professional-type experience. As assistant directors, the SPAs had to work alongside their supervisors and on their own in running a building. They had to handle most of the problems that would confront a director, including some interaction with upper-level administrators. However, they realized they were not the ultimate authority in their buildings. In some of the non-Ohio State University settings, the SPAs tended to see their work as insignificant, or limited in scope, due to what were
perceived as conservative housing policies and incompetent administrators. In one of these locations, however, the SPAs did feel they were in very responsible and important positions, with significant autonomy.

In general, across all settings, the SPAs' sense of importance, status, and significance centered on their buildings and geographical area. Within the halls, they had specific and separate responsibilities to select and supervise staff, train and advise groups, and resolve a variety of problems that surfaced. They had to make decisions about room and building transfers and assignments of students to temporary spaces. Partially assisted by what they had learned in the group procedures course, they planned and conducted training sessions for student groups. Depending on the expectations of the hall director, they had partial to total authority for room and administrative issues. As team members with directors and other SPAs in the complex, they met periodically to discuss issues and plan staff meetings. In most cases, while recognizing and accepting as legitimate the ultimate authority and expertise of the directors, they felt a part of a professional team that made joint decisions.

As noted earlier, most of the student became instructors of the undergraduate career planning or pre-teaching seminars. Some said it was hard to fathom that they were actually college instructors. However, as time passed, they grew increasingly comfortable with that responsibility, and were more willing to assert their judgement on the syllabus.
The nature of the assistantship assignments changed in the second year. The SPAs became responsible for specific programs within a variety of offices. They now used the skills learned in the first year in attempting to achieve the goals of those new settings. The biggest difference was the nature of those locations. They were offices, which were perceived by the SPAs as more formal than residence halls. Casual dress was no longer as acceptable as it had been in the residence hall. While some SPAs had evening chores, many confined their work to regular nine-to-five hours. It was noted that they had fewer general "bull sessions" with students as they had in the residence halls, and for some their student contact was limited to specific groups and officers. The positions also brought them in contact with professionals in other offices, and the SPAs occasionally found themselves representing their own offices to those people. The seriousness of that chore was recognized and felt. The feeling of the second year, as a result, was more professional and of the "real world."

View of Professionalism. Being in a professional-type role was no guarantee that the students felt like professionals. The author spoke directly with them about how they viewed professionalism. They commented that professionalism was a matter of two factors. First was the manner in which one presented oneself--in dress, maturity, and polish. One student commented, "I started thinking I should act like a hall director as soon as I heard I had an assistantship." Another added, You shouldn't dress in a t-shirt and jeans in meetings." Another assertion, made by more than one person, was that one should not be drunk or go out and drink with the student staff.
The second factor mentioned was that of expertise. That meant using knowledge, research, grounded theory, and information in one's work. One student said, "You have to be able to back up your feelings." Another student added, "It's taking your career seriously . . . a belief in what you are doing . . . more than style . . . dedication to advancement, growth, and development of your field."

However, the strongest impression was that being a professional in student personnel work came from doing the work that a professional did, being committed to the principles of the field, and, mostly, from how one behaved and felt. The greater one's experience, then the greater one's ability to act responsibly, to use one's own judgement, to act with polish, and think on one's feet. Acting in a professional manner, with some underlying substance, made one a professional.

Second-year students, when looking back, had several definitions. For some, doing the work of a student personnel worker and having responsibility for their actions made them professionals. Other factors included having a genuine knowledge base, both theoretical and practical, having comfort in one's abilities, being included in committees and treated as a colleagues by professionals, being committed to the work of the field, and carrying oneself and dressing in a mature fashion. Being "out there," in a full-time job with significant responsibility, was cited as one important element, as well.

The students went on to say that being able to handle situations and problems as they arose in a competent fashion, using prior knowledge to generate new responses, was both evidence and a result of professionalism. In addition, as one student said, being professional
was being able to integrate one's own person into the professional role and not feel uncomfortable.

**Role-Definition.** How the students actually felt about themselves as professionals depended on how they saw themselves in comparison with others with whom they came in contact while engaging in this role. In particular, they were being forced to disengage from their undergraduate self-concepts and gravitate towards the professionals in the organization. For many this had begun in a small way as undergraduate RAs. It was then that they began distancing themselves from students. While most still identified with their floormates while serving as RAs, several mentioned in their first interviews how they came to Ohio State University acutely aware of the need to disassociate themselves from students. Often this awareness arose out of problems that surfaced when they had identified with their floormates and could not enforce rules. One student, who was not an RA but was actively involved in student government and judicial affairs, said that he felt less and less like a peer of other undergraduates as his college years progressed.

Becoming assistant directors increased the gap between SPAs and students. Now they had to learn not to identify with RAs, but instead with the housing organization. At the same time, they were learning techniques—counseling, group leadership—which gave them the power to influence students' thinking and decision-making. In the introductory student personnel work course, they gained insight into the broader perspectives which underlied the mission of institutions for
which they would be working some day. Undergraduate students were thus cast as "clients," "group members," "advisees," and as members of developmental stages which were usually below those of the graduate students. In short, the students were asked to observe, study, categorize, and take action, and then to evaluate the effects of such actions on students. In other words, they were asked to take and develop a new perspective—a professional perspective.

At this point in the study (second quarter), there was no compelling evidence that the students felt totally immersed in that role, but it continued to be part of their program. In the student development theory course, they were taught how several theories explained the cognitive, moral, social, and emotional development of undergraduates. In classroom discussions, they were asked to apply these concepts to their residence hall students. For example, how would one interpret and label the behavior of a student who acted or spoke in a certain fashion when explaining why he/she had violated a certain rule? Furthermore, lectures and readings mentioned conditions that led to movement up the developmental ladder. While the next quarter's class would be devoted to planful change for that purpose, they were already learning they had the potential to effect change in others. Put in a medical model, they were learning how to examine patients, using professional terminology, and soon would be taught to prescribe treatments.

Their awareness about this newly-discovered power and knowledge came across in their excitement about student development theory. Several claimed how important this was to the profession, even if they were not quite sure how to use it yet. Said one student, "It's
very important to the field. We're educators. Most seemed to have accepted the underlying purpose and were anxious to learn how to use the knowledge. The comment of one student quite possible summarized their current attitudinal state.

Student development theory and student personnel work go together. That's what the profession is all about. We're hurting people if we don't use it. I like (theorist's) course. It's new to me. It's very applicable to what we're doing. It's fun to think "I know this person's stage".

While some students might have been advanced, claiming the ability to apply student development theory, they did not give much clear evidence of how. Rather, they expressed very vaguely how knowledge of student development theory had aided their work with students. It appeared that they now felt more able to understand why students acted or reasoned, and thus it helped them communicate and reason with them more effectively.

On the other hand, this should not be dismissed as insignificant. There was definitely a sense of perspective and what one might call "privileged potency." They now knew something that gave them the potential to understand others in ways that laymen could not. This may have also been felt with the acquisition of counseling skills. There did not appear to be any devious attitudes attached to these awarenesses, only an initial excitement and, perhaps, sense of entry into a higher level of professionalism.

Students-in-general were not the only undergraduates with whom the SPAs interacted. As assistant directors, they supervised RAs, security, and office staff. At first, some SPAs were uncomfortable as
supervisors to RAs, feeling neither clear nor versed in the tasks of
an assistant director or an RA, or knowing much about the university.
Some, on the other hand, felt older and somewhat distant from the RAs,
and they had little difficulty accepting a higher role, even if they
knew very little about the actual jobs involved. The remainder felt
a need to be accepted as a senior staff member but also as a confidant.
Several of those had been RAs and were aware of the problems that
could arise when such professional distance was not maintained.
Finally, one noted how she was uneasy being anything other than a
peer, feeling uncomfortable in the authority role and preferring to be
one of the gang. In fact, this would plague her for most of the year.

Interactions with RAs, from initial contact through first quarter,
provided senior staff role definitions for the SPAs. Here, especially,
their own stylistic preferences, sense of confidence, maturity, and
previous experience affected how these roles emerged. On paper, in an
Ohio State University residence hall the RA was chosen and supervised
by the hall director. The role of the SPA was ambiguous. SPAs were
senior staff members, but most difficult staff decisions regarding
RAs had to be finalized by the hall director. There was room for the
SPA to shape a role with which he/she was most comfortable, however.

Initially, when RAs first arrived, many of the SPAs reported what
one might label "tentative authority." They felt they were in a higher
position, or wanted to be seen that way. Several acknowledged feeling
fairly young but wanting to be respected. In a few cases, the SPAs
had had problems as RAs overcoming identification with floor members,
and they were determined not to have a similar problem with their RAs.
A few noted their fear of being a supervisor to RAs, either due to lack of experience or not feeling confident about the information of which they were supposed to have command. Either due to lack of self-confidence or maturity, a few truly wanted to be part of the RA group and be liked. In one instance, due to working with what was described as an authoritarian hall director with a strong administrative disposition, a SPA with admittedly low self-confidence and high identification with students felt both a preference and responsibility to be a confidant to the RAs, and not to be a senior staff member.

Others who wanted/liked being friends or "chums" with RAs saw themselves later in the year as intermediaries. The RAs would come to them with problems and questions and get them resolved. A "big RA" is how one student characterized herself. In some cases, the RAs would talk with the assistant director because they might be facing a difficult decision where they might be asked to overlook some rule violations. It is possible the RA's saw the SPAs as more sympathetic and less of an authority figure. This, in a sense, played into the hands of those SPAs who felt a need for autonomy, as they could make decisions and keep the hall director in the dark, or handle the problem and announce it to the hall director as all completed. It was also convenient for the SPAs needing to be liked, as they could be a sympathetic ear to the RA and not have authoritarian responsibility. In the latter instance, the author could have speculated that the combination of an ambiguous role definition, lack of motivation/self-confidence, and having to work in a hall that included one or two more administratively-oriented senior staff members allowed the
particular SPA to remain in a non-professional stance and not progress professionally.

Certainly there were differences among the SPAs that could have contributed to different initial viewpoints towards students. Those who had supervised students or had been RAs were aware, for the most part, of the dynamics of working with and over other students. As one commented, "I knew the dangers of getting too friendly with students on my floor." At the other extreme, one had been so involved with the administration that he had not felt like a student when in college. There were several who had been out and away from college for a year or more, and they seemed not to experience too much difficulty seeing the distance. As one said, "I don't want to be their friends and socialize with them." "But," she complained, "I wish my classmates could understand why I don't want to go out and have a beer with them."

At the same time as they were forming new relationships with students, the SPAs were trying to merge with professionals. As noted, they were expected to do so quickly. The training sessions brought SPAs and directors together as area teams for problem-solving, team-building, and planning activities. In area meetings they discussed their goals for the upcoming year, along with policies and issues. At this time, most SPAs felt only limited comfort with being included, sensing the senior staff had been there before and knew more than them. While there was a range of willingness to offer opinions and disagree, most SPAs who commented about this phase of the training indicated some hesitancy about relationships with senior staff.
In addition, however, much depended on the atmosphere existing in their areas. In one of the three areas there seemed to be the perception by SPAs that one could not contribute equally with hall directors, but was expected to listen only. On the other hand, a second area seemed to encourage participation and involvement.

Once the year began and hall duties became an everyday affair, the new SPAs appeared to move into the staff situation fairly smoothly. They expressed some trepidation and discomfort in making comments about issues raised in general meetings, but seemed fairly comfortable with their directors and were optimistic about their ability to become involved as senior staff. As the quarter progressed they grew in confidence. Those who had been concerned about serving as assistant directors were now feeling more comfortable and settled in that role. At the same time, those who had preferred being seen as a friend to RAs were still concerned that they be accepted in that fashion, or at least not be seen as a "boss." They wanted to delegate responsibility to RAs rather than simply give them non-important things to do. At the same time, they gave evidence of feeling at ease with their role as assistant director. They were able to define with greater certainty how they fit in the role, in a way that appeared to be consistent with their style and philosophy of working with others.

Comments they made about their status were revealing. Of the 19 first-year SPAs with whom the author spoke, 12 indicated by late October/mid-November a sense of confidence in their stature as something greater than a student or student staff member. They had not experienced great difficulty in seeing themselves as assistant
directors upon their arrival, although one or two noted a deliberate pulling away from RAs to establish separation. One, being 22 years of age, was definitely concerned about that, but felt capable of handling his work. By late first quarter these people expressed noticeable certainty about their ability to carry on in their directors' positions, with some reservations about counseling and more difficult problem-solving. For them being on a par with the director was a matter of accumulating more experience and housing-related knowledge.

Four of the group were still "in-between." They had felt very much like students or like understudies to supervisors when first in the assistant director position, and by the time of the interviews were beginning to change. They were still groping with the supervisor role, but were feeling greater confidence in giving directions and making decisions, as well as being less of a friend to RAs.

The remaining three were still experiencing difficulty separating themselves from students and seeing themselves as distinct. They realized its importance, but they did not wish to relinquish the comraderie and acceptance of students. One saw himself becoming less of a "big RA," but was not totally removed from that role. Another still felt uncomfortable in a supervisory role and felt she was still "playing at facilitator."

Finally, the author heard comments from four non-SPAs about their professional status. These were mixed. One who had been in a professional role in another field had enjoyed that status, but did not appear to have that role in her non-SPA assistantship at this university. A second person, in an Ohio State University secretarial position,
felt she had professional status in the office because people there asked her to do more than her clerical job, such as solving problems and some academic advising. The other two felt they were students, both preparing for professional work later.

While the SPAs did not come out and say bluntly that they were professionals, they seemed to be saying they were ready, willing, and able to act in that capacity. Some reported their deliberate attempts to remove themselves from their client population, as well as from supervisees. They felt they were able to assume the role that their title required, and could handle much of their supervisor's job as well.

On the other hand, even the most confident were motivated to learn about the substance of the field, especially student development theory, which they included in the definition of professionalism. Thus, they were not acting as if they were totally prepared for the field, and they admitted that more work experience would be helpful. They did not see themselves as full-fledged professionals in the field, but as individuals who had grown job-wise and were further along than when they first arrived.

As the year passed most students' identification with undergraduate students and staff became considerably weaker, while their comfort with their supervisor and their staff role was strengthened. The author suspects that the student development theory course contributed to that outcome. As suggested previously, they had to consider the effect of their actions on other students, who were fast becoming "clients," and they had to take a more critical, detached view of their work as a result. This was capped with discussions in the spring theory course, when they discussed the pros and cons of deliberate student development.
Self-Appraisal. Given these changes, how were the students seeing themselves? Of the SPAs, a small majority saw their attachment to school being of greater importance than to their jobs. Several, however, felt that the job was of greater importance. Three felt the two were equally significant. With non-SPAs, there was almost an equal split, with some prioritizing school, others their university jobs or family roles.

A few indicated they felt like assistant hall directors who "happened to be going to graduate school." Others still felt like students who were on assistantships. But it is safe to say that the assistantship experience was viewed as very significant and professionally related. Not only did it take up a great deal of time, but it also was seen as a laboratory in which to gain experience, develop skills, and work in a professional capacity. This was in marked contrast to the counseling psychology majors, who often saw residence hall assistantships strictly as jobs to help pay for school.

While they felt their residence hall roles were important (in most cases), there was a direct and indirect recognition that they were not bona fide professionals, skill-, experience-, or status-wise. They were still graduate students going to classes, writing papers, and taking tests. However, in their jobs they felt a significant role, having gone beyond the status of novice to one of competent senior staff member. They were willing and ready to move on to a second pre-professional position, where they recognized the opportunity and need to learn new skills, polish current ones, and learn from established professionals.
When asked about their degree of professionalism, the clear majority felt they were not professionals. The primary feeling was that they needed more training and experience. Some attributed this to their current assistantships, which they saw ranging from insignificant ("glorified RA") to totally out of the field. One student said, "I'm not out there 'doing.' I'm accumulating applicable knowledge, but only in the classroom." This was typical of the non-SPAs. Two students mentioned they had not developed the confidence or ability to change the syllabus in the career development class to add their own exercises. Finally, two specifically stated that while they could do the residence hall job, they could not do all of their directors' jobs. As one noted, "He can back up higher level administrative decisions with reasons I wouldn't think of."

Five individuals were quite emphatic that they were professionals. One felt he was able to do the hall director's job, to design workshops, deliver programs, and teach a college course. A second reason was knowledge base. Academic growth, particularly with regard to student development theory, was cited as contributing to one's status as a professional. This allowed, one student said, him to discuss "things" and talk with people in the field.

Third, mental framework concerning the professional role was an important facet of being professional. One SPA mentioned how she always tried to be aware of students, "where they're heading and helping them get that way." She also mentioned how ethical concerns regulating the profession were important to her. She and others from this group mentioned feeling like professionals. One said that she was very
conscious of being professional, how she carried herself, respecting confidentiality, and knowing her abilities and limitations.

It was interesting to note that some gray areas surfaced. That is, not all who felt they were not yet professionals felt they were totally unprofessional. There was a sense of progress and partial professional status. As one student said, "I feel close to being one. I feel pretty professional in how I'm working. I still need to integrate my learning." These students were definitely conscious of the importance of being a professional. Said one, "I try to act like one."

At the same time, those students who said they were professionals did not rule out the need for growth and experience before going out and getting a full-time professional position. While they may have been acting professionally and accepting the principles of the profession, they were not "out there" in real positions.

Comments during the third-quarter interviews revealed that the students had settled down and were, in a sense, taking a breather. While not addressing the question of their professional status, it appeared that they were in a holding pattern. They realized that the second year was the next step in their development, and that the current one had little more to offer. They had become, in their minds, colleagues of their hall director, or at least much closer, but it was getting time to leave. They had long since resolved their student identification problems, and they were awaiting the challenge of relating effectively with new supervisors and clients, and handling new duties. Despite the comments that they were professional on the part of some students, the majority knew they still had another year of being
students, or at least trainees. To most this seemed reasonable and desirable. In their minds they were not yet student personnel workers or full professionals. On the other hand, they had made significant strides in those directions.

During the fall, relationships with the administration course professor gave evidence of the evolving status of the second-year students. These students interacted with both the instructor and each other in an increasingly collegial fashion. While the instructor tended to lecture, he disdained the use of a formal or final exam. He attempted to place the responsibility for learning and discussion on the class. As this and the next quarter passed, they debated more and more amongst themselves as a group. They also took on a more critical, detached look at their own field. While this was taking place, the author noticed how the instructor used the word "we" when describing the students' roles as leaders of organizations and members in the field. In one instance he called the class "professionals." The instructor also allowed himself to be teased playfully, almost inviting such repartee by his humorous, self-deprecating jokes and playful jousting with the class. While such humor had been part of all classes the author had observed, there was definitely an increased willingness on the part of the students to engage in such give-and-take with the instructor in this particular course and its sequel.

In the second quarter weekly practicum seminar, the collegial atmosphere flourished. Students' comments evoked reactions from other students, who would agree, disagree, question, clarify, extrapolate, or move on to tangential issues. The instructor would attempt to bring
focus to the discussions by clarifying or raising underlying or related themes, or would raise broader philosophical and ethical questions to stimulate further discussion. It struck the author that these conversations resembled case conferences, where they co-analyzed an individual's work situation. In their comments about students they were teaching or dealing with in some counseling or administrative capacity, the almost sounded like doctors discussing a sick patient, or teachers in a teacher's lounge chuckling about a recalcitrant student.

Not only did they make observations and evaluations of students. They often critiqued different offices within which they were working or had contact, philosophies and practices of professional student personnel workers, and the Ohio State University organization as a whole. In these comments they demonstrated an understanding of broader contextual issues that were contributing to the symptoms that troubled them. Their remarks also revealed a sort of professional concern, as opposed to mere personal distaste.

The author sensed that the way in which students conducted themselves in this class demonstrated the ability to assume a more professional role or stance. They considered issues and questions more as concerned practitioners than as emotionally involved participants. The seminar format both allowed and stimulated the assumption of such a posture.

In that seminar the author also heard their appraisals of their own professionalization. Some were surprised to have had the latitude and responsibility given to them so quickly in their practica offices. They were genuinely concerned about the impact they could have on
students when giving information and advice. Said one student, "I'm frustrated (after I make an error), because the student probably listened to everything I said as gospel truth." Another student added these thoughts.

I realize the "experts" out there are not experts. Doctors, politicians, even in our office. You get different interpretations of all different rules by "professionals." There's no right answer. Not that I'm a dualist or anything, but ... titles don't give you expertise. I was no expert--all of a sudden, am I capable of teaching?

This conversation continued related commentary. One said, "I can see the positive and negative aspects of this. People don't seem to know as much as they should." A second student added, "There should be a professional responsibility, too. Plus, people depend on them to know things."

The instructor then asked the class how ready they felt to enter the world of work. The students' tentativeness about their professional status and readiness was evident. Said one, "It depends where I work, that is, in residence halls I know stuff, so I could handle it. But if I were in a new area, I'd still feel like a student, still learning." A second added, "I realize the process is gradual. At first, in graduate school I thought it'd happen in a course. Part of me feels complete, others, no." A third student said simply, "I feel anxious because parts of my resume make promises of what I can do ... but can I?"

Two other comments were also quite revealing with regards to the feeling of tentativeness. One class member commented, "We're in limbo for two years, between the student and learner and professional and practitioner. For me that's a troubling limbo, but probably it's
designed that way. You probably can't be professional unless that happens." The second said, "Professional--learning to be more flexible and adapt if things don't work out as you planned. Content is more specific, broader in perspective. A little easier to accept the broadness of possible directions we have than when I graduate college."

The following week the instructor asked the class to define student personnel work, as well as where they stood at that time. Their comments revealed an interesting diversity of opinion. One said, "People don't know what student personnel is. I call myself a student now. Then I say, 'this is what I could be.'" A second simply said, "Student." A third added, "Student. Probably because my main reason for being at school is learning and then getting a job."

Some of the others had different feelings on this matter. Said one, "An apprenticeship this year, as opposed to previous ones which were only for providing money for me. Now, can even take priority over classwork." Said a second, in response to a classmate who had called herself a worker, "The reverse for me. Also, I identified with that position more this year than last." A third individual, having mixed feelings on the question, added, "When I got to the OCPA (Ohio College Personnel Association) roster and had to list myself, I put 'graduate student/administrative associate.' It was interesting to see what others did. Last year, there seemed to be so little time for classwork. It's more half-and-half this year."
Finally, one student indicated why he felt mostly like a staff member in the second year.

I don't feel like a student. A staff member in a residence hall. I identify more with this work than being a student. I feel less like a student this year than last. Last year, I think I would have said 'student.' It depends on the people I'm with. With people I don't know, I usually said 'student' last year.

Outside of this class, the students' sense of professional status was reflected in comments about relationships with professional staff in their assistantships. The majority felt they were now colleagues of the professional staff for/with whom they worked. They felt they were treated as equals and part of a team. As for their responsibilities, their responses were mixed. Several claimed they had significant autonomy when handling problems and making decisions, assisting in supervising secretarial staff, and being consulted about important office decisions. A few did not that they did not, however, have ultimate decision-making authority. Mostly, the author sensed that while the students felt their responsibilities were important, they understood the organizational chain of command and their place within.

One student gave a revealing look at her growth in this regard.

I'm on a faculty committee. I supervise a secretary. The first time felt uncomfortable. We had problems and I had to tell her to improve. I wanted to be her friend, too, as much as possible. I feel very responsible for what I do. I have control over what I do. I've become the "expert" here, as I created the directions.

Other students' comments are worth noting, too. One said, "I'm not equal with _____ (supervisor), as I don't make major decisions. I have to confer with her before finalizing contracts or expectations. People rely on me more for accurate information, especially when
(supervisor) is gone," A second added, "I am allowed autonomy. I can bend rules. With hard decisions, I have a part but he (supervisor) has the final say. I'm glad I don't have to now," A third said, "I have authority to do as I please, but I'm not important in the scheme of things . . . not necessary at all."

It seemed that most students did feel they had responsibility but understood their organizational limitations. At this point in their program, they were able to see themselves as emerging professionals, but were still aware of the pre-professional status they held. For the most part they did not resent this status, appearing to accept it as appropriate.

There was also a heightened sense of distance from undergraduates and increased professionalism from the work setting itself. Several noted being able to get home and away from work, having more structured time usage, a more clearly designated work space, and dressing more formally. One student offered the following perspective.

I was seen by students in the dorm as a student. It was frustrating. This year I have my name on the wall and my own office, and I'm seen as (supervisor's) assistant. It's a real step up. I feel better about what I'm doing. I dress differently. I was tired of looking like every other freshman on campus.

Others' comments provided additional illustration. Said one, "It's better. I feel more like a professional. I go to the office and leave at night. I dress up sometimes now." Said a second, "I dress a little different here—less casual. The atmosphere's less casual, too. I could joke with RA's and students in the dorm office. Here I deal with them on specific things."
As for their general status, there was a variety of impressions. Their comments demonstrated a split on whether they were more student or worker, while overall having less focus on classwork than during the previous year. Said one, "I'm a worker who's a student. I have no strong interest in academics, except experiential stuff." A second individual agreed, saying, "I don't identify with being a student. Mostly with being a student personnel worker. I do more work versus classwork. That is, 20 hours of work, eight hours of practicum, three hours teaching, three hours class,"

The following two students had mixed feelings on the matter. The first said, "I'm a grad student, not a professional. I'm here primarily to get my degree. I'm learning a lot. I'm still in school. The assistantship is part of my education. The second added, "Both a graduate student and worker in college. A mixture--sometimes more professional than a student, sometimes the other way around.

Finally, this student talked about being in a position that had drawbacks. I'm more like a graduate student. We're "professionals of convenience." We do professional stuff but are paid less. I am part of a well thought-of office, but only behind the scenes. I'm part-time, too. I can't deal with all the issues, as would a full-time person, and I don't have all the information or experience.

The students were clearly approaching a transition. They did not appear anxious or unhappy about being where they were, but they were getting ready to move forward. Had these interviews taken place two or three weeks later, their responses might have been different. From these data, the author might have predicted that the onset of spring
quarter would have propelled their sights forward, to conventions, job interviews, and comprehensive exams. The feeling of being settled in their assistantship jobs would soon be replaced by the itch to leave.

The author's questions about readiness for a full-time job corroborated the impression he had developed from the other segments of this series of interviews. Where the students felt most confident and unanimous was in their readiness to undertake a full-time position. Most felt they had the necessary knowledge and experience. They had seen themselves grow in their current positions, and the next logical step was a full-time professional job. Those who were not absolutely certain felt they could take on such a responsibility, but they would not have minded some additional learning opportunities while in school. For them, the question was "how do I know that I know enough?" "Perhaps a little more experience would be helpful," they speculated.

Membership in the field and professional status were less of a certainty. A majority did feel they were professional, but there was a significant amount of reserve. Answers shed some interesting light on how they defined professionalism at this point. The qualities or factors which they saw as contributing were several. For some, doing the work of a student personnel worker and having responsibility for their actions made them professional. However, that was not presented as the sole factor by those individuals. Other factors they listed were (a) having a real knowledge base, (b) being included in committees and treated by professionals as colleagues, (c) being committed to the work, and (d) carrying oneself and dressing in a mature, professional fashion.
In short, the group were feeling competent, confident, and knowledgeable about their work, and felt bolstered by the information they had gained from classes and assistantships. Being able to handle situations and problems as they arose in a competent fashion, using prior knowledge to generate new responses, was both evidence of and a result of professionalism. In addition, as one student said, being professional was being able to integrate one's own identity into the professional role and not feel uncomfortable. The comparison between the following two students illustrates how they were different and similar on this dimension.

Being professional is being very into the work. When a student comes in to bitch about student government and you work with him to see why. How you conduct yourself, taking things seriously. I used to see people like that as stuck up. I think you can be both serious and personable. It's been a gradual process for me. When I get together with staff I can be this way.

I guess so, in some areas. Some of them need work. I could put on a mask and be professional. I can clown around with students and RAs now. I joke around with guys on the floor. You can't as director.

The first student saw and could integrate her personal and professional sides into one, though being in the company of other staff helped her do so. The latter still had to act, as opposed to "being." He understood what professionalism was, but it was a temporary state that he had to create for himself. The first student was not totally confident and conversant with the professional role, as she was herself still moving into it. It was more comfortable for her, but it still helped to be around other professionals.
For many, one's degree of confidence and polish/tact/diplomacy were evidence of professionalism. One student stated it as follows.

I equate professionalism with dress. I carry myself and dress comfortably. There's some change from last year. When I represent the office, I'm more diplomatic. I'm starting to think of myself as a university representative to outside groups. But it's still fuzzy to me.

His comments about being a representative point to another factor noted by a few students—that of "role." Being on professional committees, representing the office to faculty and colleagues, and maintaining a professional stance all were examples given. One student said, "Teaching 130 and CPC (courses)—that's professional activity." Being seen by others as responsible colleagues was also cited. "I'm included on committees, and my opinion is listened to by professionals," commented one student. For another individual who worked with little or no contact with student personnel workers, that element was noticeable by its absence. She said, "A third component is a professional body in which are my professional cohorts. That's less clear for me. Not in this office."

In the last set of interviews, the author once again investigated the participants' sense of who they were as emerging professionals. Their comments revealed a group ready to move on, feeling as if they had gained what they could from the Ohio State University experience. While they were confident in their abilities, they were waiting for the "real" test. They were not quite student personnel workers. In addition, as the ensuing discussion on commitment will show, they were ready to start being student personnel workers, but a career commitment was an issue that would take further testing.
The first set of questions dealt once again with relationships with undergraduates. Most felt greater distance and a reduced need to be seen as a friend. Instead, they wanted to be seen as professionals. One student put it bluntly, "I purposely distance myself," he said, "I have no desire for the High Street scene. Also, I want to be a role model, not get drunk with the staff."

Two other students offered related commentary.

I'm learning to understand how students saw me as a staff member, not just a grad student. I have much fewer regular established relationships this year than last. More of an educational emphasis this year, I do want students this year to know I'm not work-study, rather, a grad student who works here.

Greater distance. It was real important to be close last year. I needed to be an undergrad. More and more I decided that was unnecessary. I need more to be seen as an authority figure who understands them. I wanted them not to fear me. Greater distance this year.

Some students were feeling closer to students and wanting to retain that closeness. In several instances, these students had been in scholarship houses or in non-residence hall settings during their first year. Now they were finally being exposed to a broader group of undergraduates. Said, one, "I'm closer this year. I have closer friendships. I feel like one of the students. Last year I was in an office and I didn't see or visit them. . . . I don't feel this year like I'm invading their space."

A second student added these comments.

I feel closer now than last year. My background is different than (building) last year. (building) is more natural, greater socially aware and career self-search. Plus, they're dealing with issues I'm dealing with too, so I realize they're not so different.
Other comments added to the impression being formed through these interviews. Said one individual, "I understand their developmental needs." A second added, "It's different, due to different environments and types of students. First, college students were immature. Now, I deal with student leaders. I see myself developing students now. More maintenance then. I feel close this year, staff and friend."

Finally, this student supported the comments just presented.

The second year changed my perceptions of college students, due to the issue of student development and a new way to look at people. I have a broader view now. What I might have called childish, now I am more tolerant of. I'm less surprised by that behavior, too.

Membership in the Field. Finally, the author asked the participants if they were now student personnel workers. Were they genuine members of the field? The following were some comments offered in response to that question.

If I had a job and were reading the journals I would feel more so. I can imagine myself wearing nice clothes to work, a briefcase, reading journals, going to conventions. That's my image of a student personnel work professional. I'm in transition. I'm not sure where I'm going in the field now.

I don't feel like a student personnel worker or ready. I identify with it, in that I see the need for student personnel work for the development of the whole person. I don't feel ready, though, or part of the profession, as I haven't worked in the field. The assistantship is only like a practicum. Until I work, do something, and get a paycheck at the end of the month, I won't feel like a student personnel worker.

It has just hit me recently. Reality. "I am a professional." Prior to this, I didn't feel like a member. I was a graduate student in my assistantship last year, and this year, too. There's no professional feeling about the assistantship job. Getting a job offer and accepting it made me feel part of the field.
Not totally part of the field. I need to be in a full-time job and considered a professional staff member. That will probably make a difference in my attitude towards myself, title, and position. How others see me will probably change. Graduation is not a big part of that, but it will substantiate it to others.

I surely feel part of the field and professional in it, and more identify with what it's about. I feel identity with the way I choose to pursue the field, how I define the parts I'm comfortable with. I identify with the "ideal," as defined by (assistantship program director), ACPA people, et cetera. I don't identify with those who only are for services and are down on student development stuff, and who feel anyone can do our jobs. I feel socialized to what is presented in class and my assistantship ... that may be a different reality and notion of the field if I had a job. Being here has developed confirmation and a stronger notion of what I want to be with regards to specific areas of interest, especially student development theory. I didn't feel like a full-fledged professional. There is still a part of me that says that until I'm no longer partly a "student" on those froms, that I'm not a full member. Maybe I have a little question as to how I'll do as a full-time complex director or assistant dean, but I feel as competent as others (professional staff in residence hall area). I guess I'll never know what would be required of me, how my competence would be tested in those positions, until I get in there.

Other indications of tentative readiness and membership are evident in the comments of additional students. One commented, "I'm right on the edge of totally being in it. I'm really immersed. I'm not totally professional and not paid yet. I do feel a part of it."

Said a second individual, "I feel part of the field when I'm with other student personnel workers or reading a journal. I understand the topics. But this year in my assistantship I don't use theory." A third added, "I feel like a student personnel worker. I'm concerned that what we do is important but doesn't have much status. I pick up my professional journal before Time Magazine. It's a more recent phenomenon. The convention reinforced it. We have things in common."
A fourth student summed up the feelings of many when he said, "I identify, but not one hundred percent, because I'm not sure what I want to do. I'll rely on the next two years to find out."

Readiness for a Professional Position. Evidently, the students were feeling ready to take the next step, but they would not consider themselves as full members of the field until they were in real positions. They were beginning to feel closer to the field, both in recognizing the field-related values they held and the activities in which they engaged. Some minor hesitation could still be seen, but the willingness to move on was the dominant factor.

Several comments portray those feelings. One student said, "Yes. When I look at comps, and the "Counseling Psychology of Women" course, I have wonderful things to draw upon. I know stuff and where to find things. I'm ready. My assistantship was good hands-on experience."

A second student with such confidence added with enthusiasm, "Oh yes, oh yes! I felt ready this quarter. I'll finish my coursework, so I've gotten all I can from school. And from the job, I learned all I could two months ago." A third confident student remarked, "I'm anxious to go on to the 'real world,' to put myself on the line. I'm confident and ready. My training's been good."

Not everyone was as certain as these three individuals. One student said, "I'm confident my skills are good. But am I ready to settle down and be an adult? I'm not sure? Said a second, "Yes. I'm more assertive and confident. But I'm still hanging on to my student self a bit."
Finally, this student's commentary probably best represents the state of mind of the second-year students at this time.

Yes and no. I'm ready to be away from school and be full-time, not having to juggle the two. I will feel inadequate at times, wishing I had done more to prepare me for this work. But I did, realistically, all I could do over two years. I still have more to learn.

**Commitment**

The author had two other issues to explore that were of major consequence. One dealt with the strength of the students' commitment to the field of student personnel work. How firmly did they feel committed to a future in this area? Secondly, why were they committed? That is, was there some mission on which their commitment was based? This question was raised because the initial interviews and those that followed pointed to some underlying values which led the students to apply to the program in the first place. As they went through the program, those values were challenged by what they had learned about the field and the experiences they accumulated. As they progressed through the six quarters, they began to talk about ideals and goals which were broader than their individual motivations. The missions about which they spoke became evident as this happened.

**Mission.** The initial reasons for choosing student personnel work were several. Students had had fun working with college students, enjoyed the stimulation of the university environment, and liked being in a helping role. Many had felt their college lives had been made more meaningful by their extracurricular activities, and they wanted to bring those opportunities to others. This was their fledgling sense of purpose.
The author watched with interest as this feeling developed. Certainly the point was raised early. They were told how the program at Ohio State University had been very selective and that it was unique and excellent. At the same time, they were told by the dean of the College of Education of their special role. "We must prepare students to live in this complex world," he said, "and want your help in spreading the word. You are role models. We work with you as professionals to make the undergraduate experience positive."

In the introductory student personnel work class, they were asked to defend the importance of their work and its mission in higher education. Often they would disagree with the "negative" view of the instructor, and gave some evidence of a "we-they" attitude with regards to faculty.

However, it was not until they were introduced to student development theory that this issue became significant. With theory came the power to have influence, a measurable impact on students' that went beyond the issue-specific assistance they could provide with their counseling skills. They could now intervene to attempt changes that would benefit students even if a problem was not apparent at the time. Command of this theory and its use was, according to the instructor, what differentiated amateurs from professionals. It was seen at this university as a foundation of student personnel work practice.

A major issue that faced these students surrounded the use of such theory. It was raised both informally and through questions posed by instructors. The essence of the question was, "Do you have the right and should you be 'developing' students?" The author posed this
question to both groups, noting that student development theory allowed them to influence people even when such assistance was not formally requested.

In the first-year group, the large majority said "yes," with only one person saying "no," and a few giving tentative approval. They offered several reasons why it was important and necessary to do so, the most frequent having to do with the role of student personnel workers as they saw it. It was felt that student personnel work included a commitment to development. This was a part of students' total education, and it would benefit them. A few respondents said, in effect, "we influence students, so it should be done appropriately."

The following statements illustrate their reasoning at this time.

Sure. It's part of their total education. We're teaching people to be socialized. The university is responsible to educate the mind and develop them in other ways. We need to have people go ahead and map it out, like a geography teacher would.

Yes, we should. By virtue of being on campus and in classes, having chosen to go to college, a person has chosen to further his education. There are things of developmental benefit, in and out of class. It's the whole basis for my being here. Now I want to learn how to do it.

A third student added, "Yes, because eventually they may see a bigger picture than now. They need to see that what they do affects others and others' rights. In principle we'll be helping, so 'yes.'"

While most people agreed it was important and desirable to act in this fashion, they had some concerns about the use of student development theory. Nearly two-thirds said they had considered this particular question before, due to their own independent thinking, discussions with others, or class discussion. Not all had considered it
extensively, but the issue had caught their eyes.

"Manipulation" was the one word most often spoken when discussing these concerns. Other questions were raised about the validity and reliability of the theory, along with possible value judgements inherent in the theory. It was suggested that such deliberate development should be done in a proper fashion, and that people be given the choice to have this imposed on them. Some were just cautious. It would be wrong, they either said or intimated, to carry things too far and manipulate or overly influence the students. Several comments should be considered.

One student said, "I don't know. Who knows about the consequences. It should be researched. It's still experimental. Tampering with people without knowing." A second said, "I'm concerned about that. Yes, we should . . . but should we open peoples' eyes? Do we have the right? I think about it a lot. Who am I to say dualistic is less good? With women's issues, we do programming that perpetuates stereotypes. Yet that's what they want." A third added, "yes, but I see both sides. Yes, they need it, and no, we shouldn't do it if it's not asked for. We should set the environment and show them the benefits, then let them decide."

Other comments merit inclusion at this point.

I've wondered and talked with others. Some research is done at colleges—we're not imposing it. We're improving something that goes on. We're making it easier for students to grow in that way. I'm concerned about the creation of a non-pluralistic society, like what would happen if we had all Kohlberg 5s and 6s. I also critique Kohlberg's prescribing a liberal perspective of law and justice. On the
other hand, my experience with Chickering is positive. We should not force a student into programming. They have to decide if it's worthwhile. At this point, I would continue programming for those who wanted it and accept that some don't want it. They'll probably grow without my intervention... to do an intervention is not devious. It's positive. The intent is a positive experience for them, such as residence hall groupings. We're not forcing stuff on them by grouping them. Random assignments could lead to a negative experience. We are using knowledge to help them.

The question is "is student development theory manipulation?" It depends why you do it. You need to let people know what you're doing. Tell them that residence hall programs are for development. Yes, it's manipulation, but that's okay. You can't always explain what you're up to while sitting in the hall and talking, but you should tell what you're doing if asked why you're always throwing stuff back at them.

One student had some concerns about using theory. "Yes, I have a hard time with that," he admitted. "Is it right to stir things up when people are happy? We critique theory, not whether or not we should do it." However, these three individuals felt differently. "Yes," the first said. "One reason I'm in the field is to educate, and probably not in the classroom. Plus, they don't have to take my help. Each person needs to make a choice, and it's my choice to educate. It carries a great deal of responsibility." The second added, "Yes, we should be, as long as we're encouraging their developmental growth. It's not unethical. It's like a baby or a kid—they may not want it but in the long run it will benefit them. It's not unethical. The third concluded, "It will help them out. The more they learn about themselves, the easier it is to determine what they want to do in the real world. Do we not have the right? With training, there's no harm in it."
As these statements suggest, students were aware of an issue being involved. However, except for a few, they seemed to be saying that "it's for their own good, it's my training, and it won't hurt them as long as we act responsibly." While they saw an underlying ethical issue, they did not appear as a group to be deeply concerned. A few had pondered the question seriously, while the majority admitted that they considered the issue lightly or not at all.

Challenges to the meaning and legitimacy of student personnel work were presented throughout the second year. As noted earlier, the administration sequence instructor asked the students to substantiate that the mission of the field was real and legitimate. Since several had reservations about the field, a carryover from the first year, they were receptive to his challenges. In fact, the instructor raised doubts about the very notion that student personnel workers' motives were altruistic. At the same time, he encouraged them, almost passionately, to re-evaluate their feelings about the field and create a personally meaningful identification.

However, it was not until the second-quarter practicum seminar class, along with third-quarter interviews, that the extent and depth of their thinking could be seen. In the former the instructor asked the students to discuss their views about students, the profession, and deliberate use of student development theory. The following discussion between instructor (I) and students (S) is worth replaying.

I: I still haven't heard your philosophy.
S: Why (to another student) are you helping them (students)?
S: I enjoy helping students. They're more optimistic, looking forward.
I: Other people?
S: I have to watch my attitude. I have trouble with people who are slow, who don't catch on, because I've always been so quick. For me, it is good to be helping them move along, even a little.

S: I'm wondering if we don't just peg people, where they ought to be on the continuum, and if they aren't we react to them negatively.

S: We might react that way. I don't know why.

S: If I hadn't known about Perry and Kohlberg, I would still feel frustrated. Now I understand there are reasons for that and there are ways to deal with students and be effective.

S: I have more appreciation for the fact that others are coming from another place than I am. I may not accept their viewpoint, but I understand that. I try to allow for greater flexibility for people.

S: I'm bothered about that. I'm not sure we really know these theories.

S: For me, it's just that I have more information to work with.

S: It gives you a basis from which to explore.

S: Student development has provided more specificity and taken it farther than I would have myself.

S: I disagree. It's not just because I feel I have a certain responsibility that others will or should be treated that way.

The author then commented on the use of theory in science. She submitted that it could not be proved but only disproved, that theory was needed to advance and to make observations and facts consistent. Theory could provide viewpoints about the world, as well as limitations to such viewpoints. Thus, she continued, it could be helpful or dangerous. So, she then asked, how did one use theory without getting irretrievably locked into it?

Continuing along this line, she asked the class, "What are your attitudes towards students?" Their responses were as follows.

S: College-age group has the most potential and possibility for drastic change and growth to occur. My job is to provide assistance for that, doing programs, et cetera. . . . Are we manipulating students?

S: Enhance means to help out. Facilitate means to do it whether they want it or not.

S: I guess I manipulate students. . . . If I think it's good for them, is it okay to manipulate?

S: Manipulation leads to change without their awareness.
The instructor then proceeded to raise a crucial question. She asked why there was a need for student personnel workers if people knew what was best for them. Did students fully understand what student personnel workers were doing with them? The discussion took place as reported.

S: Students may know what we're doing but not totally consent.
S: Development will take place anyway, so "enhancement" will be useful. . . .I'm confused now.
S: We shouldn't be thinking here that students aren't aware. It's okay to influence people.
S: I see . . . feel that Kohlberg 5 is better than 4, and I'll work to move people there.
S: Just the residence hall environment by itself may or may not produce development. It's the process. I as a student could volunteer to be a leader, but not ask to be challenged or pushed. A distinction. Just one workshop doesn't make the difference. It's a totality of experience, all the influences and services you provide.
S: What about the person who doesn't have a roommate conflict or join a group? What influence will I have on him? He's the majority. We seem to work with a selective few. S: That's a good point. I can't assume they won't grow. Maybe what I do with students will filter down to others I don't have contact with.

As the reader can see, the students had mixed feelings and were grasping, in a sense, for a firmer foothold. One student, in particular, was agonizing over the dilemma he was seeing. It was not just a question over having the right to help. The group seemed to feel that was their role as student personnel workers, that is, to enhance development. But how directly should they try to be involved? Was there a difference between setting up conditions and trying to directly push people into developmental situations? How should they define enhancement?
In the final set of interviews, the author followed up on the practicum seminar discussions by asking the same question about intentional student development that he had posed of the first-year students. Only two of the entire second-year group had not considered this issue. Half of those claimed that they had actually begun thinking about it during their first year. The other half only began during the second year. While some pointed to the influence of the administration course sequence on their thinking, as well as the practicum seminar, most found that they thought about it on their own or in bull sessions with friends.

Their response was overwhelmingly affirmative, with only three having significant doubts. At the same time, they saw potential problems. Their major reservation pertained to the issue of imposition. "Am I imposing my will on these students?" they asked. The question of free will surfaced, and a few participants said directly that students ought to have the right to choose if they wanted their development assisted. Yet, despite their hesitations, they were able to verbalize why it was important and appropriate to attempt to foster developmental growth.

Their reasons varied, both in depth and content. They were not unidimensional, either. That is, their statements contained both simplistic and more abstract reasoning. From each individual's mixture of comments, the author could sense the strength of conviction with which they reasoned.
At the most personalized extreme were the responses that said, in effect, that participation in student development based programs as an undergraduate helped their own growth, or such would have had they taken advantage of the opportunities that existed. Therefore, it would be helpful to today's undergraduates. It would open college students' eyes to a broader world. Along with this line of reasoning were comments which said, in effect, that "it could help them, and it probably wouldn't hurt."

At the other extreme were students who talked about society. Society, they said, would benefit from more aware, morally developed people. It was their role as student personnel workers to stimulate such growth. It was difficult to determine from their answers if this was unthinking adherence to perceived duty, or internalized acceptance of a concept. The cautions they raised led the author to believe that most were not simply mimicking the words of their instructors. Several were emphatic in their concern that opportunity for growth be made available, not imposed, and that students not be manipulated. Furthermore, it was stressed by several that the theory needed to be well-validated and clearly understood by the practitioners.

Many comments were made about this issue. The following are representative of the reasoning used by the students.

Yes, but we don't change people, only their environments. They change themselves. I've considered and struggled with this issue. But I've changed. I don't preach it. I accept where students are at. As professionals we fall into the trap of thinking students aren't changing according to our expectations, so we aren't good professionals.
Yes. Otherwise, you hear wants, not needs. It could be too late if we wait. We must assess and work to facilitate growth. We shouldn't impose, but say"this is my thought that you might need this, so try it out and see how it feels." I have considered this, especially as I wonder if the theory fits. It's a moral and ethical question. It's not a question of "should we," But you must think how valid your beliefs are about dealing with students.

Yes, as long as we are well-read, well-researched, well-versed, and comfortable that we are doing what is appropriate, ethical, and correct. My problem is with people who think they know it but don't, and try using it. I will keep up with the latest developments. It's unethical to use if you are not well-grounded or aware of the theory's implications.

Yes. It helped me. We never harmed students with this—we're helping them. Societally speaking, society should have people at higher developmental stages. I'd like to create people who will create society. I've wondered what gives me the right, or if someone's worse if they're a "2" versus a "3." I see women in the hall going through the growth of college, and realize I grew through that. I wonder if they would end up like me by chance.

Definitely. Opening their eyes is important about things they wouldn't encounter, or even want to. We may be going against their willingness to do some things. I'm assuming that more complex thinking is better, and more open-minded is better. I've wondered if I have the right. But I consider us as teachers, and what gives teachers the right to do that, that is, teach some things and not others? It's important to look at this issue. I've gone through those experiences myself and that's helped me. It's necessary to open eyes to others' viewpoints and cultures—we all have to live together. When I do workshops, I wonder, "Is this what they need? Who am I to say what they need?"

Only if they desire help. They should have a choice. What right do we have to impose the sort of growth we value? I vehemently disagree with imposing activities. We need to think about what we do. Student development theory is a useful tool if students want certain programming. I used to assume we knew what we were doing and had the right to do it.

For me, college had certain connotations. You would be changing to a better functioning person and prepared for something, a career. You would function better, like in interpersonal relationships. I think many people send their kids with those expectations, as well as the unspoken expectations of those who, especially, pay their own way.
So, I see student personnel work as planning things that will help them with that.

Yes, I think so. The person has the choice not to go along with it. I have the responsibility to broaden their thinking, to present alternatives, as that's my value. It's a passive manipulation. You need to look at how to do it, to make it growthful and give the person room. I'm not making the person buy into it. I give them a chance. It's intentional, done carefully. You need to be aware of what you're doing and why. Is it for your need of for theirs? People say we shouldn't manipulate. But we do, every day. I wouldn't be in this field if I didn't feel I want to have influence on people. It should be intentional. We should look at what we're doing. We have an obligation to challenge and help them through this, plus give support.

It's a very good question. Yes, my bias is that growing is better than not, for me. I have a problem with pushing people. It's easier to say, "How can I best structure the learning environment to produce learning?" People will be challenged in life, anyway. I used to think about this, with Kohlberg, "is higher better?" It is--more humane, better for society. It's not manipulative. You create situations you hope will produce growth. If they don't want to get involved, you have to accept it.

The 1,000,000 dollar question, huh? That's a particularly appropriate question for me, as I'm committed to these theories. Yes, it's appropriate and ethical. As I've had exposure in that area and believe that's our role as educators. Growth and development go hand-in-hand with education. It's a means and end to education, and visa-versa. College students have made the choice to have the institution educate them, and also to ask the college to help them grow in all aspects of life. I'm sympathetic and understanding of the argument that such is manipulative and mechanistic, developing people without their knowledge, or treating them as Kohlberg 2s and Perry 3s rather than individuals. I'm using developmental theories as one aspect of education and ought to be using them systematically, not by the seat of my pants.

The note of professional obligation rings strongly through these passages. The students seemed to be acknowledging some underlying ethical questions. The author found it interesting that he never used the words "ethical" or "manipulation" in his questioning, yet they appeared frequently. The students had had a year since the student
development theory courses to consider the implications of their work as student personnel workers, and their responses seemed more complex than those of their first-year counterparts.

These questions concerned the participants. Ostensibly, in the professions members have some knowledge and/or skills which separate them from laymen. The potency which accompanies that special training brings with it some special responsibilities. Without having learned an identified code of ethics, these students could only rely on their own sense of fairness and ethical conduct. Perhaps this was underlying the mental struggling they were doing.

Commitment. The students had undergone many changes over the two years. Their perceptions of the field had been both clarified and broadened. Their professional competence had grown, and their general feelings of suitability for student personnel work were validated. Furthermore, they had distanced themselves from undergraduate students and felt greater identification with professionals. All that remained, according to them, was the acquisition of a full-time professional position.

Their goals had undergone a subtle shift as well. Their original perceptions of a career in student personnel work were imprecise. By their second year they were seeing that they were only beginning a career, and that jobs in student personnel work did not necessarily mean a long-term career.
When speaking with first-year students, the author saw that their sense of commitment had changed, and in different ways. A few indicated a slight decrease in commitment, and they cited concerns about "the grind," the time commitment, and the difficulty in getting jobs. Others noted these themes as well, but they had not become disillusioned. Others' concerns were with the low status of student personnel work in higher education.

Only one had negative feelings about the field. However, several were feeling very positive, just as they had before. They cited working on a college campus, working with people, and student development theory as three of the reasons. Finally, there were some who indicated they were "holding back" on a commitment, or not sure of how they felt. They wanted to see where they fit in the field and what options would be available. Also, as two stated, they did not come to the program seeing student personnel work as necessarily a life-long thing, and they still did not. Business and personnel were mentioned as options to consider or fall back on.

The author's impression was that for most of this group, student personnel work had become clearer in focus and purpose, and the original reasons for which it had been selected had been tentatively confirmed. They were still waiting to see what would happen, but for the most part felt an allegiance with the purposes and activities of the field. At the same time, they wanted to see where they would best fit in, and they looked forward to an opportunity to try out and learn new skills. There was now more defined reasoning and substance to their commitment, along with a sense of importance about the field that now had support...
from student development theory. However, the students, as noted previously, still saw themselves as learners, and they wanted to test out interests and skills and learn more about the university before making a solid commitment.

Comments in the third-quarter interviews showed that the students were feeling more strongly about the field than before. This was attributed to a combination of factors, particularly a heightened awareness of the field and a clearer understanding of their own interests. One student, who had come to the university with only a vague notion of what the field was, offered this perspective.

I had a broad notion of working with people in higher education before. Now I see developmental psychology and a philosophy. Teaching. Research. The spectrum as widened. I feel more positive now that I have a better understanding. There's a method behind the madness, plus a sense of the history. I identify with it more. I find myself talking about student development theory with close friends. The learning has been integrated to other parts of life.

A similar sentiment was expressed by a second student. She said, "My commitment's stronger now, because I know more and see what there is to do. Before it was a means to an end--a job. Now I'm more interested in developing the field."

While these types of sentiments were expressed often, the participants were not totally committed and focused. Several indicated that they were aware of other options, such as business, and did not see student personnel work as, in the words of one student, a "forever thing." However, for the most part they were willing to give the field a try first. Several commented that their view of student personnel work was now more realistic. They could see positive and negative sides to the field. Yet, that did not necessarily discourage
them. In fact, it strengthened some individuals' sense of commitment, as now they had a better grasp of what they were involved with. The following statements give a sense of these postures.

My commitment's stronger than fall. I know I'll be happy. I could be frustrated with the money and the academic system. Business is still an option--teaching, training, supervising. My idealism is lower. I can live with the low money, but I'm realistic, too. If education gets bad, I'll leave.

Due to this year, I have a clearer, more definite commitment to the field. I'm invested in it . . . at least five years. At the start of the year I would have said "forever," but that would have been shaky, not realistic. I have some disillusionment with people in the field. Their incompetence (has led to) a renewed interest in social psych. I would become a social psych instructor, rather than using it in the context of student personnel work.

My commitment's equal or greater. But I'm more open-eyed. I see negative stuff now, too. Originally, I saw student personnel and higher education with a liberal environment, people committed to student development. More intellectual, caring, progressive stuff. The reality--there are many in the field who don't care. Organizational change is slower. People keep dumping on people down the line. Commitment of others is lower than I expected. Even in professors, but mostly on the job. I can't say I will be in student personnel work in 40 years. I do want to be in it a while.

It appears the group had a better understanding of the field and how they might fit in than when they first arrived in Columbus. While a few felt very positive and perhaps a stronger attachment to the field in the spring, the general feeling was more of acceptance of the realities and limitations, and perhaps more commitment because of those insights. They seemed less idealistic in terms of the length of their commitment to the field in the future, but at the same time they could see more concrete methods and goals to pursue.
They also seemed willing to consider other options. One student expressed this in the following fashion.

I'm a little less committed, but more realistic. I thought student personnel work was everything. I ran into people who didn't. I thought it was a sin to consider business. People were looking at theories skeptically. I can see them changing, becoming more positive, while I'm a little less positive.

There were a few feeling noticeably less enthusiastic about the field, or increasingly uncertain. The following student's comments serve as a worthy illustration.

I used to want prominence in the field, a vice president. Now I have no such desire. I prefer an administrative position, with less student contact as I get older. A Ph.D. someday. My commitment's less. I know I can change to business or something other if I lose interest in the university. I don't want to be a vice president because you have to work more than an eight hour day. Work won't be my whole life. I've examined myself this year more than ever. Perhaps my interests are changing.

The self-awareness theme was heard on several occasions. Along with learning about the field, the students had given considerable thought to their own feelings, values, and commitments, re-evaluating previous interests, or trying to find themselves within the field. One student expressed this in the following fashion.

During fall I thought this was a helping profession. "Helping" didn't mean "developmental" then. I realized other aspects—confronting, challenging. Now I see this not as preparatory for the profession, but more personal development time for me, as well as learning things.

Another student offered pertinent commentary. I'm still very interested in student personnel work," he said. But it's so broad, with possibilities horizontally and vertically. The theories lead to a more adequate picture of myself, and that leads to questions about what I'll be happy doing."
Finally, a third student offered a different perspective. "I don't fit in the student personnel work mold here--creative, extroverted," she noted. "I don't like the jargon. If I stay in the field, I'll have to be different. . . . My reasons, though for staying in student personnel work are stronger."

Students started their second year focusing more on themselves than on the field. There was a wait-and-see attitude about their futures, as they had hoped this year would help confirm and develop their interests and abilities. Several, too, felt there were different ways of defining student personnel work professional practice. Their commitment to longer-range plans was tentative, even if their sense of personal suitability was strengthened by the first year.

Discussions during the second-quarter interviews indicated that their commitments had been strengthened during and due to this second year. One student expressed this in the following manner.

I have a much stronger commitment now. At first student personnel work was an alternative to psychology. But I had no commitment then, as I really did not know the field. Now I better appreciate it, have been successful, and feel committed. I hope I get students and help them become committed to the field.

A second student added, "I wouldn't mind being in it long-range. Last year confirmed it." A third said, "I questioned it more last year. I'm seeing a lot more to student personnel work this year. It fits together better, seeing what kinds of things are in the field. I have committed to it."
On the other hand, there were those with some uncertainty or significant doubts. One of these said, "I'm uncertain. I don't want to work with people all the time, but student personnel work requires that. I could leave student personnel work if the first job is bad."

A second added, "I'm not necessarily committed to higher education. I'm thinking of leaving student personnel work."

A third student expressed some concern about the field as a whole.

I'm more ambivalent than last fall. It's not a professional field. I don't see a lot of people operating from a student development perspective. I'm not real sure I'm interested in student personnel work. I will apply for jobs, but I'll be extremely selective. My concern is with the field, as opposed to the OSU program. I'm concerned with a university with a student personnel program but a student services division that doesn't all operate from that perspective. Maybe the program is light years ahead of where it should be.

A third type of comment revealed an interesting notion, that of commitment focused on certain value systems and related activities. One student who responded in this vein said, "My commitment is very strong to the things I do. To the activities of a student personnel worker... but not to higher education. I want it to be higher education, until the costs outweigh the benefits."

A second student further illustrated this point. "I'm committed to education," he said, "but you can promote it elsewhere--in your everyday dealings with people, wherever you are."

There seemed to be the expression of commitment or belief in a purpose, such as development of others, conditions--openness, communication--and the use of skills and training for enabling the achievement of those goals. For these students, that commitment transcended the
setting. For others, higher education was the focus. One student's comments reveal the broadest expression of this commitment, beyond student personnel work as a field.

I'm committed to the role of higher education in society and its impact on students. I believe that a lot goes on at institutions like this--academically, socially, emotionally. All of those are influenced by trained professionals working in those areas. I'm committed to that area. I want to be in it and eventually help growth in people. All those are what student personnel work is all about. It's a broader picture than practitioner.

While there was some disillusionment, students did not, except in a few instances, seem so discouraged as to leave the field entirely. Instead, their dedication to the life of a student personnel worker may have been weakened by the reality they saw. Their shorter-term commitment entering the field may have been strengthened by the heightened clarity with which they could now see that field, while long-term commitment was reduced by those same awarenesses. One student expressed her feelings about this in the following manner. "I'm back to earth," she said. I was hooked on theory last year. I was idealistic then. I was down on politics then. I learned this year. You can deal with reality without selling yourself out. You can still be idealistic."

In the final set of interviews the author explored this topic once more. Once again, commitment was reasonably firm for the present but tentative for the future. For some, the second year had reinforced their commitment, as they had come to feel more legitimate as emerging members of the field. That is, they had greater confidence that they had and could use the skills needed in the field, and that
their overall competence and ability to carry themselves suitably in an office with other professionals was confirmed. While several did mention non-student personnel work options were available to them, all but one were ready to give the field a try. A few were very firm in their desire for a long-term career in student personnel work, though they offered that financial constraints might make it necessary for them to do other things to support themselves, either separate from or in combination with the field. The following comments illustrate their state of mind at this time.

I have a tentative commitment to student personnel work and higher education, because the field only has a limited commitment to me. I'm very committed to the type of work I do. Higher education is an exciting arena—changes and students. I do want impact on "someone, somehow," other than through just personal relationships in my life.

I'm really committed now. I never questioned it. I would like to believe that what we do makes a difference. Even if someone showed me what we do is meaningless, I wouldn't care—I really like it! At least I'm not doing any harm, and I'm having fun. I would have been a very different person if not for the people I came in contact with. Some students will gain from me. I could have direct or indirect impact.

I considered interviewing with business, but I still feel strongly as when I first came here about student personnel work. I'm still infatuated with the college atmosphere, new knowledge being created, the opportunity to try new things, being able to grow by taking classes and workshops. I like working with students—they're optimistic, their life is ahead of them, and it's fun to help them with that. My goals are to help students become better people, to focus on others, to better see broad perspectives, and to care about others.

Seeing my peers get good jobs, I admire people in the field, and ____ (assistantship program director) has some impact. Student personnel workers' aims are worthwhile, and I've worked hard two years and have skills. Thus I've shifted back to student personnel work. I prefer college to social service agencies. I will feel strongly about student personnel work if I get the "right job." I will be in it as long as I enjoy it; when no longer, I will get out. It's
hard to pinpoint my purpose for being in student personnel work. I like working with students, the university setting, flexible hours, and the university calendar. I'm still a little unsure where I am.

I could go in different directions, and I'm not sure what's best. I could be a generalist in student life. Or, with the skills I've acquired, I will do non-student personnel work without trouble about not being in student personnel. Business and elsewhere have valuable experiences which wouldn't hurt if I wanted an alternative to higher education. If there were better support at the state level for institutions, I'd feel better. If institutional support for student personnel work (were there), I'd have more commitment. I don't see either here, making it easy to turn my back on student personnel. Ohio (the state of), plus there being no emphasis on student personnel work at OSU, leads me to the idea of doing other things just as rewarding. I used to rule out business because all they think about is money, plus a different lifestyle. Maybe I'm ready for a faster pace, plus working for money is not a bad thought. Plus, people wanting to pay someone with a master's degree $6,000 per year is crazy.

I realize it could turn out not to be what I wanted. It's not, thus, do or die, like it's for life. It could be frustrating, resulting in not wanting to be in it. Overall, I really believe learning about ourselves, others. How we fit in society is a process vital to enjoying life, learning that can be formal or informal. Both can happen and be improved upon. It's important for me personally but also for others. Education is vital.

A lot depends on the first couple of years experience if I stay in residence halls. I want to work in a college, with students, and offer skills and services. I see their growth based on what I've given them. It's a dynamic, fun place to be, . . . stay young. I may not make student personnel work my career for life. I've seen frustrations, bureaucracy, where you can't get things to run fast.

I decided this year what I believe in and to stand up for it. I'm realizing what commitment is and that not everybody is the same that way. I'm concerned about our profession not having a more specific code of ethics. I realized I'll have to define myself and stand up for that. I was committed to our growth and working with people in an educational setting. I still am . . . high on commitment to students and to growth. I have a greater sense of why my commitment is high, beyond intuition.
I have higher goals now. I'll not go to business. I can have an impact on people, society at large. I originally felt I'd be in it a couple of years, then go on to personnel. Now I don't feel that way. I believe in the field. It's meaningful to peoples' lives. I've seen what it's done for me and others.

Conclusion

The author observed and interacted with two classes of graduate students enrolled in a master's degree program over the span of 11 months. The report of the information gained from those interactions has been completed. The author found that the participants navigated their way through a series of challenges—intellectual, experiential, emotional, and social. From literature, practical experiences, and self-inspired introspection, they learned about the field of student personnel work and the way in which they might define their niche, goals, and commitments.

The results reported in this chapter may very well raise questions at several levels. From the data there are implications for the administrators and faculty associated with the program under scrutiny. For those concerned with the field of student personnel work, there is much to consider. Individuals with an interest and/or investment in professional socialization and education, regardless of the field, may be interested in the data. Finally, those who ponder the meaning of professions in modern society may decide to explore the implications of what has been reported.

The author, during and after the study was completed, sensed and became increasingly conversant in all of these notions. The final chapter represents the process and outcomes of the analysis suggested by the data.
CHAPTER V
Analysis and Discussion

Introduction

The results of this study can be discussed from several perspectives. There are suggestions from the data about the interaction of human factors with program structures, as well as the implications of those interactions for the field of student personnel work. There are also questions that can be raised about professions and the role of such institutions in society.

The author's plan for data interpretation initially would not restrict perspectives from emerging. Once the results were compiled and comparative analyses made, the literature would be consulted for perspective and idea generation. Since no study of this nature had been reported to date in the student personnel work literature, one which permitted the appearance of a variety of vistas and questions was in order.

However, it should be acknowledged that the individual student is the fundamental unit of analysis. This is an outcome of the manner in which the study was carried out. That is, by making individual interviews the foundation of the study, reactions and patterns of response to the educational environment are stated most definitively as individual perceptions and behaviors. The author does proceed to suggest outcomes and future research relating to broader implications,
but that which follows is mostly from the individual student's perspective.

The reader will recall that the major area of inquiry was of student identification with the field of student personnel work. The author wished to know why the students wanted to be in this field, what they wanted to be, and how strongly they felt about those goals. The data presented in the previous chapter showed that as time passed, their understanding of the field became clearer and more perspective-laden, thus allowing them to make more informed and strategic choices and commitments. Combined with the insights gained from assistantships, practica, and classwork with respect to skills, interests, and values, they were able to specify not only where they might prefer to work but how they would expect to function in those settings. The career paths they envisioned were also affected significantly by what they had learned about traditional career options. Another factor several considered was their spouses' or fiances' needs, which imposed geographical and position limitations.

When discussing their reasons for choosing student personnel work for graduate study, most said they enjoyed the higher education environment and being involved in activities which "helped" students. Some had experience as undergraduate student staff members in housing and other student services offices, which reinforced their interest in working in the university.
Early in the interviews, it became apparent that the students had different preferences for topics, activities, and types of people, both in the academic and experiential segments of the program. When they discussed their classes they presented a range of feelings about (a) the information they were receiving, (b) the way in which such information was presented, (c) the fashion in which classes were conducted, (d) the emphases given different aspects of the classes, and (e) the projects they were assigned. Similarly, their evaluative comments about assistantships, supervisors, social relationships, and the program-in-general demonstrated a wide range of opinion and strength of such opinions. Their comments about student personnel work as a field were also quite diverse. Faced with these factors, the investigator needed to begin applying the analytical process.

Managing Comparative Analyses

How the author came to understand these raw data illustrated how comparative analysis can be carried out, and, thus, how the researcher moves from observation to construct formation. The author, seeing that students were evaluating virtually every aspect of their existence, thought it potentially valuable to determine on what bases these evaluations were being made. As suggested by the methodology proposed by Schatzman and Strauss (1973), the author made observational notes to describe situations wherein students evaluated something with which they had contact or anticipated contact. An example of such a note was the following. "____ (student's name) disliked 780 because its tone was pessimistic."
As he proceeded, the author compared these notes and tried to determine their relationship. For example, he asked, "Was there something similar or dissimilar in the students' evaluative comments about the 780 class?" He found there were several reasons for liking and disliking that class. The same was true for other aspects of the program and the field of student personnel work itself. He also noted there were similarities and differences in the reasoning that underlied these differences.

Those trends sparked the development of theoretical notes, which Schatzman and Strauss (1973) suggested were helpful in developing categories and concepts. A theoretical note was a vehicle for expressing hypotheses suggested by review of the observational notes. The author investigated these notions by subsequent data review, which included new data as well as previously studied information. In this particular theoretical note he said, "There appears to be some similarity in ____'s and ____'s (students' names) thinking about this class." A second theoretical note pointed to the similarities between reasons given by these two students about two different classes. The author wondered, "Does this extend to reasoning about other parts of their lives?" A return to the data confirmed that some patterns were emerging. His next question was, "Do individual students react to their experiences in certain patterns? That is, will students evaluate the career counseling class in a manner that is similar to how they prioritize their preferences for assistantship assignments, courses, even career options?"
From this slight detour, the reader can see how one moves from data review to hypothesis development. For this author, these observations and comparisons led to the discoveries that follow.

**Professional Socialization and Discovery of Meaning**

A variety of reactions to coursework, work experience, and individuals (faculty, staff) emerged from the interviews. The following is a review of their patterns.

"Practicality"

Students frequently declared that they felt very positive about an experience or a course because it was "practical." That is, they felt they could use the information in actual work situations, and thus could improve their performance in their roles as student personnel work trainees.

This was particularly prevalent when first-year students reported their reactions to the counseling lab and group procedures course. They pointed to how they could use what they were learning in situations they were facing in the residence halls. Even if they were not intending to be counselors, the practice and feedback they had received led them to believe that they could be more effective in situations which called for the use of such skills.

The author also noted that some students were pleased with information they received in their classes because it clarified issues or defined previously vague notions about student personnel work. On the other hand, some disapproved of the very same classes because, in their estimation, they did not go far enough in defining the field.
A second basis for evaluation was the amount of hands-on experience provided while learning. Doing something, as opposed to reading about, hearing, or witnessing it, was preferred. For this reason, some were more positive about the counseling lab than the counseling theory course. Similarly, there were those with a wait-and-see attitude about student development theory. They needed to witness its actual use, or apply it themselves in a work situation before embracing it as a valuable element of the field.

It thus became apparent to the author that many students had an immediate, hands-on focus with regard to the assignment of value to program-related experiences. The author wondered if this inclination represented a general tendency that characterized them as people-in-general, as opposed to being strictly a field-related orientation. That is, how people determined value in program experiences might have been based on their personality structures, learning styles, and associated needs. For example, how one interpreted an event, such as the leadership lab, might have been reflective of a relatively stable personality trait or learning orientation that could have influenced the individual to react to other experiences similarly. According to this line of thinking, students might value a particular class segment highly because the instructor includes several experiences which prepared them to handle problems in the residence hall. Those same students might also favorably rate certain housing administrators because they demonstrated methods of handling current problems, rather than proposing philosophical questions about the issues inherent in
those problems. They might also choose to focus on certain aspects of a course which includes experiential learning, while downplaying the importance of others which stress philosophical or theoretical inquiry.

The interviews and observations provided hints that such tendencies were, in fact, real. The author found he was able to predict that certain students would react positively or negatively to upcoming elements of the program, based on the way in which they commented on previous experiences. In fact, several individuals described themselves using adjectives that the author had speculatively assigned to them.

"Knowledge for Knowledge's Sake"

The author noted three students who seemed to value learning experiences primarily because they expanded their store of knowledge. Instead of being concerned with how to solve a particular current problem, they were happy to learn for the sake of learning, and to both satisfy and challenge their intellectual curiosity. That is not to say they were opposed to or disappointed by practical, experiential learning. However, they were more concerned with expanding their lode of information in order to know and understand more.

"Self-Improvement"

There were a few students who resembled the previous group to some degree, but the thrust of their value assignments differed. They valued experiences because the "improved" them as human beings. Whether or not they used these improvements did not appear to be as crucial. It was almost assumed they would help others by nature of this improvement.
"Philosophical Consideration"

Value was assigned by some students to situations and experiences because they stimulated thinking about broader issues. While these students did not reject the usefulness of practical and immediate solutions and related skills, they enjoyed and sought out the broader issues. In fact, they seemed to prefer questions over answers.

"Marketability"

Still others valued experiences because they prepared them for professional responsibilities. The primary reason to enjoy or seek out an experience was often to enhance one's marketability for an upcoming career. Again, all students considered the post-graduate school market in one way or another, but for some that took on greater importance in their decisions about courses, assistantships, and practica.

Here the author must raise a cautionary flag. There were no pure types, and overlap was considerable. Such should be expected, as this group had significant internal similarity in background and motivation. In some cases, "types" were represented by one or two people, who were so noticeable that they defined tendencies that were seen in lesser amounts in others.

Nevertheless, it was apparent to the author that personal style and value systems had a great deal of influence on how students evaluated their program inputs, and subsequently how they charted their course within the program. The following examples illustrate this phenomenon.
Student Number One. This student indicated in her first interview that she had chosen student personnel work because it was necessary in order to get the type of job she wanted. While she liked the college environment and being helpful to others, she wanted housing work, and a student personnel work degree was required. She described herself as a person who "loved organizing things" and liked having autonomy and authority. Early in the first year she was willing to make strongly worded critical judgements of instructors and administrators, with a tone that could be categorized as harsh and uncompromising. She said that her relationship with her supervisor was positive because he "left me alone to do my job." In commenting about the student development theory emphasis in the program, she first said, "I don't care how they develop. I just care how they check into my hall." To her, the introductory student personnel work class was a "waste," because she did not wish to consider ideas which differed from her positive feelings about the field. This person was very positive about the counseling lab, because it improved the skill she could and had used outside of class, particularly in her residence hall job. At the same time, the counseling lecture was not useful because she was not going into counseling psychology, and thus did not need all the theory. She "loved" her assistantship, which, in her words, was "keeping me here." Classes certainly were not such a magnet. She said, in fact, "I don't like reading--I'm practical-oriented."

While this was not a person typical of most in the program, she demonstrated attitudes and stylistic orientations which were seen to some degree in several. Due to her extreme and strongly worded
position, there was a clear internal consistency in her comments and actions. In her second interview, she said her supervisor was being professional when he was "task-oriented." She wanted a second year in residence halls because such was needed to get a hall director job after graduation. Her adviser, in her words, was "off the wall" because he did not deal with the immediate present or practical situations, but instead threw out for her consideration abstract ideas. Her comment about herself was, "I'm not an intellectual, and thus student development theory is not attractive." Yet, she was finding some value in theory, because it was "applicable" in some situations.

In her last interview, she expanded her position about theory. "I hate theory," she said, "but I see it's practical. I like information I can use myself." She continued to offer commentary on her own style without its begin solicited by the investigator. "I'm a practical, common-sense person. I'm organized with papers. I'm always done early. I'm efficient and dislike disorganization."

Commenting on her learning style, she offered this appraisal. "I benefit from courses where I can take material and integrate it to my style and personalize it." Discussing her career goals, she indicated that her original goals had not changed since coming to the university. She was not worried about future jobs then, as she was "now-oriented." At the same time, she recognized that her perspective was somewhat constricted, and that her supervisor was helpful in showing her "how to see the bigger picture."
What might be said of this person? Here was an individual who demonstrated an orientation to learning and value that was very distinctive and clearly defined. She had decided to go after a certain type of job, and it was thus a logical choice to pursue a degree that would qualify her for it. Her strong determination and self-reliance led to resistance to aspects of the program which dealt with topics that her value system ruled out. She saw and accepted herself as being a non-intellectual, and thus offered no apologies for "hating theory," which was a very desirable aspect of the program for a large number of students. There was a consistent and soon predictable pattern of reactions and responses to her environment.

Student Number Two. This individual was quite different. He admired and liked the same academic adviser to whom Student Number One had been assigned for the very same reasons she had disliked him. That is, he enjoyed "bouncing around ideas" and having this person "challenge" him. He liked learning about theory, a preference which he traced back to his social science undergraduate major. He preferred the lecture style over experiential learning, and especially liked the introductory student personnel work course, because it allowed him to "sample ideas and throw out ideas." He admired intellectual and academic ability, indicating that people he most admired had such strengths. He had enjoyed his undergraduate major because it allowed him to choose many electives, and in a similar fashion he hoped his second-year assistantship would allow him freedom to do new things and explore the field. While both he and the previous student preferred
administrative duties, he wanted to explore options and remain open about the future, while Student Number One had set her mind to one type of job.

In this third interview, as with common with many, Student Number Two was more revealing about himself. He indicated how he enjoyed the "skepticism" he saw in others, especially that expressed in a class he was taking with his adviser. He continued to remain open about his future, defining career goals as "generalist," "vice president," or "dean." He was also concerned about integrating school and personal needs, as to him student personnel work was a way of life, not just a career.

Here, too, was a person who demonstrated a consistency and predictability in his response pattern. He enjoyed activities and people for very different reasons than the first student, but his responses all bore a relationship to each other according to his particular theme. His view of a career, the field of student personnel work, and other people was quite consistent. His personal style, which struck the author as removed or distant, forced or allowed him to consider alternatives, avoid specific commitments, and to explore different and new ideas. He enjoyed people, coursework, and jobs that allowed such to take place.

The author was not surprised about how open he was in regards to his future. He took an almost removed, clinical stance when evaluating things in his environment. This also characterized his social life. He had not been close with his peers as an undergraduate, feeling more like a student administrator than a peer. He was also not
close with many students in the student personnel work program.

Finally, when responding to a question about intentional student development, he not only considered the issue in terms of its ethical implications, but in an academic fashion as well. He noted that he and a peer had speculated about the ethical and theoretical appropriateness of a specific student development theory that was related to this question. He was also one of the few participants in the study to offer an analysis of the author's study from an academic posture. He wondered at the end of his last interview where the study was heading, and noted how it related to the research methodology of a theorist who had been studied in the theory class.

**Student Number Three.** The next student differed dramatically from the previous two. Her strongest and most clearly articulated tendency was to be deeply concerned about others' welfare. As did many others in the study, she saw college as a center for learning, knowledge, and freedom of ideas. In fact, her identification with student personnel work, throughout her three quarters, was never clearly linked to any specific setting or future.

What emerged, instead, was the portrait of a person who preferred one-to-one helping contact with others, avoided "organization," and preferred establishing close, meaningful relationships with others. Her reactions to the leadership lab were that the experiences were "neat," and that she liked the fact that it allowed her to establish close relationships so quickly. She, as Student Number One, valued the practicality of the group procedures course and counseling lab, but for
different reasons. While Student Number One appreciated that these experiences allowed her to handle specific residence hall problems, the latter was more gratified by the positive feelings that emanated from the relationships that were enhanced by those experiences and the skills that emerged. She noted that her supervisor was hard to get used to at first because he was not a "counseling/feeling type." She claimed that she spent much more time in her assistantship on counseling, while letting paper work pile up. She was more interested in individual development than administration or organizational development.

The tendencies expressed in her first interview persisted throughout the remaining two. In addition, her lack of assuredness surfaced as a key theme. In her first interview, she confessed to her initial terror at Ohio State University, a reaction she said was typical of her. She spoke without confidence, particularly as regards to her counseling ability. She indicated a strong concern that she was too non-directive in the residence halls, giving students and staff too much freedom. Her future remained unclear as well. She was only able to repeat her initial interest in working with "young kids," and a future devoted to an impact on young peoples' lives.

It is not safe to say that all of these factors—reduced confidence, preference for low structure, concern for personal needs of others, career indecision—were closely related, but it would not be unreasonable to speculate such to be the case. That was reinforced in the third interview, where she noted she truly needed the second year of the program to increase her confidence by learning in a "safe" setting.
When discussing her performance to date, she revealed that she was "not usually overly optimistic at first." In previous jobs, she had had a similar reaction, "beginning with no confidence and eventually feeling very confident." She continued, "It took me more than one quarter to feel confident about school--but that's my style." This was, in fact, not typical of the assistantship students. Only the part-time and full-time non-assistantship students had expressed such a delayed sense of academic competence.

Certainly it was no great discovery that self-confidence might affect one's willingness to choose a career direction. What was apparently significant was how an internally consistent pattern of feelings, values, and behaviors appeared and were interwoven with how the individuals perceived and acted upon their environment. This complex but persistent relationship between personal style and career development suggested broader issues which are explored later in this chapter.

**Students Number Four.** Yet another dimension emerged in the interviews with these two students, one from each class. In both the author sensed increasingly with each successive interview a kind of entrepreneurial orientation. The first was quite outspoken and admitted he was "cocky." The second was more restrained in his presentation, but in his last interview acknowledged what the author had been suspecting all along--his entrepreneurial tendencies. This trait was conspicuous in these two students, partially because it was not common in the
overall group, who might have been characterized as more altruistic in their motives. Neither of these two said that they did not care about others' needs, but both came forward and reported actions and goals which indicated they had strong needs for their own advancement. The first-year student exhibited a very self-confident style that seemed appropriate for a marketing, sales-oriented position, and, in fact, he talked about working in the public relations sector of the university. The second planned to develop consulting skills that would lead to extra money or, if necessary, a career outside the university. He claimed he had always been somewhat of an entrepreneur, and most likely would continue in this fashion.

**Student Number Five.** The last student of whom the author will speak, and who also had a counterpart in the other class, exhibited tendencies and attributes which resembled parts of a few individuals, but emerged as another, more distinct type. He manifested a subdued but noticeable intensity in his interviews as he attempted to think carefully about the questions being posed. This style seemed to relate to the deep commitment he felt to his academic work and involvement with developmental theory, which he hoped to continue after graduation. In his interviews he spoke with great commitment and seriousness about his work, and he hoped his career would allow him to develop and apply knowledge in this arena. It was interesting that he was serving as a kind of mentor and inspiration to a first-year student who was giving evidence of similar interests,
Personal Orientation and Career

Stylistic/value tendencies were emerging in all the people in the study, some perhaps less dramatic than those portrayed, but almost all internally consistent. These emerging personal orientations also appeared to interact with career interests and aspirations. That is, that which the students wished to pursue in the field not only related to their personal styles but to their previous interests as well. This was evident early in the study in both classes. Many were relating undergraduate majors, values, hobbies, and interests to their futures, both in combination with student personnel work and other fields.

Academic Interests. A few examples are worth citing for illustrative purposes. Two students, one first- and one second-year, noted how they had significant previous interest in international relations. The latter chose practica which exposed her in greater depth to that domain, and her assistantship included that population as well. Her hope was to forge a career which included either a college office dealing with that population, or international relations work in organizations outside of higher education. The second had similar goals as well.

Several students cited previous academic interests in personnel, communications, and industrial relations. They talked about the option of using their newly developed skills in dealing with human relations issues, counseling, and training and development in the private sector. One student, a sociology/psychology major as an undergraduate, began to consider a career which involved teaching social psychology or student development theory. A student from a health field wondered how she could combine that interest with the college setting,
addressing herself to "wellness" issues and health education programming.

**Personal Interests.** For many, their undergraduate majors were not as important as their personal interests, and they gave some consideration to how they could incorporate the latter in their careers. Three students with strong religious convictions considered working in religious institutions. One thought of working for campus ministries, or serving in a non-campus religious organization. One student, who had been active in the Boy Scouts, considered serving in a managerial position for that organization, using his training and counseling skills in that capacity. One woman with strong interests in sports considered practica and career options dealing with athletes. Finally, a student with a strong prior interest in horseback riding speculated about administering a riding program!

**Life Histories.** Some students also based their goals on topics related to their own life histories. Two individuals, both older, returning students, considered jobs with re-entry students, either in community colleges or in four-year institutions. One student with strong concerns about women's needs saw herself working in an office catering to those issues. A third individual, interested in the rights of minorities and the culturally different, sought practica and an assistantship which would bring her in contact with such populations.

**Personalities.** The author encountered a few students whose self-confidence and decision-making styles had the strongest influence on their view of a career in the field. These individuals preferred not
to commit themselves to any specific career direction, because they were either afraid to make a choice or uncomfortable being "narrowed down." They typically called themselves "generalists" or "confused." On the other hand, there were those who preferred to remain generalists because they were very independent and thus refused to be tied to one specific direction or, for that matter, any one field.

Situations. A few students had hopes of attaining a higher level position in the distant future. Therefore, they wanted a general position after graduation that would get them started down that road. Some of these wanted specific jobs, but due to geographic and relationship-related limitations they felt they had to remain open to anything at first.

Propositions

The author will now summarize and bring structure to the themes just presented to the reader. In addition, he will elaborate on the analytical processes that led him to these propositions. Such is important for both illustrative purposes and guidance to future research, given the absence of statistical data.

Proposition One. "Students determine what to learn, how to function, and who to emulate in the field of student personnel work based on individual orientations to interpretation of value and meaning in their environments."

The author initially asked all participants to describe their experiences in all facets of the program. He asked them to talk about classroom experiences, assistantship assignments, relationships
with others, perceptions of the field of student personnel work, and future goals. He then grouped their responses according to those empirical categories for the purpose of describing the program as it was encountered and perceived by the participants.

In the process of doing so he began to notice that the students not only reported their experiences but evaluated them as well. They discussed why they did or did not approve of a staff member, a class session, et cetera. The fact that their evaluations differed suggested that there were different bases to those evaluations. Thus emerged a general category--"determination of value."

With this development the author began to code comments according to how the students assigned value to the content areas upon which they were commenting. As an example of one of the multitude of his observational analyses, he noted that a particular student felt the leadership lab was a positive experience because he had learned how to conduct workshops, which he felt would be useful in residence hall work. The same student said he preferred the counseling lab to the counseling class because the former provided skills which he could use with troublesome students in the residence hall.

At this point the author made an observational note based on his review of these two comments. The student had been positive about two separate experiences because they both contributed to his ability to do his job as an assistant hall director. The author then compared other comments by this student to the tentative category, which he had labelled "practical." (The reader should note that comparisons
had progressed from between incidents to incident-to-category.) The author then noted that the student felt his supervisor should be complimented because from her he had learned how to handle "difficult situations." This provided support to this new category.

In order to sustain and perhaps move beyond this category, the author reviewed the comments of other students. Were there other themes that governed how those students evaluated their program-related experiences? The author found that other bases of evaluation existed, as explained in the previous section of this chapter. He also found that they, too, were consistent. That is, these evaluative frames of reference were not issue specific.

The author then went one step further. "What," he wondered, "was the significance of these evaluative categories? Did they have any relationship with the socialization process he was studying?" These questions led the author to compare the students of particular categories to career interests and goals. He found that individuals preferred to assume certain roles in the field of student personnel work that bore resemblance to these evaluative predilections. For example, students with pronounced entreprenurial value systems tended to seek opportunities to engage in activities which might make them more "marketable." Those with a strong "knowledge for knowledge sake" orientation tended to be attracted to futures that involved opportunities to do research, teach, and pursue scholarly endeavors.

It is unnecessary to review how each category was developed. It suffices to say that the result of this data management sequence was the proposition which headed this section.
Proposition Two. "Students will construct personalized definitions of the field of student personnel work based on prior academic interests, personal interests, life histories, and self-confidence."

This second proposition was, in a sense, an outgrowth of Proposition One. The author had determined that individual value orientations contributed significantly to how individuals ascribed importance to functions and roles within the field of student personnel work. Thus it had been suggested that internal definitions had significance for professional socialization. This led the author to consider how students defined the content areas in which they had interest. He found that such interests were expressed in other terms. Some individuals' reasons for pursuing a particular career area were based on past academic interests. For example, one student wanted to become an international student adviser because she had majored in international relations in college. On the other hand, some students wanted to work with international students because they had a personal commitment to furthering cross-cultural understanding. Their comments resulted in a category relating to "life histories." As presented previously, other categories emerged as well.

Finally, the author noted the manner in which such occupational interests were presented. Rather than simply saying, "I want to be a career counselor," or "I want to be an international student adviser," the students presented a combination of elements that would define their future jobs. In other words, they were constructing a position. This active posture took place not only within the framework of higher
education but outside as well. The reader will recall the students who spoke about using human relations skills in the business arena. The common thread was the active role of personalized career definition. That theme arose after a great deal of comparison and reflection resulted in the development of Proposition Two.

Proposition Three. "Those students who identify with student personnel work as a broad field will have the most tentative commitment; conversely, those with the most decisive commitment will identify with specific subsets of the field but not with the field in general."

This proposition was not produced by constant comparative analysis but was an outgrowth of the categories already established. That is, the author, when inquiring about perceived future relationships to the field of student personnel work, discovered that students' goals were assignable to different categories relating to specificity of interest. That is, some individuals claimed they identified with being "women's specialists" or "student development theoreticians," as opposed to "student personnel worker." At the same time, the author noted that those students who responded in that fashion acted confident about such designation.

Conversely, those students who saw themselves as student personnel workers could not verbalize a specific topical identification. They were uncertain of their future in the field and thus approached the future hoping to discover where they might best fit. Again, it must be stressed that they did see themselves as emerging student personnel workers.
The grounded development of these propositions fostered a great deal of confidence in their validity. In addition, from his multitude of comparisons and related conjecture the author considered several broader possibilities. Having reviewed a significant amount of professional socialization literature, there was the temptation to make analogies between those reports and the situation that unfolded in this particular study.

However, both the limits imposed by the author's research strategy and the data which emerged precluded the development of theoretical propositions beyond the three just reviewed. While this can be frustrating, it is crucial that the researcher be cognizant of his/her limitations in order to avoid "misusing" the grounded methodology.

Discussion

Individual and Career. Thus far, the study has revealed a group of students with a marked diversity in interests, goals, values, and personality/style orientations. Despite the inter-subject diversity, there were intra-subject patterns of thought, action, and feeling relating to these issues which were quite internally consistent. This was especially true regarding identification of value in practical experiences, academic learning opportunities, people, and career planning. As a result, people constructed career goals which were a function of their interaction with the organization/university, specifically the product of their active interpretation of that environment and how it related to "self."
The author felt that the internal patterns seen in individuals might suggest group patterns of a similar nature. However, more specific and extensive data particular to that suggestion are needed in order that those or any other patterns be established with acceptable confidence. One is also reminded that these students were heading towards a set of careers much less clearly defined than those being considered by students in most of the professional socialization studies reported in the literature. It is conceivable that lack of definition restrains the formation of easily distinguishable group patterns. Finally, it is also possible that the striking diversity in the students' directions and patterns of thought and action was partially an outcome of the author's research approach, which placed a strong emphasis on individual interviews. A study in which observation plays a greater part might tend to facilitate perception and evolution of group patterns.

In any event, the interactive approach suggested by individual patterns and group trends is the fundamental premise to the career development perspective upon which Schein (1978) based his discussion of individuals, organizations, and career development. In his study of the career development of alumni of a graduate business program, he noticed patterns in the reasons given for career-related decisions. From these he postulated the concept of career anchor. A career anchor is a set of "driving and constraining forces on career decisions and choices" (p. 125). These are based on the interaction among abilities, motives and needs, attitudes, and values in the total self-concept.
One comes to "want and value that which we are good at, and we improve our abilities in those things we value" (p. 126). Schein added that these anchors are a function of self-evaluations, but do depend on opportunities to test oneself in "real" work situations.

Schein (1978) continued by discussing the role of the career anchor in the individual's work life.

The career anchor functions in the person's work life as a way of organizing experience, identifying one's area of contribution in the long run, generating criteria for kinds of work settings in which one wants to function, and identifying patterns of ambition and criteria for success by which one will measure oneself. As we will see, people really differ in how they view their careers, even from a fairly homogeneous background such as graduate management school. (pp. 127-128)

Schein (1978) found five types of career anchors in his study. These were: (a) technical/functional competence, in which the primary concern in making career choices and decisions is on the actual technical or functional content of the work being done; (b) managerial competence, where one prioritizes a combination of competencies which lead to higher level general management careers; (c) security/stability, where one is concerned more about remaining in the organization and/or geographical area of the country; (d) creativity, where one needs autonomy to build or create one's own product; and (e) autonomy and independence, where the chief motivation is to be maximally free of organizational restraints to pursue professional or technical/functional competence. Schein also suggested that other anchors might be imagined, such as service to others, power, influence and control, variety, and basic identity.
Schein (1978) believed that the five anchors revealed through his study might have applicability beyond these business people. To demonstrate his point, he applied them to a study of the development of policemen's careers done by Van Maanen (1973). What was most important from Van Maanen's study, though, was the notion that one could conceive of "careers within careers." That is, there are "types" of people within a field, based on their career anchors. In other words, people in the same occupational environment may create for themselves different definitions of careers, manifest behaviors related to those definitions, and forge career paths according to their attitudes, goals, abilities, and values--their career anchors.

In summary, career anchors reflect the underlying needs and motives which persons bring into adulthood. They reflect values and, most important, discovered talents. Schein (1978) wrote about this in the following manner.

It is the process of integration into the total self-concept what one sees oneself to be more or less competent at, wanting out of life, one's value system, and the kind of person one is that begins to determine the major life an occupational choices throughout adulthood. The career anchor is a learned part of the self-image, which combines self-perceived motives, values, and talents. What one learns is not only a function of what one brings to the work situation, but also reflects the opportunities provided and the feedback obtained. (p. 171)

Certainly there is reason to consider the relevance of Schein's (1978) concept for describing and understanding what has been revealed in the current study. However, while Schein suggested that career anchors have broad occupational applicability, this author would not try to "fit" student personnel work students into those particular
career anchors. Given the particular nature of student personnel work and the students it attracts, it would be wiser to seek to determine the career anchors which are indigenous to this field. As the author will suggest later in this chapter, research of this nature may provide important information and insights for practitioners, educators, and high level administrators.

One caution should be raised, however. Schein (1978) stated that a career anchor requires "real" work experience. The students in the current study did not clearly state if they felt their experiences qualified as such. Several did say that they felt they would be student personnel workers only after they began in full-time positions after graduation. There was also a sense that the status and recognition that accompanied their work as graduate assistants was subprofessional. The reader may recall the comments of one second-year student, who remarked, "We are professionals of convenience. We do the work of a student personnel worker but get paid as graduate students." On the other hand, their appraisal of their assistantships, particularly in the second year, indicated that they felt the experience was career-specific, called for the use of significant career-related skills, provided responsibility, and granted autonomy.

Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that existence of career anchors can be determined at the graduate level. However, one would have to carefully appraise the nature of students' work responsibilities to determine if they truly provided opportunities for self-testing that are necessary for development of career anchors. In addition,
studies of people already working in the field would be an important aspect of research about career anchors in student personnel work, particularly if one wished to be confident about the meaning of results gained from studies of graduate students.

Commitment and Career. Subtle differences were noticeable in the emphases underlying career planning and commitment. Some students considered working in a non-student personnel work setting but engaging in activities and seeking the types of outcomes being addressed in their educational program. These settings were determined by previous or newly-found interests. For them, the essence of their program was what they learned to do and the underlying human development they sought to foster. The degree of their disappointment in student personnel work, geographical limitations, concern with low salaries in the field, and the strength of previous interests were related to the force with which they considered working outside the field.

Ambition, too, was an important factor. Those with the strongest and longest-term commitments either had formed very specific areas of interest which they wished to pursue to the hilt, or had broad ambitions for higher level work.

However, there were very few who had a powerful, long-range career commitment to student personnel work. Those with the highest and strongest commitments tended to define those commitments to topics, such as student development theory, housing, and international education. The majority were saying, in effect, that they wanted to give the field a try, were aware of other possibilities, and would decide in the
future just where they would head. For now, they would prefer certain types of positions, would perhaps accept residence life assignments, and hoped that the experience of their first job would facilitate a decision later on about a career in the field.

While many students talked about careers and first jobs which were related to their particular needs, histories, and values, actual job pursuit reflected a resignation, to some extent, to the realities of the job market and other personal commitments. Regardless of specificity of need and strength of commitment, there was a tacit acknowledgement that getting a job might require some compromises. In fact, the first job was seen by most as an opportunity to take on the professional role and see how the field "fit," to grow professionally, and see where things led. Those few who wanted a high level job in the future knew there were many steps to be taken, including additional education, and thus considered the first job as merely a start. Those with very specific interests saw endpoints which were attainable in shorter time spans and really considered nothing further. In between were a number of individuals who had neither specific short-term interests nor long-range plans. They believed in the underlying importance of student personnel work and wanted to begin in that arena. They saw other avenues as possible if family and economic conditions required such change.

For the majority, in fact, the commitment was not to a specific profession but to two underlying purposes—human development, and helping others enrich their lives. They valued the college environment, and they enjoyed doing the things they had learned during their
master's degree program, that is, workshops, counseling, administration, group leadership, teaching, consulting, and research. Their identification, it seemed, was with the social purpose of employing these skills to stimulate and support the growth of others. Certainly, there was an attraction to the college setting and the freshness of college students. Very few, however, refused to consider plying their grade with other populations, such as business, for they believed that human development could be facilitated outside the college setting.

What, then, does this say about the experience of these individuals? Had they become socialized to the field? Were they members of a profession? In essence, had they approached the field, assumed its roles, digested these inputs, and emerged as professionals?

This is a most perplexing problem. Student personnel work is a field that is hard to define in a precise manner. From one perspective, it is an assortment of roles, knowledges, and settings that, depending on the particular institution, are considered part of a student personnel work, academic, or administrative domain. While a core knowledge (student development theory) and technologies have emerged in the last 15 years, they are not universally embraced in higher education.

If such diversity and uncertainty are real, then how does one define professionalization in that context? How can one develop a strong identification with a profession that is hard to define? Why would students define themselves as student personnel workers when many
people in their lives and future work might not know what that meant? (In point of fact, when asked how they would introduce themselves at a party where no one knew them, several remarked that they would not call themselves student personnel workers, because they expected that no one would understand them. Instead, they would call themselves dorm directors, college administrators, or counselors.)

This is not to say that there was no sense of identity or community. Reading field-specific journals, attending professional conferences, and, especially, having accepted positions gave several the feeling they were becoming members of the field, part of a greater entity. In other words, there was a "thing" out there, student personnel work, to which they felt some allegiance and commitment, even if only tentative. However, as the author stressed, it was very hard to determine if the commitment and identity was with a field/profession or a set of programs and practices.

**Professions and Professionalization**

**Introduction**

Early data review raised questions about professions. In particular, what are professions, and was there something special or different in this study that had some bearing on the process the author had been witnessing?

Some ideas were suggested by observations the author made which took place long before any interviews began. First, as pointed out in the previous chapter, the students were very quickly granted admission to the field as professionals by the program administrators...
who conducted and participated in the orientation sessions for the entering class. The reader will recall how academic and housing administrators eagerly welcomed and embraced these students as colleagues and professionals. Very quickly, these students were placed in situations where they were forced to assume postures similar to those of their teachers and supervisors, that is, critiquing the behaviors of others, making presentations, processing groups, and training and supervising staff. They were also participating in meetings with full-time staff where policy decisions were being made, and they were being asked to contribute to those outcomes. Within six weeks they had ostensibly progressed from inductees to functioning colleagues.

Second, the language and actions being modelled by the program leaders suggested that certain values and behaviors were very desirable. In effect, they were the essence of being a student personnel worker—dealing with human growth, using honest and direct communication, sensitivity, a desire to learn, and a commitment to collaborative behavior. To be a student personnel worker, it seemed, meant to foster conditions and act in a way that helped others learn about themselves, communicate with others, and solve problems. Everyone had the potential to grow, and the better one understood oneself, the more capable one was of functioning effectively as a leader, counselor, teacher, processor, and team member.

Thus, there appeared to be a blend of value, technique, role definition, personal/educational growth, and immediacy. It seemed that the students were being taught, perhaps indirectly, that to be a
student personnel worker, one had to grow as a person as well as help others grow, and thus one's identity as a student personnel worker depended partially on how one's own persona emerged. Furthermore, the apparent speed with which one was granted admission as a professional and placed in a position of expertness could have given the subtle message that professional definition and identity was not strictly defined and guarded by "the field" but left to the member's discretion.

These notions took on greater and more vivid life when students were developing their career goals, commitments, and definitions of their niches in student personnel work. Did they relate, perhaps, to the strikingly individualized professional development patterns of the participants? That is, did this particular program influence trainees to see student personnel work as a matter of individual preference and definition, thus allowing them to commit themselves to others' growth by seeking and defining their own?

The evidence was compelling enough to give that hypothesis serious attention. Furthermore, since there was an underlying value espoused by the program and most of its members--development of others as human beings to more advanced and thus more "competent" stages of development, that is, self-actualization--one could help people realize their potential in a variety of settings both within and outside of higher education.

How, one might ask, could anyone call that professional socialization? Does it not seem that the students were taking literary license, so to speak, with the field and ignoring its "reality?" How could this
program be preparing student personnel work professionals when it seemed to be turning out individuals who had a greater allegiance to principals and practices rather than the locations in which they would be working, and, through occupational plans, were making the field in their own personalized image?

One might consider the ways in which second-year students thought about the job search and the field as a whole. So many had said that they wanted to begin a career in student personnel work, but recognized the uncertainty of its future and its remunerative shortcomings. The field was not held in high esteem, and it had much incompetence and ill-prepared practitioners. They had to be ready to embrace other options. At the same time, they did feel strongly about the underlying purposes of the field.

Could it have been, then, that these students were being socialized to a field that discouraged strong allegiance? It could not clearly define itself, and so it said, in essence, that to join this field, one should become committed to certain purposes which clearly were not limited to higher education. Being a student personnel worker meant dealing with students, but being a student was no longer limited to any one age or setting. Learning takes place in business and government, for young and old. Student personnel workers were, in essence, people personnel workers, who chose to work in a college because they liked that setting and enjoyed its occupants. However, if jobs were not available, they could ply their trade elsewhere.
Most of all, while most wished to take a job in the field of student personnel work, their strongest identification was with roles, skills, and a general educational mission. Their commitment to this field was not necessarily greater than when they entered the program, but it was clearer. That is, with a better understanding of what the field was, they could define what they wanted to do and how strongly they felt about such goals. It was also clearer how their commitment to certain educational ideals were not restricted to higher education.

In a sense, then, these students were trained in a set of practices and roles that did not inherently define and limit them to specific organizational settings. They had also developed abilities, gained new understandings about higher education and specific organizations within, and perhaps most of all had become more mature. Part of that maturity was job maturity. That is, many, when describing how they were more professional after one or two years, were defining vocational maturity. They were better at speaking before groups, managing time, and making decisions. In addition, they had learned how to use counseling techniques, group leadership skills, and apply them in work situations. The result was greater confidence that they could function in a student personnel work job after they graduated.

This does not suggest, then, that there is no profession of student personnel work, and that no socialization took place. On the contrary, if a field has vague boundaries and definitions, how better to socialize trainees than to help them develop roots that are not dependent on one particular concrete definition, setting, or role. Let them learn values, techniques, and attitudes which allow them to
survive in the vagueness and challenges of the field, while keeping in mind that they can ascribe to purposes nobler than those they may temporarily confront in a less than enlightened work situation or group of colleagues. By being allowed and encouraged to create their own definitions of their roles, they are much better equipped to function in this field.

Defining Professions

Some serious liberties were being taken with the concept of profession. The independence in student personnel work identity creation and commitment exhibited by these students did not necessarily mean that professional socialization could be viewed in such a liberal fashion.

The emergence of this issue dictated that serious attention be given to that area of the literature. The author refrained from including such information until this point in the report. The importance of this information for the study demanded that the reader, much as the author himself, be allowed to see the results without the "colored lenses" this information might have imposed over their line of sight.

Much debate, beginning with Flexner (1915), has centered around the definition of professions. Concern has been expressed about which occupations should be called professions and according to what criteria. Freidson (1983), in reviewing this literature, suggested there are two distinct definitions which can be confused. First, there is the one that suggests a broad collection of prestigious but varied occupations
whose members are highly educated and are identified more by educational status than occupational skills. Second, a profession can be seen as a limited number of occupations which have specific institutional and ideological traits in common. The latter "represents much more than only a status, for it produces distinctive occupational identities and exclusionary market shelters which set each occupation apart (and often in opposition to) the others" (p. 23).

Freidson (1983) noted that the two differ notably with regards to their relevance to present-day industrial society. The former concept, one of a broadly educated "stratum," is vague, and it can be applied quite easily to most industrialized nations. In fact, the increased access to higher education for the middle and lower socioeconomic classes in the past 75 years has contributed to a proliferation of these groups. Nevertheless, most writings about the professions, while perhaps in reaction to this expansion, have focused on the latter definition—a small number of occupations which share characteristics more specific than higher education and which are distinctive as separate occupations. The members of these professions define themselves first as "members." Only later might they conceive of themselves by their class. The difficulty has and continues to be how to arrive at an institutional concept of profession that is clearly applicable to the range of occupations under this domain (p. 23).

Occupations labelled professions in the English language were born of the medieval universities of Europe. These were three in number—medical, law, and the clergy. The last included university teaching.
These not only had occupational specificity but higher status. The development of capitalist industrialism in England and the United States in the 19th and 20th century led to confusion about the definition of professionalism, as the newly emerging middle-class occupations sought the title of profession. Its "gentlemanly" status was desirable. Furthermore, and perhaps of greater importance, being recognized as a profession provided the members protection from competition in the labor market. Having specialized skills, knowledge, and importance to society allowed for the claim of privilege, self-governance, and thus protection.

Given these developments, interest in the definition of profession grew. The initial stimulus for the writings that have been published in the 20th century can be traced back to the work of Flexner (1915). He claimed that professions were composed of six major elements, namely (a) intellectual operations coupled with significant individual responsibility, (b) raw materials drawn from science and learning, (c) practical application of such information in serving others, (d) an educationally communicable technique, (e) a tendency towards self-organization, and (f) an increasingly altruistic motivation. This was also the forerunner of what has been called the "attribute" approach to defining professions, wherein one seeks to identify the attributes which characterize a profession and thus apply them to different occupations to see if those occupations qualify. This came to its "ultimate" fruition in the work of Greenwood (1957), who is most often cited in this regard. He claimed there were five essential characteristics of a profession, which were: (a) a systematic body of
knowledge; (b) professional authority, that is, being able to dictate what is good for the client; (c) sanction of the community, that is, the profession is allocated the permission of society to control training, licensing, confidentiality, and freedom from community intervention in judging technical matters; (d) a regulative code of ethics with which to restrict abuses by professionals of their freedoms; and (e) a professional culture which includes the values, norms, and symbols of the profession.

Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933) attempted to arrive at a definition of profession but felt that such was untenable. They did, however, feel it was possible to list a "complex of characteristics" which the recognized professions of that time seemed to have. These included (a) lengthy and specialized intellectual training to develop a technique, (b) the use of this to perform a service to the community for a fee, (c) a sense of responsibility for the technique, and (d) the development of associations for testing competence and enforcing standards of conduct. They felt that some occupations that were commonly considered professions may have lacked one or more of these characteristics. Accordingly, they differentiated four major types of professions in modern society: (a) "established"—law, medicine, church—based on theoretical notions and bound by certain modes of behavior; (b) "new"—based on their own fundamental studies, that is, engineering, accounting, chemistry, and social science; (c) "semi"—replacing theoretical study by acquisition of technical skill, such as nursing, pharmacy, and social work; and (d) "would-be"—requiring no theory or exact techniques, only familiarity with modern practices in business and convention, such as hospital managers and sales managers.
Cogan (1953), a follower in the Carr-Saunders/Wilson (1933) tradition, decided that two factors were most important in defining profession—disciplined knowledge and ethical (altruistic) service. Two years later (Cogan, 1955), he returned to this question and suggested that one could better explain professions with a three-tiered definition. The first, "historical/lexicological," defined professions from the traditions from which they arose. The second, "persuasive," had the effect of redirecting peoples' attitudes to the field, providing incentives for becoming members. The third, "operational," offered solutions on how to make decisions as to behavioral commitments to the professions. His underlying feeling was that occupations approximated the condition of a profession by possessing characteristics of a profession.

Goode (1957) wrote that each profession was a community without physical locus. He claimed that this community was characterized by eight factors:

1. Members were bound by a sense of identity.
2. Few members would leave once admitted to the field. Therefore, membership is terminal/continual for most.
3. Common values were shared.
4. Role definitions for members and non-members were agreed upon and the same for all.
5. Members had a common language, understood only partially outside the profession.
6. The community had power over its members' actions.
7. The limits of the profession were reasonably clear, and while
not physical or geographical, were social in nature.

8. The community produced the next generation of members.

In essence, then, Goode (1957) claimed that profession was a sociological category that transcended any one occupation. Later (Goode, 1960), he went a step further with his notion of community, writing that the bottom line was "trust." The professional's job was such that the client or society could be harmed by unethical or incompetent work, and qualification for such trust set the professional apart from the non-professional.

Hughes (1963) claimed that "specialized knowledge" was the key factor in setting professions apart from non-professions. He said there was a distinction between professions which, in essence, pursued knowledge in order to improve and inform practice, and those which were "professions by accident," such as archeology, where practices were for increasing knowledge. Professionals were set apart, he maintained, because they knew more and could use that knowledge in practice.

Barber (1963), in the tradition of those attempting to define the essence of a profession, suggested four attributes were the key elements. These were (a) generalized and systematic knowledge, (b) primary orientation to community interests, (c) self-control through codes of ethics, and (d) a system of rewards that were ends in themselves. He felt there was a continuum of occupations, and those which approximated but had not completely attained these qualities should be called "emerging" professions.
Bucher and Strauss (1961) suggested that professions should be studied as being "in flux," as opposed to Goode's (1957) notion of an anomalous community. They contrasted Goode's functionalism with a process or "emergent" approach to the study of professions. Bucher and Strauss looked at the conflicts and differences within a profession and proposed that there were a number of such groups, called "segments," which tended to take on the character of social movements. These segments could include (a) separate sense of mission, (b) diversity of work activities, (c) different methodologies/techniques, (d) different concepts of what constitutes the core professional act, (e) different images of patient relationships, (f) different circles of colleagueships, (g) alliances with neighboring segments, and (h) associations. They also developed distinctive identities, a sense of the past, and goals for the future. They organized activities which would secure an institutional position and implement their distinctive missions. Since segments were in flux, they were paramount to developing social movements, and from their competition and conflict the organization of the profession would shift.

Wilensky (1964) asserted that two attributes were most important in defining professions. First, a profession had professional norms, that is, the service ideal and related conduct. Second, technical expertise, acquired through prolonged training, was obtained based on systematic theory.

Moore (1970), still seeking an attribute-based definition, offered his set of criteria. These included (a) full-time occupation, (b) commitment to a calling, (c) identification with peers in a formalized
organization, (d) possession of esoteric but useful knowledge and skills, (e) specialized training and education, (f) a service orientation, and (g) the ability and right for members to proceed using their own judgement and authority.

As recently as 1975, Hall (1975) noted that professions stressed mental prowess, whereas crafts stressed manual dexterity. Thus he felt professions were based on theoretical knowledge, where crafts were based on technique.

Despite the efforts of these writers and many others, a consensus could not be reached. During the 1960s there arose a reaction against this taxonomic approach, due to perceived inconsistencies and differences in the terminology of the attributes (Klegon, 1978). This led to different notions about ways to approach the entire question of examining professions. Moore (1970), while still attempting to define the qualities of a profession, acknowledged that it was difficult to do so in "ideal-typical" terms for three reasons:

1. Identified attributes or persons displaying them may have only an approximate and perhaps very poor fit with attributes or persons identified as professional by other viable tests.

2. The resulting division into "pure" professions and "all-others" may be an unnecessarily rigid dichotomy, in view of significant variation.

3. This leads to dropping from view the process of professionalization and strategies used to secure higher status.
As a result, Moore (1970) suggested that there might be a scale of professionalism. That is, professions are more or less professions, as opposed to being completely professions or not professions at all.

Schein (1972), made an important point when he wrote about how the professions differed depending on their organizational affiliation. He described a range of situations, which included: (a) full-time self-employed; (b) part-time self-employed, such as the part-time employee of a service organization; (c) partner in a group practice; (d) full-time employee of a service organization devoted to the delivery of the professional service; (e) employee of an organization not primarily devoted to the delivery of the professional service; and (f) employee of a professional association. In other words, the problem of definition derived from trying to give a precise definition to a social or occupational role that varied as a function of the setting in which it was performed. That setting, as Bucher and Strauss (1961) wrote, was evolving and was perceived differently by different segments of society.

As mentioned previously in this chapter, Barber (1963) suggested that one ought to study how an occupation is becoming a profession, that is, professionalization. Wilensky (1964) wrote that emerging professions engaged in a series of activities to gain professional status. These include (a) working full-time at all the tasks that need doing, (b) establishing a training school, (c) establishing a professional association, (d) defining core tasks and establishing a pecking order, (e) competing with neighboring occupations, (f) engaging political agitation to win support of the law for the job
territory and sustaining a code of ethics, and (g) developing a code of ethics to reduce infighting and to screen out "unscrupulous" individuals. Barber added that the leaders of these movements establish measures and titles of more and less professional behavior, hoping to use such titles, such as "fellow," to serve as an incentive for the less professional to become more professional. He also maintained that in order to get support from the general public, the leaders engage in a program of public information about the services they provide and the standards of community orientation they maintain.

Wilensky (1964) was concerned, however, that since very few new occupations would actually achieve the authority of the established professions, and if people called everything professionalization, they would obscure the newer structural forms that were emerging. He also felt there was a different process by which established professions achieved their position and that employed by occupations aspiring to professional status. The latter had sought status before achieving a solid technical and institutional base. For example, the formation of a professional association tended to precede the establishment of a university-based training school. He concluded by arguing that one should not call everything professionalization, and that the emerging occupations should be studied as they were, not for what they aspired to be.

Jackson (1970) maintained that more important than traits were the processes which allowed occupational groups to take on those traits. He expanded on this point in the following manner.
The significant question must become what are the means by which an occupational status becomes reified and expanded into wider social significance, rather than "is occupation x or y a profession or not?" Then, too, sociologists could ask how that status is maintained and what are the consequences of an occupational status gaining wider social significance. The real issue then becomes not which occupations have a knowledge base, but what are the social conditions that allow a particular occupational group to claim and then perpetuate their claim. That makes it a social question, not a scientific one. (p. 267)

Klegon (1978) attempted to explain the development of the social position and influence of particular occupations. He wrote that both an internal and external dynamic were evident in this process. The former consisted of the efforts of practitioners to raise status, define services, and achieve and maintain autonomy and influence. The latter suggested that there should be a relationship drawn between professional organization and control to other institutional forces and arrangements of power. Such included looking at historical factors affecting the occupation vis-a-vis society, and occupational resources, such as possible sources of power which can result in an occupation gaining and maintaining the expanded social significance of a profession. The reader may also recall Bucher and Strauss' (1961) segments, which were seen as analogous to social movements which lead to changes in occupations.

Dingwall (1976) took a different approach when looking at profession. He felt that one should not attempt to determine the meaning of profession in an absolute sense. Rather, one should examine how people in a society determine who is professional and who is not, how they make or accomplish profession by their activities, and what the consequences are for the way in which they see themselves
and perform their work. Furthermore, he felt that the central problem with the efforts of those who would attempt to define profession was the assumption that the term has a fixed meaning. He argued this point in the following manner.

Words do not have fixed meaning, and the attempt to legislate meaning is unavoidably a fruitless exercise. Words do not have fixed and unequivocal uses according to some calculus of rules...We cannot, then, define what a profession is. All we can do is elaborate what it appears to mean to use the term and to list the occasions on which various elaborations are used. (p. 335)

Dingwall (1976) suggested that anthropological work provides clues to the way in which this is to be accomplished. By observing people at work and seeing what traits they use to identify themselves as distinct, (that is, professional), from their neighbors, one ought to have a truer understanding of the grounded meaning of the term. In his own research, Dingwall observed how a group of subjects used the term "profession" in designating their own and others' behavior as professional and non-professional conduct. He concluded that there is a need to examine how occupations are established as discriminable events through the interpretive work of their members and of outsiders, and how certain occupations further seek to establish themselves as professions through certain kinds of appeals. It would be desirable to carry out additional studies of what appeals are made, how they are carried out, and in what settings such takes place. Finally, it would be important to obtain details of the response of other members of society to their efforts. He concluded by saying that one should take the "mundane, everyday world of the non-sociologist seriously rather than try to substitute our own versions of reality for it" (p. 347).
In a recent discussion of professions and professionalization, Freidson (1983) critiqued the work of his predecessors and, in that endeavor, brought some perspective to the topic. He claimed that to advance a theory of professions, one must treat the concept as a historical construction in a limited number of societies, and study its development, use, and consequences in those societies without attempting more than modest generalizations. He criticized Klegon's (1978) idea that one should not define characteristics of professions as inherently distinct from other occupations but instead discuss the process by which they get or claim professional status. Freidson felt that the outcome of that position was to avoid entirely any conscious definitions while in fact covertly advancing an implicit and "unsatisfactory" vague definition of a profession as an occupation that has gained professional status. What, he asked, is professional status? How does one determine when it does or does not exist, and what are its characteristics? (p. 21)

He also felt that it was inadequate to merely shift from focusing on the "static" concept of profession as a distinct type of occupation to the process by which such is professionalized. Professionalization as a process, Freidson (1983) wrote, requires a definition of the direction of the process and the end-state of professionalization towards which an occupation may be moving. Without some definition of profession, the concept of professionalization is virtually meaningless. (p. 22)
Freidson (1983) maintained that a definition requires specification of a set of referents by which the phenomenon may be described in the empirical world, that is, attributes, traits, or defining characteristics. The definitional problem for profession rests in attempting to treat profession as if it were a generic concept, as opposed to a changing historic concept, with its particular roots in Anglo-American industrial nations and their institutions. To make his point, he directed the reader's attention to the continent of Europe, where status came from attending certain elite educational institutions, not necessarily from being members of certain occupational groups.

Thus, when he came to Dingwall's (1976) narrative, Freidson (1983) maintained that that writer's argument was too simplistic. That is, Freidson claimed that there was not a single holistic folk which could lead to only one folk concept of profession. Society was too complex, with many number of folk, and thus a number of folk concepts. Members of a profession, he continued, accomplish profession partially by taking into account conceptions of members of other occupations with whom they interact, and by negotiating with them workable agreements on the usage of that term and the activities and relationships it implies. In fact, Freidson argued, sociologists, who define profession "by fiat," are part of the phenomenological world of these professions (p. 28). These sociologists accomplish profession as much as do the occupations themselves, as they comment on and analyze contemporary social issues. Their analyses are sought and used by government and the corporate world to produce categories of jobs and
related job requirements, pay differentials, and prerequisites. These create critical contingencies for rewards available to an occupation, including its status (pp. 28-29).

Freidson (1983) concluded that one must accept that profession is no simple idea, but an intrinsically ambiguous, multifunctional folk concept. Rather than analyzing profession as a sociological artifact, he preferred to see sociologists deal with the occupations themselves. This would lead, he hoped, to an increase in knowledge about occupations and their special characteristics, as opposed to how they compare to some ideal type. Another result of this orientation would be a portrait of the variety of contexts and inconsistencies to the notion of profession.

To this point, the reader has been introduced to a series of writings and positions which bring necessary perspective to the problem. Habenstein (1963) brought forth a compelling set of arguments, the value of whose contribution cannot be stressed firmly enough. Perhaps disturbed by the proliferation of definitions of profession, he suggested that profession may not merit the status of a sociological category. He fashioned his contention in the following manner.

It seems fairly obvious that terminological clarification of profession is just as difficult as it has been for such "concepts" as "crime," "family," "urban," and the like. We have before us the whole a common-sense, conventional appellation that means remarkably different things to different groups and persons. Other analyses along this line have shown that some definitions apply only to highly specific instances, viz., court cases or state license laws, or that the definitions are arbitrary, lexicographical, eulogistic, persuasive, or as in the case of operational definitions, almost empty of meaning. In my judgement, "profession" does not have the stature of a sociological
category, that is, of a concept with analytical power, describing a limited number of characteristics whose relations and order are demonstrable. As presently used it only indicates that many people, groups, and agencies orient attention and behavior toward the term in different ways. This, of course, is a social fact which in itself invites sociological analysis. (p. 293)

Habenstein (1963) went forward to suggest that there is another level of analysis that can be applied to studies of professions, one which concerns itself with basic human sentiment. Functional analysts, he claimed, do not deal with this level, but assume that if a system operates, there must be adequate satisfaction, gratification, or release of human sentiment for those within the system. Such definitions, he argued, take the sociologist away from the study of human beings in association (pp. 298-299).

To make his point, he pointed to the literature which suggested that the biological life cycle includes life crises, and that cultures have recognized and marked the "running points" with ritual behavior and ceremonies (p. 299). In addition, he wrote that

"universals of experience force crucial decisions upon man: his work, his mate, the controls to which he responds--even his moods may be left in his own hands. In addition, alienation, concealment, severance of old ties and the making of new, giving and receiving, sensing the immanent and facing the unknown are some experiences likely to befall everyone. Who, at one time or another, does not experience personal crisis, has not had unsatisfied human needs, nor felt the lack of self-consistency? (p. 299)

Habenstein (1963) concluded that the search for "definitive definitions" of profession might detract from the necessary functions that must be performed in modern society, that is, the conscious identification and handling of human emotional needs in the context of the crises of daily life. He was thus intimating that to understand
how society deals with such issues, one should look beyond the standard operations that exist to handle life and see how needs are handled within those organizational structures. Similarly, one ought to ask what purposes do professions actually serve for people trying to survive through the demands of life in society. Perhaps, he finished, that is a more reasonable and valuable way to understand what professions are.

Drawing Conclusions

The articles and arguments to which this author has referred allow a sensitivity to the complexity of the concept of profession that is essential to a cogent final analysis of the data produced in this study. If one ascribed to the attributional approach to profession, certain questions most certainly could be raised. The outcomes reported by the author make it clear that what took place in the Student Personnel Work Program at the Ohio State University, while bearing some resemblance to the processes seen in medical education, differed significantly in many respects. Accordingly, one might maintain that the program did not prepare students to be professionals, either because of structural inadequacies or lack of sufficient time to fully inculcate the students with the fundamental elements of the field. Given the findings of Bucher and Stelling (1977) regarding the importance of role assumption to professional identity formation, one could argue that these students could not have seen themselves as professional student personnel workers because their assignments, while perhaps challenging, did not allow them to assume full professional
responsibility and status. Instead, they mistook their increasing vocational maturity for growth in professionalism.

On the other hand, one might still question whether student personnel work is a profession at all. If, indeed, the increased vocational maturity of the students was, in fact, a significant definition of professionalism, what does that mean about the field itself? How can one be considered a professional if the occupation itself can be challenged on its professional status?

The importance of the arguments of Freidson (1983), Klegon (1978), Dingwall (1976), Wilensky (1964), and Habenstein (1963) is that they take the reader beyond the limitations of attributional definitions and allow a more enlightened perspective. The essence of profession, aside from political/economic issues, is what people in occupations do, why they do it, and what needs they serve. That is not to demean the efforts of those who fight for the legitimization of occupations as professions. However, to truly appreciate and understand the socialization of students in preparation for a field of work, one must understand the meaning of that preparation as pertains to the duties, roles, and missions of that field, regardless of what definitions have been imposed on the concept of profession.

In this particular situation, the students had to be prepared to enter an occupational world where definitions were vague, commitments various in strength and sincerity, and organizational legitimacy of the work in question. That field has a history that suggests that it has been attempting to both define and legitimize its activity to a community which often seems that work as unnecessary or without
substance. The essence of preparing people to assume professional membership in a field is to develop those people in a way that prepares them to handle its challenges, both personal and occupational, and deal effectively with the disparities between the ideal and the real. Medical students, as several studies suggested, lose some idealism and become increasingly cynical as they proceed through their training. Such can be seen as lamentable or, as this author suggests, necessary. That is, by facing during one's training the hypocrisies, incompetence, and human frailties which constitute the organizational realities of the occupation, one is perhaps prepared to more effectively face such challenges later on. One thus has developed the cognitive mechanisms for dealing with the disparities, discomfort, and disappointment. Part of the definition of a profession is its conflicts, issues, and controversies. Medical students take courses on ethics and also witness how others (and eventually themselves) experience dilemmas in that arena in day-to-day practice. The students at Ohio State University, while perhaps not having to confront perplexing ethical problems, did reflect on the implications of deliberate use of student development theory with students. Their remarks demonstrated an awareness of the issues involved in this question, and most were able to express with personal conviction their developmental role as student personnel workers. Moreover, they recognized the political, pragmatic, and economic limitations of acting in the manner suggested by their education. There was an awareness that colleagues graduating from other institutions, as well as current members in the field, might not be conversant or sympathetic to the notions which governed the Ohio State University
program, and that a career in the field would not be an extension of
the academic program from which they were graduating. They were,
indeed, being prepared for the occupational environments in which they
would be operating.

**Additional Localized Implications**

At this point the author will return to the outcomes seen in the
comments and actions of the students in this study. They demonstrated
a wide diversity in interests, values, commitments, and career plans.
While individuals' value and career determination patterns may suggest
trends or career anchors, there seemed to be a defiance of any group
categorization of those outcomes.

The author concludes that such was inevitable. The students were
enrolled in classes with teachers of differing philosophies and pro-
fessional allegiances, and worked for professional staff from a wide
range of educational backgrounds. The value which seemingly underlied
their field was one of stimulating and cherishing the growth and matu-
rative of individual human beings and their groups. While the higher
education setting was seen by most as a desirable place in which to work,
it was recognized that it housed individuals from a wide range of age and
experience, and those people could be encountered outside this arena. To
be student personnel work professionals, they were not only expected to
understand and be able to use human development theory, but they were, in a
sense, encouraged to grow as individuals themselves. The focus on indi-
vidualism, which was also encouraged by the negotiation of duties with
supervisors and the selection of elective courses both in and out of the
College of Education, seemed to be the focus of growth as an emerging
professional.
As the author suggested, this may have been quite adaptive. That is, these students were facing a professional arena in which their legitimacy stood to be challenged, where there would be a wide range of difference in philosophy and preparation within their own ranks, and where economic trends could seriously jeopardize their ability to stay in the field. The author has not clue if such was intentional, but their training allowed them to see their preparation as permitting them entrance and giving them the necessary skills to function in a variety of fields in higher education, as well as outside that arena. Of course, the nature of student personnel work is that it is comprised of a variety of fields loosely and situationally linked. Perhaps, thus, preparation should have prepared the students to be open about where they might head, or comfortable with their inclinations to define a commitment to student personnel work in terms of a very individualized interpretation of the integration of self and field. Bucher and Stelling (1977) mentioned that professional identity included an allegiance to specialty areas within professional domains, especially where there were differences of philosophy or opinion with regards to professional practice. In the Ohio State University program, while it was acknowledged and accepted that one might choose to specialize in a certain area, the area was not necessarily defined by a conflict with another area. Instead, it was determined by one's functional and topical interests.

In fact, the majority of students did exit verbalizing a preference for certain types of issues or people, but were willing to remain open about their futures until having some actual professional
experience. Hardly any felt they were bona fide professionals upon leaving, but nearly all expressed the feeling of being closer to such status than when they entered the program. They all felt an increased awareness and command of the knowledge of the field, the ability to function more capably in a work situation, an identification with people in the field, and, especially, issues of importance, and a feeling of commitment to the values inherent in the work of the field.

It was striking, of course, how the students in this study so actively constructed their ideal and a plan of how to be a professional student personnel worker. There seemed, at times, to be no limits placed on that freedom. As mentioned, there was not a single-faceted approach trumpeted by the program heads, and there was a diverse range of training opportunities, philosophies, personalities, and models. In addition, there was a diversity in living experiences, along with freedom to take classes and individualized programs. While there was an early attempt to bring the students together into a solid group, physical arrangements for classes and assistantships precluded such an outcome. Even if such had existed, the individuality of the students, which was supported by the philosophy of the program heads, would not have allowed single group identity formation. From all of these factors, the reader should not be surprised by the outcomes of the program.

These results are not surprising, either, when compared to those found in the literature. Bucher and Stelling (1977) concluded that professional socialization was best seen as the result of students' active interpretation of their educational experiences within a
context set by structural conditions. The programming effect, that is, the effect of the theoretical orientations of the staff, opportunities for training imposed by the professional allegiances of the faculty, and even the isolation of students from the rest of the college, contributed to how homogeneously the students were committed to a singular type, content, and field of practice. That is, a consistent and firmly etched set of structural variables would lead to students with more homogeneous goals and commitment levels. On the other hand, the more eclectic the conditions, the more likely the students were to show diverse interests, commitments, and goals.

The students in this study were not only enrolled in a program which was a reflection of a field of great diversity, but the ethos of that field was diversity and individuality. Consequently, could one expect anything other than that which was seen in these students? Furthermore, the students in the Bucher and Stelling (1977) study who most firmly resisted the programming effect were those who had strong, preformed identities. This was evident, too, in the Ohio State University study, particularly in the second-year group. For them, it was their strong personalities which enabled them to find their own ways and resist any perceived pressures to commit to the field.

It is crucial that the reader remember that conditions were significantly impacted by the students' wills. Bucher and Stelling (1977), Simpson (1979), and Olesen and Whittaker (1968) found that students actively interpreted their educational process, rather than being passive recipients of professional ordination. This was seen in how they selected attributes of various professionals and constructed their own sense of the ideal professional identity.
This was also seen in how they evaluated their own progress by their own standards. Bucher and Stelling (1977) wrote about symbolic interactionism. One facet of this literature emphasizes how individuals selectively perceive and assess events and act on the basis of their interpretation of those events. Bucher and Stelling saw how their subjects had an increased sense of mastery of professional skills, and such a sense became self-validating. That is, when the trainees perceived themselves as competent, they also felt capable of judging their own performances. Thus, they were becoming more autonomous professionals. Similarly, they could develop their own ideas of who was good for what as role models, and, in fact, could discount criticism based on their own judgement parameters. As Bucher and Stelling stated, the human being has the capacity for self-interaction, and self-interaction makes it possible to construct a line of activity, rather than to merely respond.

Bucher and Stelling (1977) reported, too, that a sense of mastery, in particular, was a critical feature in their trainees' development. They wrote about this in the following fashion.

As their sense of mastery increased, so did their selectivity and reliance on their own judgement. This, in conjunction with a strong tendency to discount criticism, led us to conclude that as mastery increased, dependency on external sources of validation decreased, and trainees became self-validating: mastery is transformed into self-evaluation. And so, we come out with an autonomous professional being, who has constructed her or his own professional identity, but whose professional identity, level of commitment, and projected career strongly reflect the structural and situational variables within the training program. (p. 279)
The students in the present study did not exit as autonomous and supremely confident professionals. They had only been in the program two years, and while they felt ready to take on a full-time job, they believed they would not be actual professionals until they were actually so-employed. There was a tentativeness about how much they would enjoy being in the field.

What stands out, though, is how not far into their first year, (usually towards the end of the second quarter), they began asserting themselves with regards to pursuit of personal interests and willingness to challenge the necessity of the workload. It was clear that the program would not prevent and, in fact, encouraged individuality and growth, and they had mastered their environment sufficiently to have the right and confidence to assert their individuality. Now they could look to apply their previous interests, seek out new ones, and determine how they could forge their future. Several said they realized that it was not heresy to look for futures outside of student personnel work, to aim for a set of purposes and principles that were not limited to the jobs in higher education.

Again, while this might sound like non-socialization, they had developed attitudes that may have been predictive and similar to those of people in the field. There were no blindly naive entrants to the world of student personnel work in this group. It would have been a disservice to them to have been prepared in such a fashion. In summary, part of professional preparation must include an awareness of readiness for the variance from the ideal that, in fact, is the profession.
Concluding Comments

The results and analysis of this study suggest some exciting notions to both consider, through both application to existing educational situations and additional research projects. First, it was evident that individual personality factors and learning orientations contributed significantly to how the students defined their interests, goals, and commitments to the field of student personnel work. Glimpses were afforded of how widespread that effect was, from personal relationships through assignment of importance to coursework. Without either constant observation of participants in classroom, work, and social activities, both formal and informal, it was impossible to get the fully informed insight into the pervasiveness of this effect. It appears there is a wonderfully complex but potentially understandable relationship of how individuals in a professional socialization situation, or, for that matter, a learning environment, manage the interface with that environment by making choices about what to learn, how to learn it, from whom to learn it, and how to define the meaning of what they learn. This has implications not only for faculty in graduate and professional schools, but for educators in all areas of society. To understand how the structural/programmatic elements of an educational program are being perceived by individual students or small groups of individuals may allow the educator to more effectively design and guide the program at hand.

Such understandings would allow advisers and supervisors who are not in formal teaching roles to act in a more purposeful fashion with students. The students in this study were virtually unanimous in their
positive reaction to the interviews with the author. They felt the need to articulate the dizzying array of feelings, observations, and issues, and place them in a coherent, related whole. The pace of their lives as graduate students was such that there never seemed to be enough time to do that on their own. Several noted how they looked forward to these sessions, and it was suggested that future classes have this type of session built into the program.

The author also found that participants in the practicum seminar group enjoyed and appreciated a similar opportunity to discuss issues surrounding professional activity, field, and ethical practices, and their personal stances on those issues. For them, it appeared that their views coalesced into more coherent wholes when the opportunity was presented to them to discuss these questions. The students in this program may have grown tired of what they saw as excessive reliance on the processing of experiences, but the opportunity to do so with the totality of their professional preparation program experience was greeted with open arms. Considering how students may very well become the main judges of their own experiences and progress, "official" and purposefully designed and strategically timed opportunities to examine those factors may be essential to a complete professional preparation experience.

Second, the author devoted a sizeable portion of his analysis to the implications of his findings for student personnel work as a profession and, as a logical extension, for profession as a concept. Both the literature and this study suggest that rigid, time-honored definitions of profession, while having face appeal to the layman and
political/economic significance for certain occupational groups, lose their meaning when the realities of social life are examined with care. Many writers have suggested that definitions are dependent on the level of analysis one wishes to apply. The results of this study argue for a view of profession and professional socialization that allows one to understand what the occupational field means to the people who are seeking membership. That meaning is inferred from how its trainees are able to construct a sense of their relationship to the field. In turn, such awareness allows educators and program planners to develop professional preparation programs which immerse people not in mere dogma but in how to face the day-to-day trials and tribulations promulgated by field realities. To simply learn skills, theories, and ideals is not enough. Being a professional member means understanding the shortcomings of the field and acquiring a mental set which allows one to pursue ideals while grappling with the weaknesses. Depending on the clarity of the definition of a field, the diversity of its segments, and the pattern of career movement, programs which engender professional socialization must provide an educational process which prepares members-to-be for that environment. For that reason, the author felt that the program he observed did, indeed, prepare students for a field as that field existed.

By this reasoning, educators in professional preparation programs in other fields which clamor for professional status need to understand what their fields truly are in preparing programs for aspiring members. As Wilensky (1964) wrote, do we need the professionalization of everyone? In fact, what seems important is the understanding of the meaning
of the fields/occupations themselves, rather than why they do or do not merit the classification of profession. Occupations will become strong if the people prepared for assuming membership and leadership roles therein are trained in ways consonant with the meaning of the work of the field, as opposed to ideologies bent on equality with the medical profession.

Third, and finally, one must consider the importance of profession as a concept for this society. With the availability of access to higher occupational and social status for greater numbers of citizens in this nation, the meanings of many of its treasured concepts and monuments are changing. Society, due to the increased speed of communication, production, and information creation, affords greatness, status, expertness, and wealth at a dizzying rate. The ease of assignment of the term professional to people from a variety of domains is evidence of this trend. A weekend of television or radio will bring forth for the viewer advertisements for professional lawn trimmers, termite controllers, hardware salespersons, and auto repair people. "Amateur," a term given athletes who compete for the honor and love of their sport, and professionals, those athletes who compete for the love and honor of money, are hard to distinguish. Indeed, the definition of the former is changing dramatically. One can see and hear advertisements, too, for lawyers, dentists, and doctors. Certainly this would be confusing to the citizen of 30, even 20 years ago. In a sense, meanings are what one decides they are. As travel time between distant points on the globe decreases and accessibility to such travel grows, society's sense of perspective and meaning is
thrown in disarray. And as standards tumble, new meanings are created to take their place.

All this leads to a point. Profession, as a concept, may still retain its appeal and importance to a society, but its "objectified" meaning may become irrelevant. If anyone can call him/herself a professional, then that term becomes an apparition, a creation of pop culture. Furthermore, as definitions continue to change, the foundation of an occupation is determined by the essence of its activities, roles, missions, and meaning to society. Those must be clearly defined by the field and to its audiences--clients and recruits. Understanding and articulating those elements, for student personnel work and all other occupations, will continue to be a compelling challenge and source of future speculation and study.

**Looking to the Future**

The author's original intention was to study how student personnel workers grow professionally in their first full-time post-graduation positions. It was reasoned at that time that, in order to understand that dynamic, one first needed an appreciation for the development experienced while in graduate school. It was from that reasoning this study was born.

The question still remains, however, about the fate of such students after leaving their graduate program. This particular study did not provide for follow-up, but the author has often wondered about their activities. The study he has completed raises several questions about what they have done, particularly as relates to the themes that seemed to govern their orientation to value attribution and
and decision-making. This author has proposed that the restraint and individuality with which the students approached their careers may have been adaptive and enabling of career survival. A simple survey of occupational outcomes would establish that in part, though it might still be premature. A longer-term, ongoing study of the career paths of students such as these would probably be more revealing.

More important, perhaps, would be a study of field members to see how they have chosen to construct their careers. Have their learning and stylistic tendencies been the major contributors to the evolution of their careers?

The existence of career anchors indigenous to student personnel work may have direct relevance to that question. Research in this arena could focus on three areas. First, it would be desirable to do a study of people already in student personnel work at different stages of their careers. The investigator might be able to identify the internal structures and value systems which governed career decision-making and professional development. To the student personnel work administrator, such information might be useful in hiring, staff development, and long-range planning. To the field in general, it might provide self-insight regarding the nature of the profession. Are people with predispositions to stay in specialized areas those who persist in the field, as opposed to those who are creative, autonomous, or of some other career anchor yet to be discovered? Which types of individuals become chief administrative officers? Which types leave the field? What happens to those who are most
driven or guided by priorities relating to creativity?

Second, the development of career anchors in graduate students should be considered. Faculty advisers and academic program administrators could find this concept helpful in assisting students' career planning, particularly in understanding the relationship between individual needs and career opportunities that the individual will face upon graduating. Understanding of the concept underlying career anchors might also shed light on how program structures may be interpreted due to individual predispositions to developing certain career anchors. Research results might also have relevance for those responsible for establishing priorities for admitting new students to graduate programs, as well as those who design and conduct the programs in which those students are enrolled.

The author believes that fields that are similar to student personnel work might wish to examine the results of this study and consider the implications for their professional preparation programs. Fields based on an assortment of elements and with less than privileged status in society need to give serious attention to the impact of the looseness of their definitions on the socialization processes evidenced in their students. As mentioned, it may be more important to understand the meanings implied and taken from these fields than how they measure up to traditional and perhaps outmoded notions of profession.
Afterthoughts on Being Investigator

The author would be neglectful if he did not add a note about the unique circumstances of this study. As already explained, he was involved in the study of a program and individuals with whom he had a range of acquaintanceships. There was a tremendous challenge to remain "objective" and removed. At the same time, he interacted with many of these individuals as colleagues and social accomplices. Certainly there was a real chance that the interactions he sustained could have jeopardized the openness of those individuals during interviews and other occasions.

Of greater significance, though, was his relationship with the department members. Three of those individuals were on his dissertation committee, as well as being instructors of classes he was observing. Therefore, they had a vested interest in the study as well as in the ability of the researcher to maintain objectivity. Concurrently, the author needed their approval of his study while having the potential of unearthing criticisms the committee members. He might have also found damning criticism of the program from the students or by implication from their educational outcomes.

This was a confusing set of dynamics, ones which might raise the eyebrows of even the most casual of observers, and the author was not blind to their implications. He acknowledges this was far from an ideal research situation, but he can indicate with confidence that he never perceived any threat to the independence and integrity of his role as researcher. The attention given to his study by faculty,
students, or staff was never expressed in a fashion that could have been interpreted as confining his efforts or his reporting.

He did, of course, have to remain on guard when talking with his committee about the progress of the study, as he had promised to protect the anonymity of the participants. He also recognized that in discussing students' reactions to their courses with one committee member, he was sharing information about his or her colleagues. If those reactions pertained to the course taught by the committee member with whom the author was processing his data, there was the potential that such information could have affected how that person conducted future sessions or courses. While this may have inhibited the author and limited the potential to derive full benefit from discussions with his committee, those sessions were still quite helpful in sorting through the hypotheses and occasional confusion the author was contemplating.

The author also had to insure that he was not seen as doing this study for the program. While students seemed to enjoy participating, and despite the potential value of the results to the program, the researcher was strictly concerned with the development of knowledge. Granted, he could not completely eliminate his attachment to a program in which he had matriculated, nor both the positive and negative feelings he had for the people and offices connected with it. He even occasionally found himself becoming a student in certain class sessions he was observing, getting caught up mentally in the discussions taking place. However, in the final analysis, the results being reported
and the meanings which are inferred appear as they do in these pages because the data command that appearance, not because they might shield the program or field from their implications. Despite all the conflicting needs and human dynamics built into this situation, the author offers the final product in good conscience and with pride to the review committee.
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