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CHAPTER I

Statement of the Problem

"Wanted! A thoughtful critic who is also a constructive counselor, a stringent taskmaster who is also a supportive colleague, a model scholar who is also an effective tutor, a principled bureaucrat who also knows how to get around the system, a prodigious researcher who is also a charismatic teacher, and a respected authority in the field who is also available to students at any time." [Adapted from Heiss, 1970]

This might well be a classified advertisement graduate or professional school students would use in seeking an advisor-sponsor-major professor. These seemingly contrary or incompatible qualities and characteristics sought in an advisor reflect the complexity, ambiguous roles, and contradictory demands placed upon advisors by graduate students. Due to such ambiguity and to the wide differences among academic disciplines in terms of content, research methodologies, and desirable personality characteristics, very little has been written about the graduate education process and even less about what constitutes good academic advising. [Winston and Polkosnik, 1984, pp. 287-288]

The quote presented above suggested what constitutes the concern of this study. Advisor's perceptions of their experiences advising doctoral students during their dissertation was the focus of the research. The culminating experience of the Doctor of Philosophy Degree is the completion of a doctoral dissertation. As stated in a publication of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, the purpose of the doctoral program is to
"... prepare a student for a lifetime of intellectual inquiry that manifests itself in creative scholarship and research." [1977, p. 1]

Some publications have focused on the graduate experience. Katz and Hartnett have edited a book devoted to the study of the scholar. [Katz and Hartnett, 1976] In her dissertation, Daniels-Nelson studied the perceptions graduate students had of their experiences in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. [Daniels-Nelson, 1983] Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain have proposed there exists a developmental nature to the advisor-advisee relationships in graduate education. [Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983] Bargar and Duncan [1982] have offered a reflective analysis in which they suggest behaviors that, if practiced by advisors, might result in the dissertation experience being a more creative endeavor for students and likely resulting in greater satisfaction for advisors.

When the above mentioned studies were taken with the others more fully reviewed in Chapter II, there emerged two consistent themes which served as a stimulus to this study. They were: (1) the author(s) suggested the critical contribution the advisor/student relationship makes to the success of the graduate experience and
they propose that there was considerable need for study of the advisors' perceptions of the graduate school experience.

The Problem

The Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain article approached the advisor-advisee experience as a series of developmental issues that are addressed during the graduate experience. They also noted the absence of research regarding the PhD advisor-advisee experience:

McClure recently completed an extensive review of research on the history of doctoral programs in American Universities. A few studies have dealt with student variables; none have dealt with the developmental nature of the relationship between advisor and advisee as discussed in this article. [Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983, p. 408]

The central purpose of this study was to provide grounds for the rudiments of substantive theory about PhD advising based upon the expressed perceptions of advisors about their doctoral dissertation advising experiences. A sample of twenty experienced advisors from the College of Education at The Ohio State University were interviewed during the Winter Quarter of the 1985-86 school year. The constant comparative method of data analysis was used in the conduct of this naturalistic study. [Glaser and Strauss, 1967]
Major Research Questions

The study began with the following questions organized under five major categories:

1. Student/Advisor:

   What characteristics describe the relationships of students and advisors as perceived by the advisors?

   Does the relationship take on a developmental nature as the research progresses?

   How do the "best" and "worst" advising experiences of advisors compare and contrast?

   How are the "problems" of the dissertation experience resolved?

   What affect do the feelings of the advisor have on the research effort?

2. Student/Dissertation:

   What do the advisors perceive as the characteristics or properties of the relationship of the student to their dissertation?

   What do the advisors perceive as the "problematic" areas of the dissertation experiences of advising students?
What responsibilities do advisors believe they have for the student's work?

What roles are placed upon the advisor as a result of the work of advising on the dissertation?

What do advisors do to assist students in making progress on their dissertations?

3. Advisor/Dissertation:

What are the properties and characteristics that describe the advising relationship of the advisor to their students' dissertations?

Whose problem is it?

What responsibility do advisors have and what do advisors do to maintain academic-professional standards for dissertation efforts?

How do advisors measure their successes, their failures?

What do advisors do to resolve the conflicts or problems that arise with respect to the research effort itself?
How do the feelings of the advisor about the work or the student affect their perceptions of the advising experiences?

4. Advisor/Graduate School Committee:

What role does the advisor play in committee selection?

What responsibility does the advisor have in the application of the regulations and standards of the graduate school?

5. Advisor/Larger role as Professor:

How does the advising of doctoral students in dissertation research "fit" into the advisors' perceptions of his role as professor?

How do advisors' feelings affect their efforts to perform the responsibilities as advisors to students in doctoral dissertation research?

As the analysis of the interview data progressed, the last two question areas did not serve as a focus for the advisors' expressed perceptions of their advising experiences. The first three research questions emerged as the major categories of analyses of this research. A
full description of the three major categories and their characteristics and properties as they emerged from the data analysis is presented in Chapters IV and V.

Methodology

This study was conducted to provide grounding for the rudiments of substantive theory about the PhD advising experience as perceived by advisors. It was a qualitative study in keeping with principles and procedures proposed for such studies by Glaser and Strauss [1967]. The purpose was to generate new categories of meaning with their characteristics as the basis for rudimentary propositions concerning the phenomena of advising PhD students. [Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 101] The constant comparative method allowed for the emergence of theory or propositions from the categories and characteristics that were grounded in the expressed perceptions of the advisors.

The major research questions presented earlier evolved from a review of available literature and discussions with the researcher's committee members. The research questions continued to be revised and restated as the data collection procedures and initial data analysis occurred. Three pilot interviews were conducted to provide insight into the nature of such interview
experiences; to provide information useful in refining the interview schedule; and to enhance the interviewing skills of the researcher. Data from these interviews were not used in the final analyses. The five question areas served as the basis for the pilot interviews. With some minor revisions an interview schedule was created from the original research questions.

The population studied was experienced PhD advisors in the College of Education at The Ohio State University during January - March of 1986. Advisors in the College of Education were chosen as the population for the following reasons:

1. The varied character of the departments and program offerings in the College of Education provides a wide range of dissertation topics and experiences, a variety of research methodologies, and a broad range of research designs and

2. Education continues to be a career focus for this researcher.

This investigation focused upon experienced advisors' perceptions of their doctoral dissertation experiences. There were 155 professors listed in the directory of the College of Education. All were engaged in advising students at various levels of graduate activity. The
researcher limited the study to those advisors who had advised five (5) or more students to the completion of their doctoral dissertations during the past seven (7) years. Fifty-one (51) advisors become the population from which a representative sample of twenty subjects was drawn.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions expressed by the advisors in sufficient depth to begin formulating propositions in support of substantive theory about the advising of doctoral students. The study design required tape recorded in-depth interviews of 90 to 120 minutes each with advisors who have successfully demonstrated their ability to assist students to completion of the degree. The interviews were to provide a source for "thick" and "deep" analyses of the advising process as reported by advisors. As a consequence the number of interviews was limited to 20 in anticipation that they would provide sufficient data while keeping the study to a manageable size. The twenty advisors drawn from the population were interviewed as the subjects of this study.

The constant comparative method of data analysis was used to categorize units of data created by the expressed perceptions of the advisors. The units of data [incidents] were those expressed perceptions of advisors
taken from over 400 pages of transcripted interviews. From those incidents of data emerged the grounded categories and characteristics which were used as the basis for propositions concerning the phenomena of doctoral dissertation advising. The propositions are discussed as the rudiments of a theory for advising doctoral students.

Summary

In Chapter I the problem, the purpose of the study, and a brief overview of the methods employed were presented. The review of the related literature is presented in Chapter II. In Chapter III a more complete account of the procedures of this study are provided. The results of the initial data analysis which provided the three major categories that ultimately served as the focus of this study are also reported in Chapter III.

In Chapter IV and Chapter V the categories with their respective characteristics and properties are presented with verbatim accounts of advisors' perceptions drawn from the transcripted tape recordings of the interviews with advisors. Chapter VI reviews the research questions and provides a summary of the meanings of the categories and their characteristics in terms of tentative propositions which serve as the rudiments for grounded theory regarding
the advising of doctoral students. The chapter concludes with implications for this research and suggestions for additional research.
CHAPTER II
Review of the Literature

This literature review is presented in two sections. The first summarizes the literature available with regard to the study of graduate education and presents the rationale for this study of advisors' perceptions of their advising experiences. The second section presents the literature related to three areas of interest specific to the findings emerging from this research. Those three areas are:

1. the importance of the advisor-student relationship,
2. creative behavior in graduate education and
3. roles related to graduate advising.

Literature Concerning the Study of Graduate Education

The need for additional research about graduate education experience was cited in several studies. Two recommendations from Hartnett [1976] provide rationale for institutions of higher education to study and report on their own progress. First he stated:

Nevertheless, a more fully balanced exchange of information between students and departments is
essential if the student-department fit is to be mutually satisfactory.

and second:

Many extremely able and potentially productive scholars do not complete their graduate training because of dissatisfaction with their graduate experience. [p. 83]

Hartnett suggested that a means be developed to share information concerning the department with graduate students prior to their committing themselves to their study.

Clark [1980] reported a comprehensive review of ERIC, Psychological Abstracts and Dissertation Abstracts yielded only 12 studies and 5 books concerning adult graduate education. She found no organized body of literature related to adult development and only a few studies related to the adult graduate education. A review conducted by this researcher of the ERIC documents of the past four years, using the term academic advising crossed with the terms graduate studies, graduate students, doctoral dissertations, doctoral programs and doctoral degrees resulted in 10 entries. Only three of these had relevance to doctoral dissertations and advising students.

Three studies which are referenced later in this chapter also indicated the lack of literature concerning the study of graduate student experience and doctoral advising. Bargar and Duncan [1982] in their article
examining creative behavior in graduate education, noted the need for the study of the graduate research experience. Daniels-Nelson [1983, p. 6] in her dissertation found there was little literature available concerning the advisor-advisee relationship at the doctoral level. In their article Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain [1983, pp. 407-408] also found evidence which supported the need to conduct research into the nature of graduate education.

In his study, "The Student in Graduate School," an extensive review of the available literature, Harvey [1972, p. 4] found studies in three main areas of graduate education. Those areas included: (1) demographic characteristics, (2) time requirements for doctoral degrees, and (3) the financial status of graduate students. Creager [1971] in a U.S. Office of Education Report of Annual Enrollments found that little had been done to report assessments of the graduate student experience.

Katz and Hartnett [1976] have edited a book, Scholars in the Making: The Development of Graduate and Professional Students, which provided considerable encouragement for the study reported here. The purpose of their book was stated in the preface: "The central thrust of this book is an examination of the student in graduate
and professional education." [1976, p. xiii] The focus of the study reported here was the perceptions of advisors about their advising experiences with students during the doctoral dissertation.

The review presented above clearly suggests the need for this study. The remainder of this chapter addresses the studies that more specifically related to findings that have emerged from the advisors' expressed perceptions concerning their advising of doctoral students during the dissertation experience.

Literature Related to Specific Areas of Interest to this Study

The studies reported below are concerned with the following aspects of the present research:

(1) the importance of advisor-student relationship, (2) creative behavior in graduate education, and (3) roles related to graduate advising.

(1) The Importance of Advisor-Student Relationship

It is clear that the advisor-student relationship in graduate studies has been found to be a critical area of concern in previous research. Clark [1980] noted that, "Student-faculty relationships appear critical in determining success or failure in graduate education."
She added:

The needs, developmental dilemmas, and learning style differences of students need additional investigation. These issues certainly underlie the emotional and psychological stresses of faculty-student relations felt by graduate students... Much more study of experiences and processes of students and teachers in the environment is needed. [p.55]

In Chapter 3, Hartnett [1976] identified five dimensions of environment that affected graduate education:

1. the nature and quality of student relations with the faculty,
2. the extent to which the department can be regarded as true "community",
3. the degree of faculty attention to and concern for teaching,
4. procedures and philosophy related to the evaluations of graduate student performance, and
5. the rigidity and/or flexibility of the formal curricular requirements. [p. 59]

The first mentioned dimension was also considered the "...single most salient feature of the graduate department climate." [1976, p. 59] The particular aspects of the nature and quality of the graduate student relations with the faculty were identified as (1) the faculty being accessible and (2) the manner in which the faculty treat
In his book titled: *Graduate Student Survival*, Dukelow [1980] supported Hartnett's findings, "Communication and availability are the keys to a strong student-advisor relationship and the means of avoiding frustrations." [p. 31]

In their article, Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain [1983] addressed the advisor-advisee issues in doctoral education from a developmental point of view. They made recommendations to the student and the advisor which if practiced throughout the advisor-advisee experience, most likely would result in an improved relationship. The recommendations were relevant to attitudes and structures and behaviors.

**Attitudes for Both Advisor and Advisee**

1. Recognize the characteristics of one's own developmental stage and explore the relationship between one's own stage and that of the other person's.
2. Maintain a creative skepticism toward the perceived limits of the discipline and its relationship to other disciplines.
3. Seek to meet the need of both for an intellectual community that both challenges and supports them.
4. Persevere in establishing a climate of openness in which symmetry of opportunity and trust are possible.
5. Affirm the role of advisee-advisor relationship in furthering the development of both toward full potential.
6. Attempt to disidentify the ego from outcomes of work and move toward personal enlightenment.
Structures and Behaviors

1. The advisor should provide orienting experiences and intellectual contacts for new students which they can use to move smoothly into effective functioning in graduate school.

2. Both should establish, and alter to meet changing needs, an ongoing advisee seminar to foster interaction among students.

3. Both should seek to maintain a dynamic interplay between their academic process and the larger community, providing opportunities to publicly present and discuss the dissertation.

4. Write and publish together as this becomes possible. [Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983, pp. 430-431]

Bargar and Duncan [1982] approached the advisor-student relationship from the perspective of the advisor promoting creative behavior on the part of their students during their PhD research endeavors. They presented principles that they believe when practiced by advisors in PhD research, will enhance the student's creative efforts. These will be reported later in this chapter. They concluded their article with the proposition that advisors as mentors can be "... supportive and facilitating [of] the student's own self-actualizing efforts." [Bargar and Duncan, 1982, p. 30]

Atcherson and Jenny [1983] also referred to the mentor relationship in their study of faculty members. They found there to be a difference in the perceptions of the availability of mentors in graduate studies. More women than men faculty members believed that mentors were
not generally available to members of their own sex. The study did not indicate that it was particularly important to have a mentor of the same sex. Also they reported that those faculty who had had mentors were more likely to serve as mentors to others.

In his review of 13 studies directly concerned with the counseling of graduate students, Melnick [1971] found reports of perceptions of the inadequacy of mentor-student relationships.

In her study of the doctoral candidates' and graduates' perceptions of the advisor-advisee relationship, Daniels-Nelson [1983] reported three findings directly from the perceptions reported to her about the advisor-advisee relationship and the perceived quality of the graduate experience. They were:

1. Relationships with advisors varied from very close to barely casual.
2. Degree of satisfaction with dissertation committee members was, in most cases, the second most significant element that influenced interviewee satisfaction with the dissertation experience.
3. Satisfaction with the doctoral program, particularly the dissertation experience, was directly related to the interviewee's satisfaction with his/her advisor. [p. 152]

The literature cited above clearly provided support for the study of advisors' perception of advisor-student relationship in graduate education.
(2) Creative Behavior in Graduate Education

Bargar and Duncan [1982], mentioned earlier in this report, have suggested that advisors can contribute to the creative endeavors of their doctoral students by:

1. Comprehending the student and the student's research problem.
2. Assuring that the student's endeavor has developmental and creative integrity.
3. Sharing 'ownership' of the research problem.
5. Assisting in the creative research endeavor.
   - Identifying potential resources.
   - Enhancing understanding.
   - Analyzing the problem and the student's relations to it.
6. Critiquing the research endeavor.
7. Mentoring. [pp. 17-29]

The beginning of their article was devoted to the current understandings of creative behavior as they might relate to the advising of doctoral student during their dissertation experiences.

Kelman [1968] concluded, in his study of the common complaints in the training of social psychologists, that a narrowness, orthodoxy, and low creativity reflect the general values of the profession not of graduate experience. He added that the notion that graduate student creativity is being stifled was not apt. He felt most graduate students do not begin with much creativity.
In her article "Exiting Creative Researchers from Graduate Education," Hunter [1978] reported that from a review of literature on creativity she identified five qualities which she presented as "researcher qualities" related to fostering creativity. The researcher qualities she identified were:

(1) attraction to ambiguity and complexity,
(2) perceptual openness,
(3) generation of one's own questions,
(4) taking responsibility for knowledge generation, and
(5) productive in knowledge generation.

For each quality, she presented ways to foster them and examples of procedures for measuring them. [pp. 209-211]

McCarthy, Kuh, and Belkman [1979, pp. 200-202] conducted a survey of 1160 doctoral students at 42 University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) member institutions and 20 non-UCEA institutions randomly selected. In their findings 54% of the respondents reported that their programs rewarded their imaginative and creative thinking, while 22% disagreed. [pp. 200-202] The Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain [1983] article also referred to the importance of encouraging the student's creative ability in dissertation research.
"In our view the dissertation should be seen as a creative capstone for a doctoral program experience." [p. 414]

The Council of Graduate Schools in the United States phrased the central purpose of doctoral programs in their 1977 policy statement as

"... designed to prepare a student for a lifetime of intellectual inquiry that manifests itself in creative scholarship and research." [Council of Graduate Schools, 1977]

As noted in the statement above and in the literature review there exists sufficient research and inquiry to indicate that creativity is a characteristic often associated with the graduate experience.

(3) Roles Related to Graduate Advising

The final area under review concerns the role of the doctoral advisor as it has been reported in the literature.

Winston and Polkosnik [1984] in "Advising Graduate and Professional School Students" stated five essential roles for advisors to fill in order to be judged successful. They were to be: (1) a reliable information source, (2) a departmental socializer, (3) an advocate, (4) a role model, and (5) an occupational socializer. In addition they stated two additional roles that may be filled by the advisor: (1) friend and (2) mentor. [p. 291]
In their article entitled "Ethical Issues in Graduate Education", Brown and Krager [1985] presented what they perceive as the ethical principles in graduate study as they relate to the roles of the advisor. The five principles are: Autonomy, nonmaleficence, beneficence, justice and fidelity. Each of the five ethical principles were presented as faculty responsibilities across the roles described by the authors. The roles they identified for graduate faculty were: Advisor, Instructor, Curricular Planner, Researcher and Mentor. [p. 405] The suggestions made earlier by Bargar and Duncan [1982] and those in Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain [1983] suggested also that role would be a consideration in the study of advisors of doctoral students.

The literature that related to the role of the faculty in graduate education was limited. It did provide support for role as a dimension of the study of advisors' perceptions of their doctoral advising experiences.

Summary

The review of the literature presented in this chapter was focused in two major areas. The first area focused upon presented the need for research in graduate education and built a rationale for conducting this research of the doctoral advising experience as perceived
by experienced advisors. The second focus presented areas of related literature that had a direct association with the following aspects of this research: importance of the advisor-student relationship, the creative behavior associated with graduate study and, roles of advisors in graduate work. In Chapter III the procedures of the study are presented.
CHAPTER III

Procedures of the Investigation

Introduction

This study was intended to provide grounds for the rudiments of substantive theory about PhD advising based upon the perceptions advisors have of their doctoral dissertation advising experiences. In Chapter I the problem was introduced and the rationale for the study was presented. Chapter II provided a review of the related literature. In this chapter the procedures of the study are described. The population is defined and the sample and procedures used for its selection are presented. Also in this chapter a description of the subjects is given; the development of the interview schedule is described; and the interview process is detailed. The constant comparative method of data analysis as described by Glaser and Strauss [1967] and as used in this study is discussed and an explanation of trustworthiness in naturalistic inquiry as it relates to this study is presented. The chapter concludes with an introduction to the three major categories, Advisor--Student Relationship, Student--Dissertation Relationship,
and Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, that emerged from the initial data analysis. These categories are presented as the elementary conceptual framework for Chapters IV and V.

Defining the Population

The population to be studied were major advisors from the College of Education at The Ohio State University. This population was defined in the following ways. First, potential subjects were to be drawn from the four departments that were the major subdivisions within the College of Education. They were:

1. Department of Educational Policy and Leadership,
2. Department of Educational Theory and Practice,
3. Department of Human Services Education, and
4. School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Within the College of Education, there are assistant, associate, and full professors who may have some responsibilities in PhD education. As the purpose of the study was to explore the advisors' perceptions of their doctoral dissertation advising experiences, it seemed important for the advisors to have had fairly extensive recent experiences from which to draw. On these grounds it
was decided that to qualify as a potential subject, the professors had to have advised at least five (5) students to successful completion of their doctoral dissertations during the past seven (7) years.

Two sources of information were contacted to provide data on the population of advisors eligible to participate in this study. First, the Assistant Dean of the College of Education provided a list of professors whose students had completed dissertations during the past five years. Fifty professors from the College had five students complete the dissertation from Summer Quarter 1979 through Winter Quarter, 1985. After some discussion with members of the reading committee, it was proposed that the dates Autumn, 1978 through Spring, 1985 be used (1) to determine if there would be a significantly greater number of faculty added to the population and (2) to bring the population up to date.

On investigation through the graduate school, an up-to-date list of names of the advisors from the College of Education who had five or more students complete the PhD. during the quarters Autumn, 1978 through Spring, 1985 was provided. Fifty-five professors were identified as potential subjects. Using the most current faculty directory as a basis, those potential subjects were eliminated who were no longer listed as active faculty members in the 1985 Directory. The names of the
investigator's committee members were also removed. The remaining names formed the population of fifty-one professors from which the sample of subjects was drawn.

Sample Selection

The College of Education has undergone several reorganizations during the past ten years. The most recent, with the reduction to the four departments outlined above, occurred in 1983. Each department now has several different program areas that are representative of major interests of faculty members. The departments and associated program areas are outlined below:

Department of Educational Policy and Leadership
  Educational Administration
  Humanistic Foundations
  Higher Education, Student Affairs and Adult Education
  Curriculum and Instructional Development
  Vocational-Technical Education

Department of Educational Theory and Practice
  Educational Research and Evaluation
  Elementary/Early Childhood Education
  Humanities Education
  Industrial Technology Education
  Instructional Design and Technology
The selection of subjects was conducted in the following manner. A sample of twenty subjects was drawn randomly from the population of fifty-one experienced advisees. An additional ten names also were drawn randomly to serve as alternates if necessary. As these alternates were drawn they were assigned a number 21-30. Of these only alternate #21 was used in the study; replacing one of the first 20 subjects who had left the university.

The sample of twenty subjects was compared to the target population along the following dimensions:

1. Department affiliation,
2. Program area affiliation, and
3. Academic rank.
The sample was found to be roughly representative of the population from which it was drawn. A comparison by department affiliation and rank of the population and the sample is displayed in Table 1. There was no major over representation of subjects in any one program area, department or rank.

Twenty interviews were thought to be sufficient to explore the range of responses one might get of advisors' perceptions of their advising experiences during their students' doctoral dissertation experiences. As it turned out the data provided by twenty professors during 70 minute to 2 hour tape-recorded interviews provided over 400 single spaced typewritten pages of data and appeared to have exhausted the variety of responses that could be elicited through the interview schedule that was employed.

Description of Subjects

As may be seen in Table 1, the 20 subjects selected for participation in the study were fairly representative of the population under study. The following description will provide a further summary view of the subjects, all of whom had advised at least five students to successful completion of the dissertation during the past seven years.
## TABLE 1

A Comparison of the Sample Selected to the Population of Advisors Who had 5 or More Students Complete the PhD during the Period Autumn 1978--Spring 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Population N=50</th>
<th>Sample N=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy and Leadership</td>
<td>20 40.0</td>
<td>7  35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Theory and Practice</td>
<td>14 28.0</td>
<td>6  30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Physical Education and Recreation</td>
<td>10 20.0</td>
<td>4  20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>6  12.0</td>
<td>3  15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>8  16.0</td>
<td>2  10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>42 84.0</td>
<td>18 90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data on four demographic variables were collected during the interviews. They were:

1. age,
2. years of service at The Ohio State University,
3. department affiliation, and
4. whether their PhD degree was earned at OSU or another institution.

These data indicated that the subjects were experienced faculty members of the College of Education. Experience at OSU ranged from 12 years to 40 years. The average number of years at OSU was 20.2. The average age of the advisors was 52.2 years. The range in ages was from a low of 44 years to a high of 63 years. Only 6 of the 20 completed their degrees at The Ohio State University. Four of those six were from the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. All of the 6 who completed the PhD at The Ohio State University have been at OSU 20 years or more. None of the subjects were female. The implications of this fact are numerous but perhaps most telling is the almost complete dominance of males in the PhD advising role over the seven year period of time these subjects were functioning. There were six women in the population from which the sample was drawn. The failure to randomly select one or more women was not considered to have seriously biased the outcomes of this study, although the outcomes may appropriately be restricted to male advisors. The sample selected was reasonably representative of the population of those male College of
Education faculty members who have had five or more students complete their PhD degrees during the past seven years.

**Interviews**

The first form of the interview schedule was developed as a result of reading selected dissertations and related literature to identify the areas of questioning that might best capture the advisor's view of the advising experience. Subsequent discussions with the researcher's advisor and committee members resulted in additional successive revisions to the initial interview schedule. Several revisions of the schedule occurred before the first pilot interview was conducted.

Prior to engaging in the interviews that provided the data for this study, three pilot interviews were conducted. Two interviewees were recently retired professors from the College of Education and one was a member of the researcher's reading committee for the dissertation. The pilot interviews were tape recorded and listened to for consistency in the questioning procedures and the adequacy of the patterns of questions to determine if the areas of interest of the study were being addressed effectively. In addition, feedback was solicited from the subjects of the pilot interviews about additional areas of interest or potential areas to delete from the interview.
Some recommendations were offered with regard to the questioning procedure and some additional areas of inquiry that might be added to the interview schedule were shared. The interview schedule was appropriately amended in light of the pilot interview experiences. Finally, these pilot interviews provided the researcher with opportunities to improve his already developed skills in open-ended interviewing.

Human subjects approval had been requested and received before the interviews were begun. It was stipulated by the Human Subjects Review Committee that individual professors and references to individual student's work be held anonymous. In the initial letter requesting their participation each subject was provided with assurances that these stipulations would be honored, as they have since been, and each subject signed a human subject's consent form at the time of the interview. (See Appendix A for samples of the initial letter and Appendix B for the human subject's consent form.)

The initial letters that were mailed to each subject described the study, briefly outlined the interview, and introduced the sponsoring investigators by name. Followup telephone contact was made by this investigator to arrange for an interview of 1 1/2 to two hours. Arrangements for the twenty separate interviews were made over a period of
six weeks. Generally interviews were scheduled within two weeks of the telephone contact. In several cases four or five telephone calls needed to be made in order to speak first hand to the subject. On three occasions the interviews were scheduled through a secretary. Only one subject could not be contacted. That subject had left the University to take a position at another institution and subject #21 was substituted for him.

During a two and one half month period, 20 interviews were conducted. The interviews ranged from 70 minutes to 2 hours in length. Most averaged about 90 minutes in length. No subject canceled or changed the time of the interview. All consented readily to audio taping. Prior to the interview, each subject received a second letter from the investigator confirming the time and place of the interview and providing a full outline of the interview schedule. The purpose of the study and the proposed use of audio tape recording were restated in the letter. (See Appendix C for sample of the second letter and Appendix D for an outline of the interview schedule)

All interviews were held at the Columbus Campus and in all but two cases, the interviews were held in the subjects' offices. In the two exceptions, a conference room was used in one and an empty classroom was used in the other.
The subjects were prompt and appeared to commit themselves comfortably to the time and effort necessary to complete the interview in a thoughtful manner. Four subjects when contacted by telephone, commented that they did not think they would have much to say about advising. Only one of those interviews was less than 90 minutes long and in all four cases the subjects commented on how surprised they were that they had had that much to offer regarding their advising experiences.

The interviews were conducted using a tape recorder to capture and preserve most of the richness and complexities of the subjects' responses. The researcher was consequently freed to probe, to listen, and to use his mind in helping to guide the subject through the unfolding interview experience. Thus, each interview took on its own character. The functions of the interviewer as researcher were to assure that each question area was sufficiently well explored and that the "depth" of responses revealed the richness and complexities of the subjects' perceptions of the advising experience.

The length of the interviews, the subjects' reliability in keeping appointments and the expressions of interest in the topic stated by every subject at the beginning or near the end of the interview provided support for two
conclusions: first, the respondents perceived the topic as important to them and second, they expressed their perceptions openly and willingly.

Following each interview, the researcher completed a form created to capture his initial perceptions and feelings about the interview. The form contained three questions and an additional comments section to which the researcher wrote his initial reactions to the interview and the subject:

1. Where: Description of the environment, any special considerations or comments?

2. Who: Comments on the subject, how we met, nature of the subject's attitude toward the interview.

3. General perceptions about the interview, did it seem to be treated honestly, openly; just generally: "How did it go?"

4. Additional comments:

The forms were numbered sequentially 1-20 as the interviews occurred and filed in a notebook. A typewritten transcription of each tape recorded interview and the signed human subjects form were also numbered and filed sequentially in the notebook. These three items completed a protocol for each subject.

The forms used to capture the researcher's initial reaction to the interview provided support for the advisors'
willing participation and interest in the study. The records indicated that the researcher had previously met five of the subjects during his residency experience on the campus. In no instance was the previous meeting felt to have adversely affected the full participation of these subjects. The responses to the question "How did it go?" suggested that the interviewer thought the subjects were relaxed, confident and willing to discuss their experiences. Further, the remarks noted by the interviewer suggested the subjects were interested in the study. Almost all asked questions beyond the interview itself about the research or indicated their interest in the outcomes. The notes provided good support for the researcher's belief in the willing participation of all subjects and their interest in the nature of the study.

Data Analysis

Each tape recorded interview was transcribed. The transcriptions were checked for accuracy. The researcher analyzed the transcribed data using the constant comparative method for the analysis of qualitative data as described by Glaser and Strauss [1967]. The purpose of the constant comparative method is to organize qualitative data by comparing incidents that are descriptive of emergent categories and then integrating categories with their
properties and characteristics to build grounded theory. "Grounded theory can be presented either as a well codified set of propositions or in a running theoretical discussion using conceptual categories and their properties." [Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 31] The result of the analysis in this investigation tended more to provide for the latter. That is, this research ended with the discussion of the rudiments of a theory expressed as propositions that had emerged from the categories and their characteristics and which were grounded in the data from the interviews with advisors.

The data that contributed to these results were composed of (1) the transcribed responses of the subjects to interview schedule questions about the advising process during their students' dissertation experiences, (2) the research memos recorded by the investigator as the analysis unfolded, and (3) the interview forms completed by the researcher following each interview.

The data analysis was begun as soon as the first interview tapes were transcribed and continued well beyond the last interview and its transcription. The initial analysis of each interview consisted of reading the transcription, highlighting the demographic data and those of the subjects' responses that captured their perceptions regarding the advising experience. In addition, the
researcher made notes of his thoughts as the analysis proceeded. These accumulated notes (memos) eventually led to the initial identification of the three general categories for the conceptual framework used in reporting the results. As the analysis proceeded, modifications in the data collection procedures also were occurring. Although these changes were not major, they influenced the nature of the interview in directions designed to enhance the possibilities for saturation of the emergent categories as the data collection continued.

These procedures for qualitative analysis are described by Glaser and Strauss [1967] as a conjoint activity in which the collection, coding, and analysis of data occur together and support the "... notion of theory as process..." [p. 43] The experiences of (1) changes in the interview schedule, (2) the emergence of the three major categories from the meanings expressed in the perceptions of the advisors about their advising experiences, and (3) the continuous process of refinement of the data which formulate conceptual themes in order to build the rudiments of a theory about advising have served to underscore the notion of this investigation as a study in process.

Following the initial review of the first four interview transcriptions, the researcher highlighted the subjects' responses into five general response areas.
The areas identified were:

1. demographic data,
2. "best experience,"
3. more troublesome or difficult experiences
4. creative activity, and
5. advisors' feelings toward the experience.

The first eleven transcriptions were reviewed in terms of the above five response areas.

Changes occurred in the data collection procedures as a result of that review included the addition of the following questions to the interview schedule:

1. How are advisors assigned to advisees?
2. Number of students for whom you have served as major advisor?
3. How did you learn your advising? and
4. How do you feel about your advising?

These questions had not appeared directly on the interview schedule, however, they had appeared in some of the initial eleven interviews. Following the thirteenth interview a research note made reference to the questions and indicated how they had become incorporated into the interview schedule.

The analysis of the transcripts continued until the transcripts of all twenty interviews had been reviewed and the subjects' responses related to the five question areas
identified above were highlighted. Subjects' responses to the questions related to the five areas were then transferred to cards to create units of data or incidents. In this study the incidents were the advisors' expressed perceptions of their advising experiences during the doctoral dissertation effort. The cards were sorted and those with demographic data were separated out.

Each transcript was again reviewed to verify that all data referring to the question areas identified were transferred to cards. The researcher then reviewed all memos and notes and the initial proposal of research in an effort to take the most comprehensive view of the phenomena of doctoral dissertation advising that was possible within the limits of this study.

The advisors' perceptions as units of data were recorded on color coded cards according to the five question areas presented above. The cards were reviewed and compared to provide the grounding for properties, characteristics and categories for more fully understanding doctoral student advising. Three major categories emerged through memos from the constant comparative review and coding of the cards: Advisor--Student Relationship, Student--Dissertation Relationship, and Advisor--Dissertation Relationship. The cards in each category were compared, reviewed and coded to identify the characteristics and properties that emerged.
Those characteristics and properties provided a full, grounded description of the categories that emerged from the data of this study. It is the incidents from the specific cards as verbatim quotes that provide the grounding for the emerging propositions concerning the advising of doctoral students during their dissertation experiences which are presented and discussed in Chapter VI.

**Trustworthiness**

In the article "Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries," Guba [1981] presented a comparison of the conceptions of rigor as they apply to naturalistic as well as rationalistic inquiry. The four basic concerns of "trustworthiness" as they are applied to naturalistic and rationalistic inquiry described by Guba were:

1. Truth value,
2. Applicability,
3. Consistency, and

Each of the four concerns and how they were provided for in this naturalistic research inquiry are described below.

**Truth Value.** This research was conducted to capture the perceptions of experienced advisors about their
experiences of advising doctoral students during the
dissertation experience. Truth value is related to the
degree to which the findings and interpretations are
perceived as credible and descriptive of the reality which
is being studied. [Guba 1981, p. 80] Efforts made in this
study to establish truth value included careful reviews of
the interview schedule with committee members; pilot
interviews and perception checks with the pilot interview
subjects to determine the relevance of the questions; using
verbatim quotes from tape recorded interviews as units of
data; debriefing notes following each interview to determine
if any factors were perceived by the researcher as having
undue influence on the nature and conduct of the interview;
and discussions with a committee member following interviews
and during data analysis to maintain as bias-free an
attitude as possible. Each of the efforts mentioned above
provided a measure of support for the credibility of the
perceptions expressed by advisors and reported in this
study.

Applicability. The concern for applicability related
directly to the purposes of the research. The issue here in
a rationalistic paradigm would be one of generalizability.
This study was limited to those expressed perceptions of the
advisors interviewed who were reasonably representative of
the population of experienced advisors in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. The research that was conducted and reported here accurately represents the responses of those advisors who participated in this study. The interviews were conducted freely and openly. All participants were volunteers. Their responses were transcribed from audio tapes of the interviews conducted by this researcher. Efforts made to insure accuracy of the data included: tape recorded interviews, a review of each transcript following the completion of the typing, several discussions with one committee member as the transcriptions were being analyzed and a review of the forms completed at the end of each interview.

The question concerning applicability discussed by Guba was described as a question of fit. That is, do the findings, interpretations and integrations fit; do they fairly describe the advising experiences of doctoral advisors? Two sources provided support for this concern. First, each of this researcher's committee members provided him with their sense of "fittingness" of the questions; the data; the corresponding characteristics and categories; and the propositions that were built from the expressed perceptions of the advisors. Second, the nature of the questions posed and interest indicated by the subjects during the interviews provided support for the applicability
of the research. The advisors were curious as to what the findings would likely be. Many offered their speculations as to what the research might find. In addition, their interest was evidenced by their promptness and reliability at meeting appointments. No scheduled appointment was broken. The length of the interviews was 70 to 120 minutes with the average being near 90 minutes.

Consistency. The concern of consistency for the naturalistic inquirer is one of dependability. [Guba, 1981] The question was proposed by Guba in terms of two issues: (1) stability, are the "instruments" yielding credible results and (2) trackability, can the changes in instrumentation (e.g. the researcher as instrument) be accounted for?

According to Guba [1981, p. 81] the issue of stability is found in the inquirer's belief about reality. A naturalistic inquirer believes in multiple realities. He therefore sees the instability as real and attempts to account for it. In this study the full and rich account of the variety of perceptions expressed by advisors were presented in order to bring a measure of stability to the multiple realities being described. The effort in each case was to present the broadest possible range of relevant responses provided by the advisors. Differences were as
much sought as likeness in collecting and categorizing the data. To provide for "trackability," the trail of evidence included the review and development of the interview schedule, pilot interviews, research notes and memos, tape recorded and transcribed interviews, interviewer notes following the interviews, verbatim quotations of respondents on cards as incidents of data, the coding of cards and discussions held with a committee member as data analysis progressed. Each of the efforts noted above were to provide for a detailed accounting of the researcher's activities during the conduct of the study.

The naturalistic view of consistency would include the question of replicability. This study was described fully in an effort to provide sufficient information to assist in replication of the study. The goal of a replication would be not only to provide support for the findings in a different context; but also, to more fully describe the phenomena of advising doctoral students during the dissertation experience. In a subsequent study an inquirer might make changes in the interview schedule, population for study, organization and analysis of data. This study could be replicated and it would likely be useful to do so in different contexts, using a different population to ascertain the degree to which the findings reported here might be applicable elsewhere.
Neutrality. The concerns related to neutrality were described by Guba as equivalent to the concerns for "objectivity" in the rationalistic paradigm. [Guba, 1981, pp. 81-82] As it related to the naturalistic paradigm, he used the term "confirmability." The concern here is not one of, can the researcher be "objective," but rather can the results be confirmed. The researcher has relied for meaning upon the perceptions of those advisors he interviewed. The advisors said what has, herein, been reported as the data of this study. The tapes of their expressed perceptions were transcribed and selectively reported for inclusion in the research as data. Those expressed perceptions were in response to the questions posed and were coded and recorded on cards as incidents or individual units of data. That they exist cannot be denied. Nor can it be denied that the advisors have said what they have said, the tapes do exist.

The researcher was used as an instrument in the process of data collection, categorizing of data, the analysis and the synthesis of the data into the emerging categories and characteristics that support the propositions as rudiments of a theory for the advising of doctoral students during the dissertation experience.
As presented in Guba and Lincoln [1981], there is value in the researcher as the instrument in the research. The potential of the researcher as the instrument in the research is

... embedded in the ability of human beings to be observers, categorizers, and processors (on both propositional and tacit levels) of many forms of data: verbal, nonverbal, environmental, social, and contextual. The strength of such an instrument is its multidimensional quality. [pp. 150-151]

As the researcher in this investigation proceeded, efforts were made as described above to insure the "trustworthiness" of the study. The element of the researcher in this research was perceived as exploiting the depth and richness of the data as suggested above by Guba and Lincoln in their reference to the "multidimensional quality" of the "instrument." The researcher's biases are in the research, are part of the richness and depth of the research. The meos, discussions with the committee members have served to identify and account for those biases.

Initial Description of Categories

In using the constant comparative method, the first step is to compare incidents applicable to each category.

The analyst starts by entering each incident in his data into as many categories of analysis as possible, as categories emerge, or as data emerge that fit an existing category. [Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 105]
As this researcher began to review the incidents, three major categories emerged. Each of the categories identified emerged from a focus on one of the relationships described in Figure 1. Each category is best characterized as a relationship between two of the three distinguishable elements; the student, the advisor or the dissertation.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 1
Relationships that Occur Between the Advisor, Student, and Dissertation during the Dissertation Experience

The first category, identified as a. in Figure 1 was characterized by the reciprocal relationship that occurs between the student and advisor during the dissertation advising experience and is referred to as the category, Advisor--Student Relationship. The interaction of the student with the dissertation (b. in Figure 1) formed a
second category which emerged from the data and is referred to as the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship. A third category, referred to as Advisor--Dissertation Relationship was characterized by outcomes of the interaction of the advisor with the dissertation (c. in Figure 1). The properties and characteristics of these categories and the integration of these properties, characteristics and categories create the foundations for the propositions presented in Chapter VI.

Summary

In this chapter the fundamental procedures employed in the study were presented. They included the identification of the target population, selection of the sample of subjects, development of the interview schedule, conduct of the interviews, procedures for analyzing the data, a discussion of trustworthiness as it related to the naturalistic research design of this study, and an overview of the three basic categories that provided a conceptual framework for the analysis and presentation of the data.

A full account of the three categories that emerged from the data analysis with their characteristics and properties are presented in Chapters IV and V. The category, Advisor--Student Relationship, amplified through incidents from transcripts of interviews with advisors, will
be presented in Chapter IV with an explication of the four major characteristics that serve to describe that category. The categories, Student--Dissertation Relationship and Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, with their properties and characteristics supported by descriptive incidents from the advisors' transcripted remarks will be presented and discussed in Chapter V. Table 2 presents in outline form the three categories and their respective characteristics.
**TABLE 2**

**Major Categories and their Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor—Student</td>
<td>- interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- time demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>- role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- creative aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student—Dissertation</td>
<td>- topic/problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- student attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>- work beyond the dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- creative aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor—Dissertation</td>
<td>- judgments regarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standards/quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>- dissertation time demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- advisor interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- creative aspects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

Category: Advisor--Student Relationship

The main objective of this research was to provide a grounding for the rudiments of a substantive theory about PhD advising based upon the advisors' expressed perceptions of their students' doctoral dissertation experiences. Chapter I provided a statement of the problem, Chapter II presented a review of related research and Chapter III presented a description of how the study was conducted and the three major categories which emerged through processes of data analysis. In this chapter a detailed description of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, is presented with specific, verbatim accounts of the perceptions provided by the twenty advisors which build "depth" and richness into the meanings of the proposed characteristics and properties of the category. The integration of meanings of the categories, their characteristics, and properties into the rudiments of grounded theory is developed later in Chapter VI.
Advisor--Student Relationship

The category, Advisor--Student Relationship as perceived by the advisors was the most complex of the three relationships or categories which emerged from the data. The focus in this category was not on the advisor nor was it on the student but rather on what transpired between the two. Clearly the two were seen by the advisors as being in a transactive and not simply an interactive relationship. The major characteristics that seemed to describe those transactions as perceived by the PhD advisors were:

1) interpersonal relations,
2) time demands,
3) role, and
4) creative aspects.

Each of these four characteristics and their properties are described in depth below through perceptions directly quoted from the transcripts of the advisors' interviews. The intent is to provide the reader with a grounded description of these characteristics and their properties.

Transactive referred to here was the broader perspective of the relationship. Each person affects the other in a broader context, not merely reacts to or interacts with the other. It infers that the relationship has mutual and reciprocal dimensions.
Interpersonal Relations

The characteristic, interpersonal relations, was revealed through a variety of reported perceptions. Many of these centered on the feelings of the advisor toward the student. An overwhelming majority of these perceptions made reference to the positive nature of such relationships.

Examples included:

I'm very close to my doctoral students, really close. I have them to my house often and I think [it is] like . . . a marriage contract. [#3, p.4]

. . . and the relationship seems much more like that of colleagues who work together . . . [#4, p.3]

. . . and the experience of doing the advising has more to do with the interpersonal relations that we have than the kind of intellectual journey . . . [#14, p. 11]

It's a great deal of joy to work with the doctoral student very closely." [#5, p. 14]

It is a learning experience that will bring [the] student closer than he or she has ever been before with her major advisor. [#6, p. 10]

I want a completely open relationship . . . [#5, p. 12]

---

2The notation presented here and in later excerpts refers to the respondent #1-20 and the specific page of their transcribed interview.
Because the nice thing about doctoral students, when you have this kind of relationship, is you grow with them.

... for a year or more you are as important as anybody in that student's life. I think one has to be sensitive to that fact. [#19, p4.]

And all of my students are part of my family, I really care about them. [#6, p. 21]

Many other similar responses occurred which characterized the perception held that closeness to advisees is an important characteristic of the advising experience. However additional responses suggest not all experiences were nearly so positive. Some examples which provided for a more negative description of interpersonal relationships included:

... it [sic] was not an easy person for me to interact with, it was one of those things when an hour with him was like three hours with someone else. [#9, p. 8]

[Those] people who have changed advisors, have left me and gone to another advisor. I think in some cases they felt maybe I wasn't as interested in them as other people. [#3, p. 15]

In describing a more troublesome advising experience one advisor said:

[As a result of his requiring more writing and rewording] . . . he was mad as hell and I was uncomfortable as hell and because I felt that we probably, I . . . [didn't let him know earlier the writing was poor] without calling it
right there early on and so we both had to go through that challenge. [#10, p. 16]

... I spend time with them, but [sic] I'd be disappointed if they didn't do well and that sort of thing. But, not a lot of social relationships or anything like that. [#15, p. 15]

I can think of people [students] with whom they thought I [had] a personality conflict. I think that happens with me. I think that happens to many human beings ... they can't get along perfectly with everybody. [#3, p. 15]

So my style is to be as open as possible, to be as fair as I can and there are students that I just can't deal with ... I tell them, 'I think you ought to get another advisor.,' [#12, p. 13]

... in some cases they learn to hate me because I gave them a hard time and maybe because I know what kind of sloppy poor work they've done and I let them get away with it. [#2 p. 11]

They don't want me to have as much a peer relationship with them as ... I attempt to take on. ... they don't want me to be as much to them as I, what I, am willing to [be]. [#7, p. 18]

Thus, it appears that advisors reported there to be a range of positive and negative descriptions that characterize the interpersonal relationships. As this particular characteristic of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, was investigated there seemed to be a considerable degree of agreement that the success of the
advisor-student transaction was dependent upon a "good" relationship. Three subjects commented in a summary sort of way:

I think the students are certainly much more important than our feelings. I am going to do a great deal not to reveal any negative feelings that I may have; distinguishing feelings from judgments, personal judgments. [#19, p. 13]

I would not serve on your committee if I, (1), wasn't interested in your research, or (2), more importantly [interested in] you. [#6, p. 24]

People are interested in you and you are interested in them so the relationship is built on that . . . [#10, p. 5]

But perhaps the complexities involved were best characterized by the response:

"... it is a difficult question because it turns on the level of satisfaction that I have on the advisor side as contrasted with the success of the work of the student who's on the other side. There are always satisfactions associated with that advisor--advisee relationship." [#1, p. 5]

**Time Demands**

The characteristic, time demands, that emerged here seemed to be related to time demands of the advising experience as the advisors' responses further described the category, Advisor--Student Relationship. The
characteristic, time demands, was directly related to three properties affecting the advisor--student relationship. These were:

1) students being off-campus while completing their dissertations,
2) students changing advisors, and
3) quality of the student and/or the level of his/her skills.

Examples that described the advisors' perceptions of the demands linked to each of these properties are presented below. The effects of students being off-campus while completing their dissertations were revealed by the following reported perceptions.

But there is a lot more work for this student off-campus . . . you've got to write out more explicitly the comments so it does take a lot more time. [#13, p. 15]

Another problem is the period of time between the time I see them . . . then I don't see them for three or four months. We almost have to start from square one . . . so that's been a problem through the years . . . those who are off-campus studying in various parts of the country. [#3, p. 4]

I try not to [treat students away from campus differently] but the proximity or lack of it increases the probability that there is some less intimacy . . . . [#20, p. 9]

So I see the full time study as extremely important to the completion
of the degree and I won't accept a part-time PhD student. . . .[#5, p. 15]

I've seldom seen a student who leaves campus and finishes a dissertation within a year, usually it takes up to five years if at all. Most people that leave never finish. [#6, p.16]

But if they [students] wait and they go back to work, the students go back to work, it gets pretty hard. If he doesn't [finish] the first year, chances are 85 to 15 he won't come back the second year. [#12, p.6]

Examples that described the effects on advisors' perceptions of student's changing advisors included:

... but one of my colleagues who is no longer here advised this student . . . I was given this student. I wouldn't sign a petition for an extension so she got another professor to serve . . . [and they got her through.] I was very disappointed that this happened. Now I have very mixed feelings about it. [The advisor said he felt good she finished, felt bad that he couldn't sign the petition for extension.] [#3, p. 5]

A student's original advisor would not agree to the topic selected, the student changed advisors, and her new advisor commented:

... it was, . . . a very mixed affect setting or ethos at that point. . . . I would guess, on balance, if I had to, I could go back and add up the clock hours of working with that student. It must have been three or four times the amount than with students that were on parallel calendars . . . . [#1 p. 17]
Two additional advisors offered these experiences:

... I inherited this person is what it amounted to. The person she was working with retired, [and] she already had a proposal. So what am I to do? I don't let people [just drop or quit], she's got an investment here. ... and the first thing I knew I'm in the middle of this thing. That's a bad situation. [18, p. 18]

But one person who I've inherited from another advisor who retired, I've been working with him almost weekly. ... I couldn't do it with every student 'cause that's all I'd be doing ... It takes more advisor energy. [15, p. 8]

The third set of incidents to describe the characteristic, time demands, included the advisors' perception of students' quality and/or his/her skills:

... [if] you have a marginal student, it becomes a much more difficult task. ... you assist in more detail and specific ways ... [13, p. 20]

... we have, in the past, too often as a matter of fact, ... accepted marginal candidates. ... But when it came time to formulate, propose and prepare and do a dissertation, they just didn't have the stuff. [2, p. 8]

... [if] someone who isn't as secure, we'll structure their suggestions more specifically, I'll be honest with you. Maybe even write them out on paper. [13, p. 22]
The most often mentioned skill deficit was students'
lack of writing skills.

I insisted that he write, as he wrote each chapter . . . and I had to do a lot of rewriting and he began to get resentful. . . . It took him an additional year . . . [#10, p. 6]

. . . but then when it came to writing the dissertation . . ., it just wasn't adequate at all. [#13, p. 9]

I had to make him do some rather extensive rewriting in certain areas and that was extremely upsetting to [him] to the point that he was ready to punch me in the face. [#13, p. 9]

These three properties: students being off-campus at dissertation stage, advisor changes, and quality of the student and/or the level of skills of the student all combined to make for increased dissertation time demand on the advisor. It became clear that advisors perceived the effects of off-campus students, changes in advisor and the quality and/or skills a student brings to the dissertation experience as "troublesome" properties that created high demands on the advisor's time.

Role

The category, Advisor-Student Relationship, was further described by the characteristic, role. The properties that served to describe this characteristic included:
1) the attributes and functions of advising as perceived by the advisor,
2) expectations of advisors for themselves, for their students and what they perceive as student expectations of them, and
3) satisfactions from their role in the dissertation advising experience.

Each of these linked properties will be illustrated below by citing specific reported perceptions from transcribed remarks of the advisors.

The first property of the characteristic, role, of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, as perceived by the advisors was reported mainly by references to two aspects. One aspect related primarily to the attributes of the person in the role: e.g. honest, open, and responsible. The second property focused more on the content or functions of the activity of advising such as: providing specific direction, critiquing, and other actions an advisor could take.

Specific examples linked to the attributes of the person in the role included:

. . . there were many factors and then I would guess I would want to include my influence as one of those factors that cause them to become active, productive scholars, . . . [#19, p. 4]
...by the time they are ready to do their dissertation I feel I know them, so that we have pretty good rapport going into the dissertation. [#9, p. 6]

I want a completely open relationship. . . . I will accept criticism . . . I don't punish them for being open with me. [I] treat them with respect. [#5, p. 12]

I try to be open, friendly, helpful, cheerful, relevant and all those good things. [#14, p.11]

You have to be honest about them [your feelings] . . ., at least with yourself because then anything you do at least you can look at with some degree of understanding . . . you can judge your behavior in a somewhat better fashion . . . [#10, p. 19]

Examples of the functions of the role, or specific actions on the part of the advisor included the following:

My role [in describing a best advising situation] is to kind of affirm his judgment, offer corrective advice, help on some technical problems of sample size and how to get cooperation from the data sources. [#1, p. 5]

He wanted me to take it up to the committee . . . The committee rejected it. Everybody objects. [The student says,] 'you're just trying to fail me.' And you have to deal with depression and everything else and actually trying to stick in there and prop up questions and not letting him down. [#7, p.15]

. . . The most difficult, of course, is offering criticism . . . good teachers are good critics. That is to say, they can offer a criticism without
destroying the feelings, without hurting, without humiliating people. [#2, p. 11]

... to the degree to which they have feelings about themselves ... the best you can do as an advisor is to spend almost as much time trying to deal with that ... you've just got to keep encouraging a person and saying 'Hey, that's pretty good.' [#8, p. 17]

... I had to, as advisor, put up or shut up, and say to a student, 'Hey, look this can't go on any longer and you're going to have to get moving on this.' and became more directive than I normally am ... [#8, p. 22]

There is always some direction I give them on where to go from here ... To be concentrating on, always try to make it a positive session, in that I want them to feel like they're moving. [#9, p. 7]

There were some comments that might be characterized as non-examples or expressions of inadequate performance by the advisors in their advising role:

I don't always feel ... I've always provided students with as much information or as much assistance as I can. ... I don't know the information and sometimes I don't know where to send them when I ought to know where to send them. [#12, p. 20]

... earlier times when I was a more neutral kind of creature and in some ways I gave students enough rope to hang themselves. [#12, p. 17]

Well, I get with them and help them. I try not to write it for them. [#12, p. 17]
I think a lot is on the shoulders of advisors and if the advisor is unsure as to whether the student has written a satisfactory dissertation, there shouldn't be a defense in the first place. [#3, p. 9]

I think that we'd be careful that we not advise, . . . people or try to administer research projects for which we really don't have the true expertise or experience to do the job with integrity, with honesty. And I think some dissertations have been done in that fashion. . . . [#6, p. 7]

I think you have to play within your own competence you . . . and if you get too far outside, or get a student who is too far outside, I think the student and the advisor can get into hot water simply because you are not playing your own game anymore. [#16, p. 23]

Advisors perceived the attributes of their role as those that established an open, honest, responsible relationship in which they functioned to provide active support in both an encouraging as well as a substantive-methodological way. Their concept of role tended to blend into a complementary set of attributes and functions they held for themselves, and for their students in the dissertation research experience.

Four dimensions of the property, expectations, emerged from the variety of advisor perceptions within the category, Advisor--Student Relationship. First were the expectations advisors held for students and their perceptions of the students' expectations for the work;
second was the level of performance expected of students; third were those expectations the advisor has for himself and finally, were those expectations for his relationship with his students. The most definitive statements about the first dimension were reported in the responses given when discussing the characteristics of their best advising experiences. Examples included:

. . . those students were self-starters. They were students who didn't wait for you . . . they are almost self-directed. [#12, p. 4]

. . . the student is interested in and enjoys and is learning and growing. Then I grow as well. [#12, p. 10]

. . . following the general examination [the student] then submits a formal dissertation proposal, which is largely of the student's own creation . . . They come with the problem fairly well thought out--articulated. [#8, p. 5]

. . . they all seemed better disciplined, better prepared, motivated, better organized, more knowledgeable about what they were doing. [#2, p. 2]

. . . how independent a student is, or . . . the more independent a student is and able to pull a lot of this stuff off by himself or herself, the better the experience for the advisor. [#15, p. 6]

Some advisors reported their expectations to be more related to the character of the work and its relationship to the advisor's work. They suggested that the student's work ought to parallel their own interests.
So beginning in their second year there was always one person [who served as a GRA on a research project] . . . that person would step into like a leadership role and that their dissertation would come out of that work. [#5, p. 3-4]

Another similar view is revealed in the following advisor's response to students' requests that he become their advisor:

I say that I'd be glad to be their advisor but that they should know something before they want to commit themselves to [him and he continues] I'm doing this research and that I expect my doctoral students to participate in that research. [#4, p. 3]

Another advisor commented:

... we have already an understanding that it's going to be research typically associated with a [specific] area. [#7, p. 8]

Another dimension of the property, expectations, was described by advisors in terms of the level of the students' performance. It was reported in situations where advisors expectations were too high and student expectations were too low:

I have high expectations for [the student]. Sometimes I expect more from people than they are ready to give. I try to be fair or open about that. [#11, p. 7]

... my most difficult experiences have to do with those students who--who
waste time, I think waste time, who cry and bitch and moan all the time. [#12, p. 7]

[in describing what students did in a research way]. . . students would come asking questions, needing advice about much more trivial matters. [#4, p. 8]

In describing a situation where the student did not meet expectations this advisor commented:

[The student pressed a committee meeting] I go back to the committee and . . ., there was nothing else you can do as an advisor. They [the student] say[s] 'I'll defend it, I'll take the consequence.' It went to committee three times. It was rejected three times . . . [#7, p. 14]

. . . Some students . . . either expect more or you know, need very rigorous direction in a sense that' . . . tell me what to do and I'll do it . . . just tell me what to do and I'll do it.' That's when the process becomes traumatic. [#10, p. 5]

The range of advisors' expectations for students has been captured in the responses described above as the first dimension of the property, expectations. There are two further dimensions of the perceptions of advisors related to the property, expectations.

The advisor has expectations for himself as they relate to the category, Advisor--Student Relationship.

The expressed perceptions of the advisor's expectations of self included the following:

I've identified with them as people, I want to help them succeed. [#9, p. 6]
I think the main thing is to treat the
PhD students with respect, expect
things of them that you would expect
from yourself.  [#5, p. 17]

Part of that is, I think, I feel a
responsibility for their survival.
We're talking about the next study and
looking down the road.  [#4, p. 12]

[Advising] is an activity that is
absolutely essential if you really want
to help that student maximize the time
they have here on campus.  [#13, p.
24]

They should have an advisor who really
cares about them.  [#3, p. 18]

It's something I take very seriously
for I feel I have an obligation to be
there and to do it with them and not be
sloppy about it.  [#9, p. 16]

... a lot of them do fairly poor
research because when you have faculty
members not prepared for research to
the extent that I think they should,
it's going to affect the students ...  [#17, p. 14]

... we foster maybe a little bit too
much dependency ...  [#17, p. 10]

Advisors seemed to hold the expectation that they
treat students with respect, care about them, take
advising seriously, and expect them to succeed. Some
expressed that they see poor research skills demonstrated
by faculty and it was suggested that perhaps faculty
foster dependence.

The final dimension of the property, expectations,
had to do with those expectations advisors have for the
overall relationship itself. Here the advisors' perceptions fell into three areas. The first related to conceiving the relationship in terms of teaching, apprenticeships or mentoring types of experiences. A second had to do with reference to students coming to work with specific advisors and last, two descriptions were presented as failures in the advising relationship based upon advisors' expectations.

Specific references to teaching/counseling, apprenticeship or mentor relationship models included the following:

Using the word teaching broadly . . . it might be better described as counseling. [Many students] feel close enough to an advisor, will come and ask for help, ask for advice and just want to talk about things. [#19, p. 17]

[In describing the teaching/counseling relationship] I mean the most important thing is that the advisor and advisee be compatible, that they resonate in a mutually advantageous way, have residence [time together] between them . . . [#14, p. 15]

I think though, I think in general this environment has been very facilitative of a student being very open of how they feel and how interactions are proceeding. [In reference to an apprenticeship type relationship.] [#4, p. 6]

And so in going through those experiences with students it was more like an apprenticeship model which I feel is what the dissertation [sic] should be. [#5, p. 4]
The advisor is really a mentor, trying to transfer to you as much of the information, skills and attitudes that he or she has in two years. ..
[#7, p. 17]

This same advisor reports

... I am very aware of being in a mentor relationship. [#7, p. 19]

... often I think, successful people have a mentor and also the successful person who has been mentored, at some point, makes a break with the person who has been the mentor. .. [#11, p. 7]

The theme of advising as teaching was the description most often given of the function of advising as perceived by advisors. The apprenticeship or mentoring model did not commonly emerge as ways of viewing the overall advising relationship. Nonetheless, they were expressed by some advisors' as a descriptive of their role.

Students do come to work with specific advisors, generally because of the advisors' expertise in a highly specialized field. Two examples were reported.

One advisor stated:

... the best students come with that in mind, know so and so who has written in an area, studied an area, and they want to come here to work with that person.

He continued on to say:

... vast majority, 90% or more come to us without anything like that in mind ... and that I think is an apparent weakness in this whole program and dissertation process. [#2, p. 17]
A second one commented in response to a direct question:

"Do people come to be advised by you specifically?"

That's true right now with a person that began this quarter . . . yes, that happens, definitely. [§3, p. 14]

Advisors also perceived there to be failures in advising in terms of their expectations concerning advisor behavior. Two examples are presented. One referred to the advisors' failure to fulfill his expectations for himself as mentor:

. . . She's a fine person, . . . a hell of a practitioner but she doesn't know a . . . thing about research. . . . the courses she took over . . . in research and methodology failed to provide her with adequate basis for determining what is good research and there is nothing that I, I guess I didn't have the ability to, I failed as a mentor, okay? I just couldn't work with her adequately . . . to convey . . . the proper direction . . I failed as a teacher in her education. [§6, p. 9]

A second described his perceptions of the failures of some other advisors to meet even university expectations for the role.

. . . but I also know there are some cases that are downright, in my opinion, criminal in the sense of lack of attention, lack of attentiveness, lack of concern or dogmatic stance with regards to the student. Which I think are probably violations. Certainly they are violations of what I think the university should stand for.
He went on to say:

But that's actually not nearly as common as one might think ... [#14, P. 19]

The final property of the characteristic, role, as it related to the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, is satisfaction. Satisfaction refers here to the satisfactions or rewards advisors perceived as growing out of their role relationships with their students. There were two dimensions reported of such satisfaction and these were those satisfactions derived from student growth and satisfactions perceived as a result of advisor growth.

Examples of advisors' perceptions of student growth providing satisfaction included the following:

The final pleasure is ... a student that by all indications ought not be admitted. ... but you are willing to take that student on. And that student does well. [#12, p.5]

... but in the case of the advisor/advisee role I get a lot of pleasure from a student doing a really good job. In a sense an awful lot of pleasure where a student teaches me something. [#4, p. 16]

So to me it was just a very, very positive experience and it was approaching teaching research much like we do with, preparing a classroom teacher ... [#5, p. 4]

In answer to the question, are you proud of them? ... you can't advise somebody who doesn't contribute far
more than the advice, but what I'm proud of is the teaching that goes into advising. [#16, p. 19]

There were many such accounts of student growth reported by the advisors. However, the examples of the advisors' perceptions of their own growth and satisfaction were also descriptive of their role.

... some of what would be my best advising experience has less to do with a particular student than it does with my own growth as an advisor. [#4, p. 3]

[Commenting on the good feelings he gets from advising he states] Yes sure, yes. I don't have any doubt about that. It is not a selfless act at all. it is very self-serving and I get a lot of my 'goodies' from my students. [#11, p. 15]

... but it is more fun working with someone that is compatible and doing something of mutual interest, that shows enthusiasm and it's not just a chore to get it out of the way. There's no question about that. [#18, p. 26]

But I think the work I've done, the most memorable [advising] work, the most memorable part of my role has been with my own students, [my] graduates . . . PhD students. That's where all of the action and the rewards have been for me. [#17, p. 14]

... I foster that [closeness] because I get a lot of my good experiences and professional experiences with that, with . . . PhD advisees in particular. [#11, p. 15]
The satisfaction and rewards advisors receive from their role relationships with students seemed to have their roots in the teaching-learning and growth experiences.

In summary, the characteristic, role, of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, provided several properties for careful review. In summary they included the following ideas. The attributes of advisors as reported by the advisors involved a mixture of responsibilities, the exercise of influence, and behaving in ways that generate a mutual trust, openness and honesty. In addition, advisors performed such functions as criticizing, representing students with committees, establishing expectations for progress, and providing direction. Some advisors recognized a need to be cognizant of their own skills and limitations, knowledgable enough to seek help or assistance when necessary, and able to know where to send students for assistance.

With respect to the expectations as a property of the characteristic, role, of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, advisors' responses expressed the following: the best students were perceived by advisors as being self starters, self-directed and well motivated. Advisors saw advantages in situations where students' work paralleled their own work and thus shared
substantive-methodological expectations in common. The advisors reported that when students brought high expectations to the work the result tended to be better dissertation efforts. Also with respect to the advisor expectations for themselves they reported generally that they should treat students with respect, care about them, take advising seriously, and expect students to succeed.

The final dimension of the property, expectation, as it related to the characteristic, role, was described in terms of expectations about the overall advising relationship. Advisors most often perceived that relationship in terms of a teaching experience while four subjects referred to it as a mentoring or apprenticeship experience. An additional condition used to describe some advising relationships was the result of certain students coming to study with a specific advisor. However, this appeared to occur in only a few cases.

The final property of the characteristic, role, was that of satisfaction. The advisors perceived the advising experience as contributing to student growth with a concomitant real satisfaction for the advisor. In addition, the advisors perceived their own growth as a source of satisfaction in the advising experience.
Creative Aspects

The doctoral program is designed to prepare a student "... for a lifetime of intellectual inquiry that manifests itself in creative scholarship and research." [Council of Graduate Schools, 1977]

The quote from the Council of Graduate Schools seemed to have found some support in the perceptions expressed by the advisors participating in this study. The issue of creativity in doctoral research is a complex one. It seems to cross into all dimensions of dissertation work and reference to it appears in the three major conceptual categories that have emerged from data in this study. Thus in each descriptive accounting of the three categories identified, one of the characteristics of each category has to do with the creative aspects. As it relates to the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, the characteristic, creative aspects, was reported in terms of two properties:

1) descriptions of the dissertation process as creative and

2) efforts on the part of advisors to encourage creativity.

Each property is presented below with descriptions of advisors' perceptions taken from the data. The two presentations are later summarized into a description of
the characteristic, creative aspects, as it relates to the category, Advisor--Student Relationship.

First, descriptions of the dissertation process as creative were numerous. There tended to be a range of perceptions about just how creative one might be during the dissertation experience. The range will be portrayed by the following descriptions reported by advisors, beginning with a more restrictive view and moving toward a more open approach.

. . . there tends to be an emphasis, desire to do more rigorous experimental kind of work that will meet those criteria [that the subject perceives as coming from the graduate school] which may in turn cause me or others [working] with it, to influence the student away from the other creative thing. [ #2, p. 6]

. . . So I think there is a place for people who are not doing much more than a replication . . . but that is not much fun and so I think students know that I am liable to set up even higher expectations for themselves, they create in themselves self-expectations that would push for a much more creative start. [ #4, p. 10]

. . . I think the fact that they have seen many different kinds of dissertations early on shows that I would entertain creativity in their approach. [ #3, p. 6]

[States that each advising experience is similarly unique, how ideas get started popping in and out.] It is how it gets started--little minuets. And if you don't follow the rigid rules of how you have to get things done . . .
[comments on how eventually you must meet deadlines, file forms with the institution, etc.] But along the way keep it informal and . . . playing [the idea] along. . . . And I don't know any other way to describe it, but a kind of creative, . . . may be creative is too stereotypic, but certainly an emergent, emergent process." [#11, p. 10]

In describing the efforts advisors made to enhance the creative aspects of their students' work, two approaches emerged. The first described a modeling approach and the second seemed focused upon using the environment or context for the early introduction to educational research.

The first three reported perceptions describing what some advisors do to enhance the creative activity of the students.

What happens . . . I think is a lot of informal, not structured sit down in a scheduled meeting so much, but maybe having a cup of coffee . . . having breakfast, something like that . . . just exploring ideas. Or, going around the [office, talking, sharing] wondering what it means. Relating it [ideas] to something else. Most of the dissertation kind of gets into shape that way, you know, just sort of grabbed on eventually there's something there that takes place. And that's a very creative process. Very little of what actually happens is what you find written up. [#11, p. 9]

. . . I think my best advisees and most creative advisees . . . [are people who travel, go to meetings, are RA's, TA's with me] [have] gotten to know me and
they've gotten to know I'm a risk taker and I try to be a creative individual and I've got a lot of self-confidence. I think they learn by imitation. [#6, p. 14]

I try to create conditions in which it can happen, comfortably, relatively efficiently, and those things are largely being open, being available, being supportive and being helpful in the sense that I'm willing to give whatever I've got to help them clarify what they are trying to do. [#14, p. 7]

The second group of responses tended to focus on classes, books or the resources one might make available. In describing a funded research effort that supported doctoral students this advisor commented:

We were able to get funds . . . so . . . my students from about the mid-70's even until now, have been part of that whole creative process . . . [#17, p. 15]

Well, I use books a lot [in his seminars with his students] I took them a number of items that will help them get away from the conventional, dry way of doing things.

He went on to say:

And you can do things to help people know where to find things to be creative. [#12, p. 8-9]

A different approach presented here suggested the interactive nature of the advisors' work with the student:

... principally where I will stimulate [creativity] is, (1) the suggestion that I make to them early in the program about being sensitive to picking up on an area they're
interested in for investigating . . . (2), if it doesn't emerge through that process to start suggesting areas of things that seem to be moving along to them and by suggesting areas where they might want to take this area [of research] in terms of their own individual interest. [#13, P. 15]

. . . a major part of that encouragement comes in our course structure. I do a series of research courses dealing with the conceptualization and conduct of research. I hope what happens above and beyond what happens there [in course structure is] that the students know there is the freedom necessary to create. . . . I feel an obligation for creating an environment where they can be free to [create] do that. [#19, p. 7]

The characteristic, creative aspects, of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, seemed to be described as two properties. The first was the perception that the process is creative and is so within a range of views that one might describe as ranging from not very creative, moving toward more creativity with respect to topic selection, through to a dissertation being creative with respect to almost all aspects of the research experience.

The second set of perceptions focused on efforts of the advisors to encourage creativity and these were reported from two perspectives. First, the activities of the advisor can in fact present a model of creative behavior. Second, the advisor can address the issue
through course work, the introduction to various creative research endeavors, and the creation of an environment in which creative activity is encouraged.

Summary

Chapter IV presented an in depth view of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, during the dissertation advising experience from the point of view of advisors. The data were organized in an effort to identify emerging characteristics and properties of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship. Four characteristics emerged from the data that described this, the major of the three categories identified in this study. In summary the four characteristics of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship and their related descriptions are presented in Table 3.

It is important to note the emergent propositions or rudiments of the theory being proposed are described in Chapter VI. The intent of the summary statements presented here is to synthesize the data for the reader into a more manageable form. Chapter V will address the analysis and descriptions of the categories Student--Dissertation Relationship and Advisor--Dissertation Relationship with their distinctive characteristics and properties.
Table 3
Characteristics and Descriptive Properties of the Category Advisor--Student Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Descriptive Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Perceived as a range of feelings about the relationship both positive and negative. Overwhelmingly positive responses describing close, personal, collegial relationships. Success of the dissertation was related to positive interpersonal relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time demands</td>
<td>Students being off-campus, changing advisors, and the quality of the student and/or his or her skills combined for increased time demands on the advisor. Demands on the advisor were most often perceived as a dimension of more &quot;troublesome&quot; dissertations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>Attributes of positive advising experiences reported by advisors were open, honest, and responsible. Functions of the role included: offering advice, support, criticism, encouragement, direction and assisting in decision making. Expectations were described as the perceptions advisors held for: (1) students toward their dissertations, (2) students to their performance, (3) themselves toward the student, and (4) the relationship as it related to teaching/counseling, mentoring or apprenticeships. Also mentioned was coming to work with a specific advisor. Satisfactions were expressed by advisors as rewards from in student and advisor growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative aspects</td>
<td>Descriptions of the dissertation process as creative presented a range of views from not very creative to a creative emergent process. Efforts to encourage creativity included modeling, introducing ideas, and creating an environment nurturing creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

Categories: Student--Dissertation/Advisor Dissertation

This chapter addresses two of the three major categories identified by the constant comparative data analysis of the interviews of doctoral advisors. The two categories are:

1) Student--Dissertation Relationship and
2) Advisor--Dissertation Relationship.

In chapter IV a grounded description of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, was provided. The category and the characteristics and properties of the category were presented and supported with examples from the transcripted tape recordings of interviews with advisors.

In this chapter the two remaining categories describing the advisors' perception of their relation to the dissertation and their view of the students' relation to the dissertation are presented. The chapter concludes with summary statements about the two categories and the properties or characteristics of each.

Student-Dissertation Relationship

The category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, is described below by four characteristics which are grounded
in the advisors' responses concerning the student and his/her relationship to the dissertation. The four characteristics that emerged from the data were:

1) topic/problem
2) student attributes
3) work beyond the dissertation, and
4) creative aspects

Each characteristic is addressed below by introducing properties descriptive of the characteristics. The meanings of the characteristics are grounded in the data by quoting the expressed perceptions from the transcripted interviews held with advisors. It is important to note that the focus in this section is on the second major category: Student--Dissertation Relationship. Following the discussion and description of each characteristic of the category there is a brief set of statements summarizing the nature of each characteristic. Table 4 is presented to organize the summary statements and to add to the readers' understanding of the phenomena.

**Topic/Problem**

Advisors perceived the characteristic, topic/problem, to be of major importance to the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship. A review of advisors'
perceptions of the relevance of the topic: revealed three properties of the characteristic. The three properties were:

1) selection
2) conceptualization, and
3) commitment to and interest in.

In each case there were contrasting views presented which served to enhance the range with which advisors viewed this characteristic and its three properties.

Selection was perceived as a very important property of the characteristic, topic/problem. Examples of the advisors' responses illustrated how important they perceived the selection property to be. In describing the best advising experiences one advisor stated:

... they already had them [their problems] in mind and knew where they were going and that made it easier for me.

He continued, adding the observation:

... I guess it is well known for many, many years, students who have an idea about what they want to study is [sic] going to perform perhaps a little better than the student who has no idea and is just floundering around. It seems to be borne out by experience as well as logic. [#2, p. 3]

A contrasting view that still supported the importance of topic selection:

Topic was elusive, it was curriculum...

... in an area where it isn't well
developed. . . . he was trying to make something out of darn little . . . the building blocks weren't there. [#9, p. 8]

Additional difficulties with topic selection included:

A not uncommon thing is for people to finish the generals without having really pulled together [a] dissertation topic, research question and all the stuff associated with it. And I think when that happens, the most frequent outcome is they have difficulty dealing with both the post partum depression after generals . . . and the problem of putting their head on a piece of work that is independent, outside their course work and free of external strictures. [#14, p. 6]

The following examples represented three different approaches to the topic selection.

An advisor suggested

I suggest areas of specific problems, problems that could be investigated and not necessarily have them piggyback on a specific kind of research I'm doing. . . . I think the important thing is that once you give them a problem, [you say] 'ok, why don't you crystallize that problem, let's see you back here with the problem crystallized in written form in a month.' [#13, p. 12]

Advisor supported--

. . . and when they hit on something that I feel good about, they can tell, I imagine by the way I react and they, so they are more likely to feel good about it. And go off excited about it. [#13, p. 12]
Advisor directed--

. . . we already have an understanding that it is going to be a research associated with a [specified] learning area. . . . students still have got their elements that they're interested in and what we're trying to do is to take bits and pieces of theirs and being able to scrapple that into a piece of research. They've all bought into it; they all see value in this. [#7, p. 8]

The property, selection, seemed to be important and to be related in the advisors' view of the students' ultimate success with the dissertation.

The second property related to the characteristic, topic/problem, was conceptualizing. There were more descriptions related to the difficulty of conceptualizing the problem than there were to the successful conceptualization of the problem. In an effort to provide a contrast, two examples are presented first which highlight some differences in advisors' perceptions related to the problem of conceptualization.

So I guess my best experiences are when they start with not much more than a general interest . . . and spend usually a matter of several months wrestling with that area and finally [they realize] this is what I [student] really want to come to know more about . . . and it's a manageable kind of question and they go out and collect some data to answer that question, write it up and do end up completing it. [#19, p. 5-6]
In a contrasting view:

I have an advisee now which [sic] is just having a very difficult time in developing a researchable [problem] and coming down to the point where he can analyze the theory and come up with a justifiable problem to research . . . , one that can be delineated to a point where it's actually researchable. . . . problems are often very global in nature and they are not reasonable . . .  

Additional descriptions of troublesome conceptualization problems that were reported:

Not totally unrelated to but of a different order is the other kind of problem. That is the problem with conceptualizing an idea, dissertation idea, dealing with that in a way that has clarity and will then lead to the writing stage.  [20, p. 12]

. . . the biggest single feature in any of these dissertations is the problem of [limiting] what they were trying to do. [Two examples were given] they wanted to solve the world's problems in a dissertation.  [18, p. 13]

. . . content to play, work around with form, but are no longer interested in the substance of ideas. That's where I think good students have a problem. They want absolute methodological clarity in any fact. You need to be careful methodologically. But if you are on to a powerful idea it is going to generally transcend methodology if the elegance of the work in part is determined by how powerful the idea is . . .  [16, p. 16]

. . . then if they do [find a topic] they can't sharpen it and narrow it down so that it's feasible to do.  [3, p. 4]
Two suggestions for working with [or that get at] the conceptualization problem as expressed by advisors were:

We go through a dissertation proposal stage and they will write up the proposal and that's probably one of the hardest things for them to do. It's the hardest thing for me to do. [#10, p. 10]

... in most cases good dissertations come out of a deep immersion in the phenomena, in the data, that one's able to detect and describe from insightful imaginative and creative analysis, account for that. [#16, p. 8]

Perhaps the conceptualization issue as perceived by advisors was best summed up by the following examples of contrasting views from the same advisor:

[An example of] . . . the worst of all was, 'now that I've [student] finished my general exams and I've got to get the dissertation done the next two quarters so I can get out of here to get a job.' I [advisor] say, 'what do you have in mind?' and he says, 'Well, I'm not quite sure but I think I'd like to . . . .' and by the time you hear what the person says you have [a project that costs] anything from a two to a two and one half million dollars and four years and you might have a shot at it.

He summarized the example:

In other words, the person who comes in literally naive about what it is that constitutes a dissertation. [#8, p. 10]

He contrasted that with the best experience:

... the student comes with the problem . . . a problem they have
actually been working on for some time during their course work . . . They have been thinking about it along the way and narrowing things down and their interests down. [8, p. 5]

Advisors' perceptions revealed that finding a topic and conceptualizing it were two areas rich with examples descriptive of the characteristic, topic/problem, in the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship.

The final property of the characteristic, topic, was: commitment to and interest in. The advisors perceived student interest in and commitment to the topic as another important property of the student's dissertation relationship. There were three different perspectives describing the property, interest in, which were grounded in the advisors' perceptions. The three perspectives were:

1) a shared interest in the topic by the student and advisor,

2) the need to get a degree, complete the requirements as opposed to interest in/commitment to the topic, and

3) the value of the students' interest in and commitment to the topic.

Perceptions about shared interest on the part of students and advisors in the topic are presented first.
Two of the examples were descriptive of the advisors' best dissertation advising experiences:

I think the best experience I've had was with a student who was interested in the kinds of things I was interested in and helped me with a research project I was doing and was able to use part of that research project to develop his own project. This was sort of an offshoot of what I was doing and he had the same values I had too. . .

The best experience probably was a very bright fellow, a student who was a leader in the field, well respected by his colleagues. . . he took up a problem that I had shared with him and he explored it a little while, got interested in it, picked it up and ran with it and he brought in his rough draft. [#13, p. 9]

The second perspective gained from analyzing the advisors' responses was stated as the student's need to get a degree or complete the degree requirements as opposed to student interest in/commitment to the topic. The examples presented were drawn from advisors' accounts of more troublesome dissertation advising experiences. The first stated:

Those who come looking for a degree or a certificate . . . are problematic both for themselves and to some extent for me. . . .[he] fought it right through to the end, did a workman-like dissertation, acceptable standards in every way but wanted a certificate or a credential for job purposes . . .

[#16, p. 6]
Another advisor reported:

And I think this does happen, occasionally, that what they really want is the letters and they wish that they could write a check for $1000 send it off to some place . . . [to] the university and be issued a certificate that says they have a PhD and will be able to use it credibly, because they really don't want to do it. [#8, p. 22]

This same advisor presented two additional examples that indicated a lack of commitment to the research endeavor on the part of students.

Perhaps the best example of that [more troublesome experience] is the person who is able to get a year's leave of absence from their school and they come here and they take course work as fast as they possibly can and they don't even finish their general exam and they return in order to meet a contractual relationship . . . [their] reentry causes a condition of additional commitments [in their workplace], they've got more work now than they ever had . . . And so they cast around for something . . . that will meet the letter if not the spirit of what a dissertation should be. [#8, p. 10]

As the degree of ownership with the ideas and commitments to the ideas becomes less, then the likelihood of the dissertation being done well is less. . . . it's likely for them to reach that point on some abstract scale where the person has crossed the line . . . their commitment to the work becomes so confused with 'when do I finish, when do I get out of here?'
When do I get the degree so I can go home to do what I want to do?' [8, p. 18]

The third perspective described the values of the students' interest in and commitment to the research. Descriptions from advisors on the best and most difficult dissertation advising experiences presented a strong case for a high student interest in and commitment to the topic. The following are examples of advisors' perceptions that illustrated the value for high student interest/commitment:

One characteristic [of good or best dissertation] is enthusiasm for the topic. It's self generated, it's not contrived. . . . take the topic and the enthusiasm and turn it into something that has some scientific basis for it . . . [18, p. 13]

In describing another example the same advisor concluded:

I thought that was an interesting dissertation of someone who was passionate about the subject but scholarly and timely. [18, p. 12]

Other examples reported:

. . . because they don't have a commitment to it [the dissertation] and it's tough to do something that is not easy when you aren't committed to it. [8, p. 18-19]

A person can have even established their own problem but I've had at least one student have his own problem but wasn't that interested so the momentum that person had in getting through was totally different . . . [13, p. 12]
In describing a best experience the same advisor stated:

the better experiences are less troublesome that way [interest, motivation in completing the work] . . . they have the interest to investigate the problem whether it's their own or one that I may have suggested. [#13, p. 12]

Two advisors presented perceptions that revealed their rationales for why the interest needs to be high for students:

. . . because I recognized that it [ownership] doesn't always happen. Almost tolerance rather than ownership . . . I mean . . ., if this is of interest to you, [student], and by damn it better be because it is going to have to sustain you through this whole thing . . . [#9, p. 6]

. . . but not often do they have a very precise and acceptable, workable dissertation problem and what I try to stress is that it is something they are interested in because they are going to live with it. [#20, p. 7]

Interest in and commitment to the topic was perceived by advisors and reported above as an important ingredient for completing the work. The following view gives a sense of a larger perspective; one that involves more than just the dissertation experience itself:

. . . with the better students they are involved all along the line with the dissertation as a natural process. They come, they don't mind it so much and I think they feel facilitated. [#17, p. 19]
The same advisor suggested there was a need for interest and concern on the part of advisors as well:

We've had a huge number of students in our field, in fact in our department, lots of them wouldn't finish because they just, number one, didn't want to and the advisors didn't care one way or another. [#17, p. 9]

The review of student interest and commitment and its influence on the characteristic, topic/problem, identified a significant potential relationship which was aptly illustrated by one advisor's examples of the best and the more troublesome experiences in doctoral advising:

As the degree of ownership with the ideas and commitments to the ideas become less then likelihood of the dissertation being done well is less.

He continued:

A degree of ownership and commitment to it. . . . I put it this way, as the degree of personal ownership and a sense of commitment increases, the potential for the quality of the dissertation will increase. [#8, p. 18]

Topic/problem as a characteristic of the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, was revealed in the data as having three properties: selection, conceptualization, and commitment to and interest in. Each property was described through the presentation of advisors' expressed perceptions about them. The three properties were interrelated and combined to more fully
describe how the characteristic, topic/problem, helps to give meaning to the category, Student-Dissertation Relationship.

Selection of the topic was perceived as a difficult and extremely important task for students. It was related to the properties of conceptualization, interest in and commitment to. Advisors perceived that students find topic selection and students' efforts at conceptualizing the problem a troublesome activity. The interest in and commitment to the topic were often linked to the students' progress on the dissertation and the likelihood of higher quality performance on the dissertation was perceived as directly related to higher student interest.

Student Attributes

The characteristic, student attributes, was addressed through expressed perceptions of advisors which were organized into three properties. These properties were described independently but were considered together to comprise the characteristic: student attributes. The properties that emerged were:

1) abilities/independence of students,
2) writing skills, and
3) problem areas for students/advisors
The following account captures a general view of advisors' perceptions of students' best experiences as they related to the property, student abilities and independence:

And if I can characterize why they were the greatest, it's because these people were self starters. They were able to clearly conceptualize a researchable problem. They could analyze the research that's already been done and develop a theory base to develop . . . why that particular topic was researchable. [#6, p. 8-9]

Additional comments extended this perception:

... the student was superior and in many ways knew more about what he was doing than I did. [#2, p. 2-3]

... they develop confidence . . . in their abilities to execute, to perform here at the university and outside. . . . in time I think you begin to see that happening. [#17, p. 7]

... they [students] basically take it on almost as a full time job even though they are working at another job. [#7, p. 10]

Advisors described their efforts to foster independence:

... what I don't want to do is get tangled with the transference of that responsibility [students' responsibility for the work] and I resist that with a passion. [#14, p. 17]

... [it's an] independence, dependence thing, I'm a pretty independent soul myself . . . . and probably expect students to do that 'cause, I kind of like that style . . . [#15, p. 20]
Finally an example of the reward an advisor expected as an
anticipated result of a student's behaving independently:

And I think I'll be pleasantly
surprised by the way she executed that
creative sense of handling it. I think
I'll get exhilarated. [#4, p. 10]

The skill mentioned most frequently by advisors was
writing. It was perceived equally as that property which
was descriptive of the best dissertations and as the most
obvious, glaring deficiency in more troublesome work.

Examples of writing skill as a positive property included:

One of the best dissertations I have
had written is one of the easiest that
I have had to advise in . . .[the
student] was very productive, self
disciplined, and could write. He could
write quite well. . . . It was
beautifully written. [#20, p. 5]

There are some students [with whom] I
just read the chapters. A few areas
here and there, I don't even touch,
they go back. Those are my good
writers. [#13, p. 17-18]

A second thing that I enjoy and have
found rewarding was when a student
could write well . . . because that
seems to me to indicate that the
student thinks well as well. [#12, p.
4]

Some examples of difficulties advisors encountered when
the writing was marginal were revealed through these
advisors' perceptions.

. . . [students] who have never learned
to write very well, to write with a
flow of ideas, to write with a real facility for language and to write with clarity. And we have a distressing number of students like that. . . . [I have] spent hours and hours working with students on those kinds of difficulties. [#20, p. 12]

I think that it's a problem where I had to do more work on the dissertation than I really should have so far as writing skills . . . That's a problem beyond . . . what I would normally do as an editor on the student's project. [#5, p. 11]

. . . there have been some major revisions that we cleaned up and hadn't we cleaned it up . . . that student would have had problems. They're just not good writers. [#13, p. 18]

The final example illustrated the dilemma the advisor can find himself in as a result of the student's poor writing skills:

This one that I was thinking of a few years ago in which it was not the best . . . circumstances, you kind of break relationships because of the resentment there. I said, '[student's name] this writing is just not up to par.' And I was spending hours looking through the stuff and rewriting it. 'You know we've accepted it [the proposal] and I think you can do it, by God, why should I do it?' [#10, p. 15]

The final property of the characteristic, student attributes, was referred to as problem areas for students/advisors. Writing skills referred to above, are perceived, when absent, as a problem. There were, however, additional areas of concern advisors have about
the difficulties students have with the dissertation. Advisors' perceptions of these problem areas as a property of the characteristic, student attributes, fell along two dimensions. They were:

1) inadequate research skills and
2) working with marginal students

The preparation of students for the dissertation experience normally included requirements for course work in research. From the advisors' viewpoint the completion of such courses did not assure the students' research competence. The advisors responding in the following expressed perceptions were referring to troublesome dissertation advising experiences:

... [she] could not understand when I agreed that the problem she proposed... was real and was significant and did affect her professional practice. And I agreed... and the committee agreed. What she had difficulty understanding however, is that it was not researchable, it was not a problem that was worthy of dissertation research... which suggests... we have failed to provide and prepare students adequately for the dissertation. [#6, p. 5]

Some students pressed advisors into committee meetings before the advisors were ready to advise such action. An example:

... the committee started and I asked him to present his proposal... I just asked questions and he responded... had him identify what apparently
were some weaknesses in his methodology . . . and by then we had [professors] saying, 'you really need to do these things before you go on and do this dissertation.' [#6, p. 12]

Another view related research skills to an independence-dependence dimension:

. . . there's one [student] who can get stuck and is very dependent, so to me the independence-dependence dimension would be a biggy and that obviously ties into . . . research skills, content, knowledge . . . [#15, p. 6]

The second dimension of the expressed perceptions of advisors related to the property, problem areas, of the characteristic, student attributes, was that of working with marginal students. Three examples of advisor's perceptions are presented which illustrate the impact that marginal students have on meanings in the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship.

You have a marginal student, it becomes a much more difficult task and of course you assist the student to meet the situation and in much more specific ways. [#13, p. 20]

I guess the problem is that the student who is weak is going to be the least well equipped to make the 'silk purse out of the sow's ear' . . . so that's a very difficult issue. [#4, p. 10]

I think the worst example can be when you have some fear and trembling over the candidates, of those just in general. . . . other students have been shaky all along and those are the
worst kinds. Those are the times when it's,..., most difficult, you're concerned. [#10, p.17]

Perhaps the last comment regarding problems as they relate to the characteristic, student attributes, offered partial solution to the problem:

... so I see it more with a selection problem rather than as an advising problem. I had to put more work into the product than what you should ... #5, p. 12]

The section above described the characteristic, student attributes, of the category Student--Dissertation Relationship. The advisors' expressed perceptions were organized to comprise three properties of the characteristic, student attributes. The three properties were:

1) abilities/independence of students,
2) writing skills, and
3) problem areas for students/advisors.

Each property was highlighted above with verbatim expressions of advisors' perceptions. Some generalizations that can be observed included the perceived importance of student abilities and student independence as contributing to the best dissertation advising experiences. Writing skills, when they are absent in a student, were reported as a most difficult problem for advisors to overcome. Writing skills, when
present in students, seemed to the advisors to be characteristic of the better dissertation advising experiences.

In the property, problem areas for students/advisors, two dimensions identified were lack of research competence and working with marginal students. Both provided examples of characteristics of the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, that were related to the more difficult advising experiences of the advisors.

Work Beyond the Dissertation

The third characteristic of the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, that was revealed in the data was identified as: work beyond the dissertation. Advisors' perceptions expressed how they saw the dissertation fitting into a larger career or research effort of their students.

The first example addressed the concern from a need for students to limit their initial ideas for dissertation research.

Most dissertations are much too broad, where the students are going to solve the world's problems with one dissertation instead of . . . one study of many that should be done in a lifetime on a topic perhaps and I think one of my chief roles is to limit . . .

[18, p. 28]
The following expressed perceptions captured the sense of the work, the dissertation, as belonging to something more:

... it was really well done and he made an investment and it's paid off for him in terms of his professional career in which he has stayed and carried on with that type of investigation. [#18, p. 10]

I mean to do a good dissertation they really have to be, sincerely want to do that kind of, want to find out what it is they present as a problem and as they go along they'll kind of get excited about it. Make something of it after it's done. [#10, p. 13-14]

It's not just good if you do a dissertation. I want you to get up on a platform someplace. I want you to publish it and I want you to get up on the platform and talk about it. [#18, p. 28]

The following three advisors' expressions revealed their feelings as they were related to students conducting research in an area of interest in which the advisor was working:

But now you see I am having a much more fun experience. The experiences tend to be more like the scholarly interaction of a set of colleagues trying to move this line of research ahead and so the oral is not a silly artifact of doctoral requirements anymore but it is a good intellectual process. [#4, p. 14]

So what we are trying to do is build a research base, use dissertations ... They've all bought into it. We know that coming in ... we're close in
that respect. And much of that is built over the involvement in the research. Our research is very intense. [§7, p. 8]

A final quoted view summarized the perception of many of the advisors toward the intent of the doctoral dissertation experience.

I think the more the student is comfortable with their investigative problem for the dissertation the greater the interest the less the problem of motivating, the greater the personal satisfaction when the dissertation is completed. The person has a product that will provide a continuous spin off of additional research as they move out into the field and provide additional opportunities for publications that come out of that [work]. [§13, p. 16]

The characteristic, work beyond the dissertation, was composed of the advisors' perception of how the dissertation can be a stepping off point or entry into the research arena. The examples provided support for the view that the category, Student—Dissertation Relationship, was perceived by advisors as an opportunity for students to begin their careers as researchers.

Creative Aspects

In describing the characteristic, creative aspects, of the category, Student—Dissertation Relationship, the advisors' responses tended to describe two properties.

First their perceptions described a property which tended
to give "definitions" of creativity as applied to students proposing and conducting their dissertations. The second property provides examples of creative behavior on the part of students towards their work. The two properties are described in detail below using the advisors' responses to interview questions.

All but four of the advisors reported the dissertation experience to be in some measure creative or to provide an opportunity for students to behave creatively. The four not responding affirmatively, seemed to think the process was not a very creative one and offered little to clarify their responses.

Those advisors responding that the opportunity was a creative one, generally chose to qualify their responses. The perceptions presented here provide a series of simple "definitions" linking creativity and the dissertation experience. These simple "definitions" presented by the advisors offer differing views about what creative means in the context of dissertation research.

[The dissertation is] an opportunity to create around, I don't really view it as that kind of an experience, but I think it is for some. For some it is a hurdle they got to get out of the way. [#15, p. 10]

Contrasted with four responses of another view:

Of course, I mean what else is there but [for it] to be a creative enterprise. [#14, p. 7]
Definitely. In fact, I think they all want to be and that is how we define creativity--they are all going to be asking a question that isn't going to be exactly like anybody else's question--or if it is very similar they are going to be creating a different means to answer that question. So I see a need for a lot of creativity. [#19, p. 7]

A response that seemed to unfold as the advisor thought and talked:

... the word never occurred to me, when I'm engaged in it. ... on the one hand I feel it can't help but be. Because it is doing something. I tell everybody that this dissertation is uniquely yours, because it's your approach, your interest, your background ... nobody else would think of it this way ... so it is inherently creative, I think. [#9, p. 8]

Another view took the student as the focus:

Not all the time. I think it ought to be but ... , I think the student's agenda is the thing that makes that what they're doing it for, why they're doing it. That's the most important thing about the creativity. ... to do a good dissertation they have to sincerely ... want to find out what it is they present as a problem. [#10, p. 13]

The following view brought a slight shift in the focus:

I think it depends on who you work with. I think a lot of people think they are creative that are not ... you produce things and go about that in some very interesting ways where we could kind of move off themes and stuff and play around with variations to see where they lead.
He concluded:

. . . being creative to me means being productive. [#17, p. 6]

Additional "definitions" of student creativity in dissertation research could be inferred from the following:

Yes, . . . it was creative in his techniques of oral history and in a sense of his interview schedule . . . [#18, p. 11]

It is a tremendous opportunity for the student to do that and not very many are creative. . . . there are certain steps [in doing a dissertation] that you have to go through and [there's] a high risk in violating those and that may reduce creativity.

He continued:

. . . there is a certain economy for the student and the professor in following the road map, meeting the guidelines and go through it in a traditional, dull fashion, . . . there is sort of an institutional press in that direction. [#1, p. 8]

Another view of creative activity provides another view:

I think there is plenty of opportunity. I think it's a matter to what extent the student wants to use that creativity. . . . creativity is more in the establishment of the problem than necessarily the methods and procedures in terms of how that problem is going to be carried out. But I think there is plenty of opportunity there to be creative or allow the originality developed to progress. [#13, p. 15]
The three "definitions" that follow reported creativity as occurring within certain parameters of the research activity.

Sure, ... yes, I think again part of it now is in that apprenticeship process where they [students] see me struggling creatively ... I set some kind of a model [for them] and they are really so much better prepared with knowledge and skill that I think that they have more freedom to be creative. They can risk more now. [#4, p. 9]

The view that follows here was from an advisor who also proposed an apprenticeship notion:

... just encouraging diversity within the parameters that we are looking at, of course. But ... I see that as being an integral part of the dissertation is admitting those creative behaviors that, that's one of the things that really marks a good dissertation ... [It] is something where the student has been able to come up with a different idea or a different approach to something but yet building on a solid foundation of other work that has gone before them. [#5, p. 16]

A final view of the "definition" of creative aspects in dissertation research seemed to begin with a rather open view but the advisor summed it up from a very different perspective:

Well it depends on how you want to look at creativity. Is it creativity of research or creativity of doing what they've selected to do? I think they bring their own creativity into it by, it is really their presentation. It is their creativity to tackle the
problem. They are living within the confines of many researchers. They have no option until all Chapter 4 is assigned. They've got a very structured situation coming into it and that's not being creative. They've got creativity in doing and manipulating their timelines and accomplishing their tasks. So it is a different type of creativity. It is not the intellectual creativity that a lot of people in the college like. It's a very intense activity, so yes and no. Many people at this point and time in their life [sic] are not as creative. [#7, p. 12-13]

The "definitions" property of the characteristic, creative aspects as perceived by advisors was neither particularly clear nor very uniform. It appeared there were a range of views as to what creative activity just might be in the context of the dissertation experiences of students.

Advisors have expressed perceptions that fall within the Student--Dissertation Relationship as observations of students behaving creatively. These behaviors were expressed as a property of the characteristic, creative aspects. One advisor suggests:

... but I've worked with students who are extraordinarily creative and they press the faculty and the committee structure for modifications in how to go about it [the dissertation], not following the same outline ... define the problem in different terms, write [not] in a . . ., what shall I say, like a novel, but certainly not staid, dull traditional language. [#1, p. 8]
Additional responses related to the behavior of students, and what they do to be creative from the advisors' point of view:

. . . they're not being true to their work but you [the student] do it because you are interested in the problem and you go ahead and solve it or make that a challenge. Then it becomes creative. . . . and as they go along they'll kind of get excited about it make something of it after it's done . . . [#10, p. 13]

Another view presented:

. . . I think in order for the dissertation to be complete, the individual must create a section on his own that says, 'Here is an analysis, here is what it really means, here are the implications for educational practice, for educational research, for theory development. [#6, p. 18]

The final description presented here was in response to a question asking about the "best dissertation." The advisor's remarks were supportive of the perception stated earlier in regard to the "press of the institution" being an inhibitor to students doing creative work or work that challenges the demands of institutional norms. [#1, p. 8]

. . . students that are a pleasure to work with . . . happen to be students . . . who, . . . do not necessarily prescribe to a conventional wisdom . . . [they are] willing to step outside of what he [the advisor] says . . . and to chart their own course . . . I have found those students do best when they get into the field. [#12, p. 5]
The data on the characteristic, creative aspects, of the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, provided a range of "definitions" of what constituted creative activity in dissertation research as perceived by advisors. A second property related to the advisors' perceptions of their students' creative efforts in their dissertation research. Advisors reported that there are ample opportunities for students to be creative. It is important to note again that 16 of the 20 advisors interviewed, albeit in their own unique way, perceived the dissertation experience to be an opportunity for students to be creative.

Summary: Category Student--Dissertation Relationship

The category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, has been described by four characteristics - topic/problem, student attributes, work beyond the dissertation, and creative aspects. The category and its characteristics and associated descriptions are presented in Table 4. The table is helpful for organizing the meanings in the category and its characteristics as the grounds for the development of the rudiments of substantive theory in Chapter VI. Each characteristic of the category is summarized below.
### TABLE 4
Characteristics and the Descriptive Properties of the Category
Student—Dissertation Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Descriptive Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>topic/problem</td>
<td>- selection - important, related to advisor view of success/potential for difficulty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- conceptualizing - troublesome - often difficult for students,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- commitment and interest (1) shared interest with advisor results in better experience for advisor (2) need to get degree vs interest/commitment can be troublesome, (3) value in the commitment to and the interest in the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student attributes</td>
<td>- intellectual abilities and independence, good students tend to be self starters and confident,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- writing skills: contribute to superior quality when present, glaring deficiency when absent,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- problem areas for students/advisors: inadequate research skills and marginal students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work beyond the</td>
<td>- dissertation research fits into a larger experience for the student; beginning of a research career. Those dissertations that provided a career focus were perceived by some advisors as a characteristic of the best advising experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative aspects</td>
<td>- dissertations described as a range of &quot;definitions&quot; of creativity from an &quot;opportunity to be unique&quot; to a view that students are not very creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- examples were offered to illustrate how students often behave creatively in dissertation research. The &quot;institutional press&quot; was mentioned as an inhibitor to behaving creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The characteristic, topic/problem, was most often perceived by advisors as a potential problem area. Three properties of the characteristic, topic/problem were accounted for through the advisors' expressed perceptions: selection, conceptualization and interest in/commitment to. Each property was perceived from a range of positive and negative vantage points. Selection was perceived as a most important property. Advisors expressed perceptions that indicated they suggest topics to students, support student selections, and direct students in topic selection. Advisors' perceptions revealed that they viewed topic selection as related to students' success with the dissertation.

Conceptualization was perceived by advisors as a second property of the characteristic, topic/problem. Again the advisors revealed that when conceptualization was perceived as difficult or troublesome, the advising experience was viewed as more difficult. Conversely, the students who were perceived as strong in their ability to conceptualize were, most often, central figures in the better advising experiences.

Advisors expressed that the property, interest in/commitment to the topic, enhanced the advising experience when that interest was shared by the advisor. When a students' perceived
need was to "get the degree" or when he/she generally evinced a lack of commitment to the work itself, the situation was viewed by advisors as leading to a more difficult advising experience. The students' interest in and commitment to the topic was often reported by advisors to be linked to student progress and the quality of the dissertation.

The category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, was further described by the characteristic, student attributes. Advisors' perceptions revealed three properties of the characteristic, student attributes. The three properties were: abilities/independence of students, writing skills and problem areas for students/advisors. Advisors' perceptions most frequently indicated the best advising experiences were products of independent students with good writing skills and few problems. Problem areas reported by advisors included inadequate research skills and working with marginal students. Advisors' perceptions suggested lack of research skills and working with marginal students made for more difficult advising experiences.

The characteristic, work beyond the dissertation, was expressed in the advisors' perceptions of dissertation work that led to career activities or supported the students as they entered a given research area. Examples
presented by advisors suggested that the advisors' best advising experiences were those in which the student took the work further than the dissertation.

The final characteristic of the Student--Dissertation Relationship category was named: creative aspects. The characteristic, creative aspects, was viewed by advisors in terms of a variety of simple "definitions" of creativity in dissertation research. Their views ranged from the dissertation experience being creative because it was "produced," to it being an opportunity to do "something unique," to the view that some students are "not very creative." Examples were provided by advisors to illustrate creative behavior on the part of their students. The requirements of the dissertation were mentioned as limiting creative behavior.

Chapter VI brings the meanings in the Student--Dissertation Relationship category with its characteristics together with the meanings in the other two major categories to begin to build the rudiments of a grounded substantive theory regarding advisors' perceptions of their doctoral advising experiences.
Advisor--Dissertation Relationship

The characteristics of the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, to be discussed are:

1) judgments regarding standards/quality,
2) dissertation time demands,
3) advisor interest in the dissertation, and
4) creative aspects

Each of these characteristics are described below by presenting a representative sampling of relevant responses from the transcribed interviews with advisors. These advisor descriptions of the characteristics are comprised of verbatim quotes from the tape recorded interviews. A brief summary is presented for each characteristic and a brief discussion of its relationship to the category are also included. The summary description of the category concludes this chapter and includes Table 5 which summarizes for the reader the properties and characteristics of the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship.

Judgments Regarding Standards/Quality

One reported characteristic of the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, focused on the judgments regarding standards or quality of the dissertation. As noted by one advisor, "... certainly dissertations are
different in quality." He went on to say: "... those that seem to be less satisfying tend to be associated with those that I judge to be in poorer form." [#14, p. 11]

Advisors' perceptions about the judgments regarding standards and quality seemed to be expressed through two properties. The first property relates to meeting the academic and professional tests and requirements of the institution as perceived by the advisor. The second property seemed to have more to do with the idiographic judgments regarding standards/qualities that provided satisfaction for the advisor. Advisors' expressed perceptions are presented to suggest the nature of the two properties of this characteristic.

First, the standards associated with meeting the academic and professional demands of the advisor:

"I think they have to be very solid in terms of method, acceptable to the emerging cannons of research whether they be quantitative or qualitative. That analysis is adroit, consistent with the problem... the closing arguments are, in fact, defensible. [#1, p. 15]

Is it a good question... is it not trivial, is it researchable, will it make a contribution to the field, is it realistic for a dissertation? [#8, p.5]

The next three descriptions contrast the test of advisors' judgment and that of the committee. The first suggests the advisor not take it to committee if it isn't
ready; the second suggests that isn't always a clear cut decision and the third raises questions about just what is a dissertation:

... I think it's just a matter of what I consider to be standards ... and if I think it's not going to make it through, I would not advise that student to submit himself and the work to examination, absolutely not." [#10, p. 6]

In contrast:

I suppose the next level of decision is when a total rough draft and maybe not a final ... A rough draft that is defensible in carrying out that degree of what it is proposing to do. Then you get, you hope, a confirmation of your judgment and the committee's judgment whether indeed it has become a dissertation at the oral exam. [#20, p. 16]

... I have problems, I think, being confident that there's something to it [the dissertation proposed]. ... what does it have to do with education? I'm not sure yet, you know you've got a problem [dissertation] here ... [#9, p. 14]

The second property expressed by advisors' perceptions was more concerned with the satisfaction of the advisor. The following two descriptions provided evidence of the advisors' search for satisfaction in their students' dissertation:

A good dissertation is one that is accepted, I think that is true, but I also believe that's one a person feels
good about doing. It's one that the
advisor feels good about signing off
on. [6, p. 16]

The chapters would come in [clear; I]
didn't have to do much work after the
first time. Those are the, I suppose,
a high level of satisfaction where you
could see productivity, see the quality
of output. [1, p. 7]

Perhaps the characteristic, judgments regarding
standards/quality, was most creatively summed up by the
following response:

About anything goes because we are to
shoot the hell out of each other [our
. . is legitimate to explore but [we
question] how one explores it. At
least have it [the method] hold water .
. . [the method] had to be some way of
devising an intellectual mouse trap to
catch the critter . . . [16, p. 8]

In summary, a characteristic of the category,
Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, was reported as the
advisor's application of judgments regarding
standards/quality during the dissertation advising
experience. The advisors perceived this characteristic to
have two properties: (1) meeting the academic and
professional standards which were identified as conjoint
standards of the advisor, and the reading committee
members; and (2) providing satisfaction for the advisor
in terms of quality of the dissertation and good feelings
about it.
Dissertation Time Demands

A second characteristic of the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, was dissertation time demands; the demands that a student's dissertation makes upon an advisor's time. There seems to be a modest relationship between those dissertations judged as troublesome or difficult and those requiring more advisor time while conversely, those judged to be the best were often those perceived as making the least time demands on the advisor. Examples of advisors' responses presented below provided grounded meaning for this characteristic of the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship.

You say, 'what do you do about it [poor quality dissertation]?' You spend a whole lot of time going over page by page of the dissertation and it's not the most satisfying work to be involved in . . . it takes time . . . [#20, p. 13]

. . . some of them [dissertations] I work pretty close on and almost written parts of it, or a lot of rewrites. [#15, p. 17]

. . . the ones [dissertations] that were really working well, that's play work, but when it isn't, it's work work . . . [#5, p. 17]

I'm not likely to have negative feelings about it except the tediousness of it sometimes gets to you, the writing, the reading of writing that you don't enjoy and the
wrestling with sentence structure . . .
and so on. That's tedious . . . [#9,
p. 13]

Perhaps the following observation best summarized
what underlies the dissertation time demands on the
advisor:

. . . the best or worst experience
would be almost like how many hassles
there would be in it [dissertation]
versus how clear, not necessarily the
rapidity or how fast they would go
through it but how clear they can go
through it without a lot of problems
and hassles. [#15, p. 7]

The characteristic, dissertation time demands, as
described by the advisors' expressed perceptions,
suggested a clear relationship with respect to the
difficulty some dissertations posed and the demands made
on advisors' time. There are more difficult and,
therefore more demanding advisor/dissertation
relationships and these typically require more of the
advisors' time.

Advisor Interest

The characteristic, advisor interest, as expressed
through the advisors' perceptions, appeared to be a
lively one. The wide range of responses indicated a
variety of beliefs about the issue. The group bias was
clearly toward agreement that advisors should be
interested in their student's topics yet three reported
perceptions presented a different view:
I don't have to be turned on by the topic or especially interested in it but I really think that the student should be.

The same advisor continued later:

I do pay attention as to how students feel about what they are working with. I think that is important—not how I feel. I don't think that is important at all. I'm being paid to do a job and I don't think my feelings are a relevant part of doing that effectively. [#19, p. 13-14]

A second view was just as direct:

... it doesn't matter whether I like the topic or not as long as it touches on our field. [#15, p. 16]

Another view provided perhaps a different rationale for not being too enthused with your students' research topics:

... if you are advising half a dozen people at the dissertation stage it's not likely, you're going to be disappointed if every topic just doesn't consume you.

He continued on to suggest a link to the characteristic, dissertation time demand:

I mean I am more happy if they know what the heck they are doing and I have to steer them less... or maybe we can concentrate on interesting aspects of the question and problem rather than the technical things... It's [the technical things that are] tiring and it detracts from being interested in the topic. [#9, p. 7]
The range of response that described the interest in the topic continued along three different dimensions. One has to do with the satisfaction accruing to the advisor. That is, the advisors found the topic one which they might work on themselves:

Many of the other [dissertations] of the students I work with—It is their problem and I like it ... it's one that I'd really enjoy doing myself. Maybe that's what the difference is? It is one that you can see yourself doing and getting a lot of satisfaction out of. [#1, p. 16]

Another example supported the response presented above:

... you know in part as I talk to you, I'm thinking ... maybe ... it's not whether it's satisfying to the student that makes it count, but satisfying to me—in my enthusiasm. [#18, p. 14]

Two advisors described their earlier experiences prior to working on a specific area of research as not providing good experiences for their students:

... some of the first dissertations were very much the topical kinds of dissertations. Topical. It's not bad but it just, seeing it as a reflection, is much more fragmented, much more piecemeal. [#11, p. 19]

In referring to earlier experiences as an advisor this advisor stated:

... talking about the old experience, I didn't think were as effective experiences. ... I was probably not as interested in it so I would do my
job of critiquing . . but in some ways
[I] would never get particularly
excited about the findings. [#4, p.8]

Taking a harder line toward advisor interest in the
topic were two responses that suggested the advisors
should reconsider their participation as major advisor.
These views contrasted with a third that described
participation with minimal interest. A fourth view
suggested there ought be a degree of interest on the part
of the advisor.

First, a view, of participating with minimal interest
was expressed:

. . . I've had studies I could care
less about but if a student wants to .
. . you help them do it, but it's hard
for me to get very enthused about it.
[#18, p. 13]

Second, two examples that took a harder line and suggested
advisors not continue to advise if he was not interested:

. . . if it's a topic that I don't
like, that probably means that it is a
topic I don't think I know anything
much about and don't want to know
anything much about and in that case I
would have no reason to be on the
committee. They surely could get
someone who could do better than
I.  [#14, p. 14]

I really think you ought to send the
student some-where else to deal with a
piece of an area that you don't care
about or you don't like or that you
resist. So, I think you have to be
honest with yourself.  [#12, p. 17]
The fourth example provided a very different view from that of the two given above:

As a matter of fact, taken to what I would call a desirable state, I ought to be interested in it. I ought to be excited about the potential of it because the person has thought it through, it is, it does meet the criteria. It's not trivial, it's going to make a contribution . . . then . . . it is very rational for me to begin to become excited about it. [#8, p. 8]

The remaining descriptions that were related to the characteristic, advisor interest, were reported as having two properties:

1) interest as related to a topic in the area of the advisor's research and

2) interest in the topic area as it affects the advisor's behavior

Interest as related to a topic in the area of the advisor's research focused on students pursuing dissertation work in the advisor's area of research and the resultant identification of the advisor with the work.

I guess maybe I found it very rewarding because these people were pursuing research processes of my own. I find that's a very pleasant experience . . . [#6, p. 6]

. . . but when it is the dissertation and you have approved the draft to go to an examination and the representative comes over from the graduate school and you go on the line
and it is different from what it is in their first exam. So you begin to identify with it. [It was true for B's dissertation.] That became a project for me in a way as much as it did for him. [#20, p. 14]

It's just not your [student's] dissertation, it's a whole committee's effort. It's just not your name on it; it was my name too . . . I've got to know that research as well as the researcher. [#7, p. 7]

The effect of interest in the topic area on the behavior of the advisor tended to be linked to the work of reading and reacting to the drafts.

Yes, I think I'd lie if I said topic doesn't affect my behavior. . . .there are some [dissertations] that I'm more willing to read, more interested in reading. [#6, p. 22]

I suppose that when you get three drafts of a dissertation coming in the same day, you have to choose which one you are going to read. You will probably take the one that is fairly consistent with your interests. . . . I know intuitively that my interest in the dissertation is one that I would put first. [#1, p. 16]

Two additional descriptions provided insight into advisors' perceptions about the characteristic, advisor interest, in the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship. They presented perceptions representative of some advisors' interest in the topic not mentioned above.

And by and large, it is amazing what people come up with, that I have found
some damn exciting, I feel . . . some
darn exciting topics. [#6, p. 20]

This advisor captured the enthusiasm that many advisors
epressed when describing their involvement in the topic
when their students were engaged in a study of a topic of
interest to them.

A second quote relates the degree to which such
interest can influence the reactions and the behavior of
the advisor:

Certainly one's personal identification
with students varies for lots of
reasons, I suppose . . . personality,
internal depth of a person as human
being, the correspondence between the
problem as defined and the research
interests of the advisor . . . I
think it [disseertation problem ]
becomes very important to me. If it is
a problem that I share in terms of
defining it as a significant piece of
work, I can become very enthusiastic
about it. If it is an area where my
interests are marginal, then that is a
much more difficult relationship to
sustain on the dissertation. [#1, p.
16]

The characteristics of the category, Advisor--
Dissertation Relationship, included the interest of the
advisor in the topic as one characteristic of the
category. The advisors' comments presented above describe
the range of responses related to that characteristic.
Advisors reported that their interest in the topic ranged
from marginal to their perceiving the topic as one that
they would be enthusiastic about investigating. They also
reported that their interest affects their behavior, that is, they tended to be more involved, and to read and react more readily to drafts of those problems of higher interest to him. Three advisors cautioned that the advisor not be involved as major advisor if the topic is of minimal interest.

Creative Aspects

When addressing the creative aspects as a characteristic of the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, three properties emerged from a review of the interview data. The properties were:

1) dissertations are not creative,
2) unique generative character of research, and
3) creative quality product

Each of these properties were grounded in the data as the expressions of advisors indicated below.

The view that dissertations are not creative as a property of the characteristic, creative aspects, was exemplified in part by the following response:

... but I don't think the dissertation, if you really do graduate work appropriately, the dissertation should be nothing more than an extension of work that's already going on.   [#18, p. 4]
There are two additional properties that provided a different view toward the characteristic, creative aspects. The issue of uniqueness or generativeness of the dissertation experience was described in the following views:

... I enjoy it. I like working with people on creative tasks, designing a piece of research. I think that's fun. I like to see them [ideas] grow. ... ideas emerge. I like the creative experience of a problem. [#14, p. 17]

I think it is a creative process. We're talking about research being generative, you know, generating new knowledge and creativity. Yes, it is creative. It has to be creative and they have to be risk takers. ...yes, I think research, good research, is typically creative. [#6, p. 14]

If uniqueness were the definition of creativity, I would say that would be one characteristic of ... a good dissertation experience. [#8, p. 7]

A view that criticizes some colleagues in their advising of students reported:

I'm glad you raised that question because I'm concerned about certain professors in the college who seem to be inflexible about dissertation topics and there are some professors that insist that the dissertation topic be experimental that there be many pages of statistics ... I think we have to allow for creativity. [#3, p. 6]
The following two responses raised an interesting question regarding the view of the relation captured in the property, creative character of a quality product:

There are many ways of approaching that [creativity]. Some ways the best [dissertation experience] might be one of the most difficult rather than one of the easiest dissertations to deal with. You can approach it in a couple of ways. [#20, p. 5]

A second view more direct that the first came in response to the question, "Would the best experience most likely be the most creative experience?"

I suppose so. I would say yes. The ones, not the easiest ones, no, maybe the hardest ones, . . . the ones that would have to endure the most suffering. Because they've gone through that creative thing and that is work. That's not easy work. And so, yes! [#10, p. 14]

The category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, has been further defined by the perception of advisors that one characteristic of the dissertation experience of their students was its creative aspects. References often were made to the best dissertations being the creative ones and it was suggested that a quality of uniqueness may well describe the outcome of creative endeavor as it appears in the dissertation experience. On two occasions it was noted that the most creative dissertations may not be the easiest dissertations to deal with.
Summary: Category Advisor--Dissertation Relationship

The category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, has been described by the four characteristics: judgments regarding standards/quality, dissertation time demands, advisor interest, and creative aspects. In Table 5 the characteristics and a summary of the advisors' descriptions are presented.

Advisors perceived the characteristic, judgments regarding standards/quality, (1) in terms of their institutional manifestations through the advisor and the committee, and (2) in terms of the level of advisor satisfaction with the quality of the dissertation product and the good feelings about the dissertation. The characteristic, dissertation time demands, was perceived as more severe in those dissertations described as difficult. Within certain limits, advisors perceived that the best dissertations did not require a great deal of their time. The two characteristics, judgments regarding standards/quality and dissertation time demand, seemed to have a relationship to one another.

The characteristic, advisor interest, appeared to have many diverse and quite significant affects within the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship. Advisors generally believed their interest in the topic was important to maintaining progress. It was not, however,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Descriptive Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| judgments regarding standards/quality | - Meeting the academic and professional standards of the advisor and the committee,  
- advisor satisfaction in the quality of the product and good feelings about the dissertation. |
| dissertation time demands          | - Generally dissertations judged more difficult require more time and those perceived as the best dissertation advising experiences often required the least advisor time. |
| advisor interest                   | - The degree of advisor interest in the dissertation topic ranged from not important to "you ought to be interested or choose not to be involved."  
- There was a sense of increased involvement when the dissertation was an extension of the advisor's work.  
- The advisors' behavior, e.g.: reading, critiquing and responding in a timely way was affected by his interest in the work. |
| creative aspects                   | - Not creative, the dissertation experience should not be creative  
Some advisors reported that the dissertation can be a generative or emerging type of experience.  
- Several advisors reported a relationship of the more creative experiences to the best dissertations that they have advised. |
always perceived as essential. Advisors' behavior appeared to be modified significantly by their interest in the dissertation topics of their students.

The characteristic, creative aspects, of the category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, involved the advisors' perceptions of the dissertation endeavor as a creative enterprise. While many perceived the dissertation endeavor as a creative one, that clearly was not, a universally held perception. There was some reference to creativity being characteristic of the best dissertation advising experiences. However, the most creative experiences were not always perceived as the easiest advising experiences.

Summary: Chapter V

Chapter V presented an in depth view of the categories, Student--Dissertation Relationship and the Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, which emerged from the analyses of the expressed perceptions of advisors. Each category was further defined by characteristics and properties which were described in terms of the advisors' reported perceptions of their doctoral advising experiences. The categories with their respective characteristics and descriptions were presented in summary
form in Table 4 and Table 5. The tables provide a reference for reviewing the nature of the two categories and their characteristics.

In Chapter VI the meanings given by the advisors to the three categories and their characteristics are synthesized to build substantive grounded theory based on the perceptions doctoral advisors' reported of their dissertation advising experiences.
CHAPTER VI

Proposing the Rudiments of the Theory

Introduction

This chapter contains a summary of the major categories and their characteristics and properties; the rudiments of a substantive grounded theory presented as propositions; and implications for practice and further research. The research questions with the respective categories and their characteristics and a summary of their descriptions as they have emerged from the study are presented. The meanings found in the categories and their characteristics as reported in the expressed perceptions of the twenty advisors interviewed are interpreted for their contributions to the building of grounded theory for doctoral advising at the dissertation stage of the PhD program. These theoretical interpretations are presented as propositions in the section of this chapter titled Rudiments of the Theory. The chapter concludes with implications for practice and suggestions for further research, and concluding statements.
Research Questions and Major Categories

I tell my students no matter what you do in your course work, no matter what you do on your general exams, the difference between PhD and ABD is the dissertation.

The remark above illustrated the meaning an advisor gave to the dissertation experience in fulfilling the doctoral degree requirements. He continued later:

But you've got to remember what I said first, the main thing is the dissertation. If they can't execute that they're in trouble. [#17, p. 13]

The advising of doctoral students during the dissertation stage of the students' PhD program was the focus of this study. More specifically, 20 experienced doctoral advisors of the College of Education at The Ohio State University were interviewed. Their responses created the data sources for this qualitative research study. The purpose was to study the perceptions doctoral students' advisors have of their doctoral dissertation advising experiences. Although the study was limited to expressed perceptions of the advisors who participated in the study, the intention of the research methodology employed was to build substantive grounded theory about the advising of doctoral students during their dissertation experiences using principles and procedures from the constant comparative method. [Glaser and Strauss, 1967 p. 31-32]
The major research questions that provided focus for this study grew from a review of the literature and the initial analysis of the data. The categories that emerged ultimately from the data analyses were Advisor--Student Relationship, Student--Dissertation Relationship and Advisor--Dissertation Relationship. The characteristics of each category are summarized briefly in Table 6. Each characteristic is further described below in terms of summary response to the research questions as proposed.

Advisor--Student Relationship

The four characteristics of the category, Advisor--Student Relationship, were: interpersonal relations; time demands; role; and creative aspects. The first research question asked: What do the advisors perceive as the characteristics or properties of the relationship between the advisor and the student? Each characteristic is addressed below with summary statements that describe the advisors' perceptions.

Interpersonal relations Advisors most often reported being close to their students although not all advisors reported the relationship as a close one. It was perceived that the dissertation experience brought students and advisors together. Many students had spent
## TABLE 6
Advisors' Perceptions of Their Advising Experiences as Reported in terms of Major Categories and Their Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristics and Descriptive Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advisor--Student | - interpersonal relations: mostly positive, success related.  
|                  | - time demands: students off campus, advisor changes, lack of skills in students increase time necessary for advising.  
|                  | - role: attributes/functions, expectations, satisfactions  
|                  | - creative aspects: perceived as creative and ranged to not creative...advisors encourage students through modeling, introducing ideas.  
| Relationship      |                                                                                                           |
| Student--Dissertation | - topic/problem: selection, conceptualization, and interest/commitment were important and related to success  
|                   | - student attributes: intellectual abilities, writing skills, problem areas.  
| Relationship      | - work beyond the dissertation: larger experience, quality  
|                  | - creative aspects: a range of "definitions:" opportunity to be unique to students not being very creative. Examples illustrated students creative behavior. Mentioned the "press of the institution" as inhibiting creative behavior.  
| Advisor--Dissertation | - judgments regarding standards and quality: meeting academic and professional standards, advisor satisfaction in the study.  
| Relationship      | - dissertation time demands: most difficult perceived as requiring the most time, best dissertation experience often reported as the least time consuming.  
|                  | - advisor interest: ranged from not involved to must be involved, advantage perceived when the advisor was involved, behavior was reported as affected by advisor interest.  
|                  | - creative aspects: ranged from a not creative experience to one of emergent or a creative activity. Best dissertation advising experiences might be characterized as the most creative. |
time in their advisor's homes. Advisors reported the success of the dissertation as related to positive interpersonal relations.

Time Demands The three conditions having significant effects on this characteristic were: (1) students leaving the university before the dissertation was completed; (2) students changing advisors; and (3) the lack of skills on the part of students. All three of these conditions were viewed as contributing to poor quality of students' work and as making greater time demands on the advisor.

Role The characteristic, role, is best described through the separate properties of the category. The first property was perceived as two dimensional: attributes and functions of the role. First, the attributes of the relationship were presented frequently as open, honest, friendly, and responsible. Second, the functions of the role were described as offering advice, direction, motivation, assistance, criticism, and support.

The second property, expectations, involved four dimensions. First, advisors held expectations for students to be self starters, motivated and independent.
Second, some advisors saw themselves expecting too much of students while others felt that they did not expect enough. Third, advisors held expectations for themselves; they expected to be helpful, responsible, to provide expertise, and take their work seriously. Finally, advisors held expectations for the nature of their relationship with their students. Most advisors perceived the advisor-student relationship as basically a teaching/counseling relationship. A minority of advisors characterized the relationship in terms of mentoring or apprenticeship. There were references to what some advisors viewed as ideal instances where students came to graduate school to work specifically with a particular individual professor in a particular area.

The final property, satisfaction, referred to the advisors' perception that the dissertation related experiences of their students provided a source of satisfaction to the advisors. They saw their satisfaction arising from both the growth of their students and in their own personal and professional growth.

Creative aspects The characteristic, creative aspects, as related to the category, Advisor--Student Relationships, were reported by the advisors in terms of two properties. First, advisors were able to reflect on the degree of creativity in their students' dissertation
experience. Their views here ranged from the experience being perceived as not very creative through the experience being creative in a limited sense, to its being a fully creative, emergent process.

Second, advisors did report efforts to enhance creative activity on the part of their students. Such efforts included: encouraging exploration of ideas, role modeling, offering courses, providing exemplars, and building an environment that would support creative activity.

Student--Dissertation Relationship

Four characteristics served to further describe the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship. The characteristics of the category were: topic/problem, student attributes, work beyond the dissertation, and creative aspects. The research question related to Student--Dissertation Relationship was stated: What do advisors perceive as the characteristics or properties of the relationship of the students to their dissertations? Each characteristic with its properties is presented below with statements summarizing relationships of the characteristics to the category.
**Topic/problem** Regarding the topic of the dissertation the expressed perceptions of the advisors fell along three properties: selection, conceptualization, and interest in or commitment to. Topic selection was perceived as critically important and related to the advisor's view of success of the student with the dissertation. It was related on the positive side to those dissertations perceived as best and on the negative side to those viewed as more troublesome. When advisors spoke of conceptualizing the problem they referred to it as a difficult process for students and one that had a significant impact on their progress. The expressed perceptions about interest in the topic provided for a number of observations. First, student interest in the topic was perceived by the advisor as contributing to a positive advising experience. If the interest of the student was in simply completing the degree the outcome was seen by the advisor as a negative advising experience. Finally, high student interest in and a commitment to the topic was closely related in the advisors' perceptions of their best dissertation advising experiences.

**Student attributes** Three properties emerged from the advisors' expressed perceptions of student attributes. First, student attributes of general intellectual
abilities and independence were viewed as contributing to the best dissertation advising experiences. Second, students' writing skills were perceived by advisors as essential to producing good dissertations and an absence writing skill was linked directly with the more troublesome dissertation advising experiences. Finally, low levels of research competence and marginal students were viewed as problem areas for advisors in the dissertation advising experience.

**Work beyond the dissertation** Advisors viewed the dissertations as an opportunity for students to build their research competence, establish themselves in an area of inquiry, and to begin their research careers. Some advisors reported such efforts were perceived as characteristic of the best dissertation experiences.

**Creative Aspects** The creative aspects formed the final characteristic of the category, Student--Dissertation Relationship, and provided for a variety of "definitions" ranging from the idea that "of course it [the dissertation] is creative," and it is creative in that it is unique, to the perception that the dissertation is not a very creative activity. Advisors, generally, reported that they perceived the dissertation endeavor to be a creative one. Advisors offered examples of students'
efforts to behave creatively and some suggested that the "institutional press" may inhibit creative efforts.

Advisor--Dissertation Relationship

The category, Advisor--Dissertation Relationship, was described by the advisors in terms of four characteristics: judgments regarding standards/quality, dissertation time demands, advisor interest, and creative aspects. The second research question asked, "What do advisors perceive as the properties and characteristics that describe the relationship of the advisor to their students' dissertations?" Each characteristic with its properties and summary statements about the advisors' perceptions are presented below.

Judgments regarding standards/quality Judgments regarding standards/quality were described by advisors in terms of two properties. The first property related to whether or not the dissertation met the standards of the institution, including those academic and professional standards set by the advisor and the dissertation reading committee. The second property was the advisor's satisfaction in the quality of the dissertation and the good feelings it produced.
Dissertation time demand  Advisors' perceptions of time demands required in dissertation advising suggested a modest inverse relationship to the quality of the advising experience. Some advisors reported that the best advising experiences were those that required the least advisor time. The dissertation experiences judged as difficult or troublesome were most often perceived as requiring more advisor time.

Advisor interest  The expressed perceptions about advisor interest in the dissertation were varied. Some advisors perceived their interest in the dissertation topic as unnecessary. Others viewed their interest as a requisite to serving as an advisor. There seemed to be evidence to suggest that the advisor interest in the dissertation increased when the dissertation was perceived as an extension of the advisors' work. Several advisors indicated that their behavior was affected by their interest in the dissertation. Choices about which dissertation to read first, the quality of the critiquing, and responding in a timely way all seemed to be influenced by the advisor's interest in the topic.

Creative aspects  The characteristic, creative aspects, appeared as a characteristic of all three major categories. In relation to the category, Advisor--
Dissertation Relationship, the characteristic, creative aspects, was described through a range of responses. Some suggested the dissertation is not a place to be creative. Others perceived the experience generative experience. A final view seemed to emerge that suggested the most creative dissertations might be the best dissertations.

The major research questions related to the three major categories have been presented above and each was followed with a brief description of the category, characteristics and properties that emerged from an in-depth analysis of the transcripts of interviews with advisors of doctoral students. The advisors were experienced, each having advised at least five or more students to successful completion of the dissertation during the past seven years.

The following section, Rudiments of the Theory, provides a synthesis of the meanings that emerged through the formation of the categories and their properties into propositions related to the advisors' perceptions of their doctoral dissertation advising experiences.

**Rudiments of the Theory**

The review of the categories and their characteristics as expressed through the advisors'
perceptions provide grounding for the following propositions concerning advisors' perceptions of their doctoral dissertation advising experiences. Each proposition is stated below with a brief discussion of the related categories and those characteristics which provide the grounding for the proposition. In addition, a reference note is provided identifying the specific related categories and their characteristics.

Each proposition is qualified by the following statement of conditions. The propositions are grounded in the meanings given to the categories and characteristics by the twenty advisors through their expressed perceptions about their doctoral advising experiences. The propositions are limited to these advisors at this institution. However, just as strongly as the limitation above notes, these properties and characteristics did emerge from and are grounded in the advisors' responses in a free and open interview seeking their perceptions of their doctoral advising experiences. The reader is urged to hold these conditions in view as he/she reads the following propositions.

**Proposition #1**: The quality of the advisor and student interpersonal relationship related directly to the quality of the dissertation advising experience.
Advisors supported this proposition through their perceptions of interpersonal relations and role. Advisors stated that the success of the dissertation advising experience was related to the quality of the interpersonal relations. It must be noted, however, that not all advisors felt the need for close relationships with their students. Advisors saw a need for open, friendly, and honest interpersonal relationships and perceived advising in terms of a teaching/counseling experience. Some advisors reported interpersonal relations with students in the contexts of mentoring, apprenticeships, or students coming to study with a specific advisor. These were perceived by advisors as essentially positive advisor-student relationships.

Reference: Advisor--Student Relationship
           -interpersonal relations
           -role

Proposition #2: In the view of most advisors, within certain limits, the quality of the dissertation was inversely related to the demands on their time.

The issue of time demands was complex in the view of advisors. Advisors expected that advising was a time consuming activity. In two categories advisors indicated that the best dissertations most often required the least amount of advisor time and those advising situations judged to be the most difficult required the most advisor time. Three items that were judged to make dissertation
work more difficult for advisors and students were:

(1) students leaving the institution prior to completing the degree, (2) students changing advisors, and (3) lack of student skills.

Reference: Advisor--Student Relationship
-time demands
Advisor--Dissertation Relationship
-dissertation time demands

**Proposition #3:** Students who were self starters, had good writing skills, were independent and research competent were associated with the best advising experiences and better dissertations. Conversely, students with marginal capabilities, poor writing skills, too dependent upon their advisors were associated with more difficult advising and poorer dissertations.

Advisors reported that the best advising experiences were characterized by students who were self-starters, independent, good writers and able to conceptualize the research problems. Conversely, advisors suggested the absence of these attributes was a characteristic of troublesome dissertations. Advisors perceived a high need for students to be skilled and independent in their dissertation experiences. They also saw a need for students to be able to write, conceptualize, and conduct their research on their own.

Reference: Student--Dissertation Relationship
-student attributes
Advisor--Student Relationship
-time demands
-role
Proposition #4: The students' selection of topic, their interest in and commitment to it, and the advisor's interest in the topic were perceived as important to the completion of the work, the quality of the product, and the quality of the advising experience.

Topic was reported in the advisors' perceptions as a very important concern. The advisors' interest in the topic and their commitment to the topic of the dissertation were perceived as very important to the success of the student and to the advisors' perception of the quality of the advising experience. Student interest in and commitment to the topic was reported as important to the quality of the product. Advisor interest in the topic was related to the advisors' behavior in dealing with the student and the dissertation and where the advisor perceived the work as an extension of his own work, he reported being more likely to be involved in it. As the degree of advisor interest in the work was high and related to the student's interest in the work the advising experiences were perceived to be of higher quality.

Reference: Student--Dissertation Relationship -topic/problem
Advisor--Dissertation Relationship -advisor interest
Proposition #5: In varying degrees, advisors perceived the dissertation experience to be creative. Often, the best dissertations were perceived as the most creative.

In each of the three major categories a creative aspects characteristic emerged to provide support for this proposition. Although four advisors did not perceive the dissertation experience as a creative one, the majority saw it so. Their "definitions" of creativity in the context of the doctoral dissertation ranged from the dissertation experience being creative because it was "produced," to it being an opportunity to do something "unique," to a belief that students are not creative. A number of advisors expressed the view that their best students' work was very creative work.

Reference: Advisor--Student Relationship
-creative aspects
Student--Dissertation Relationship
-creative aspects
Advisor--Dissertation Relationship
-creative aspects

Proposition #6: The advisors did not offer many concrete examples of the efforts made to promote creativity of their students' during their dissertation experiences.

Advisors described activities intended to promote creative activity in their students. Those efforts, which were quite general, included exploring a variety of ideas, modeling, offering courses, providing examples, letting students know they will entertain more creative approaches
and developing an environment intended to enhance creativity.

Reference: Advisor--Student Relationship
-creative aspects

Proposition #7: Advisors perceived the dissertation to be a source of satisfaction both for themselves and their students.

In the advisors' view their students' dissertation efforts were sources of satisfaction for both advisors and students. The advisors saw student growth and productivity and their own growth as sources of significant satisfactions.

Reference: Advisor--Dissertation Relationship
-judgments regarding standards/quality
Advisor--Student Relationship
-role

Proposition #8: The dissertation should meet the academic and professional standards of the advisor and the committee.

Advisors see the dissertation as meeting the academic and professional standards of the committee, and the advisor. They reported examples in relation to the judgments they must make regarding the student's dissertation efforts and the demands for assistance, critique and support.
Reference: Advisor--Student Relationship
- role
Advisor--Dissertation Relationship
- judgments regarding standards/quality

**Proposition #9**: The dissertation should provide students with a beginning, initial research experience.

The dissertation was viewed as a beginning or starting place for a life-long commitment to research endeavor. Those dissertations that were reported as having led to additional study or were the beginning of a research focus for the student were viewed as characteristic of the better advising experiences by several advisors.

Reference: Student--Dissertation Relationship
- work beyond the dissertation

The nine propositions proposed above serve as the rudiments of a grounded theory regarding the advising of doctoral students during their doctoral dissertation experiences.

**Implications for Practice**

This study of the advisors' perceptions of their advising experiences during their students' dissertation experiences has presented nine propositions to serve as the rudiments of a theory regarding the advising of
doctoral students. Related to and growing from these propositions are some implications for the practice of doctoral advising.

It seems apparent there exists a need to inform students about the range of perceptions that exist regarding creative behavior in the context of the doctoral dissertation experience. Advisors could be better prepared to nurture creative activity on the part of their students.

Bargar and Duncan [1982], Daniels-Nelson [1983], Bargar and Mayo-Chamberlain [1983], and Hunter [1978] provide support for Propositions #5 and #6 related to creativity. Clearly, the evidence reported here provides little to suggest that advisors are prepared to assist students to behave creatively. However, the degree of agreement reported by advisors in this research and that found in the literature review suggests there exists an opportunity to provide for more creative dissertation activity if advisors were to be provided with the requisite skills and attitudes to encourage such student efforts.

The expectations on the part of students with regard to the demands of the relationship as it relates to the advisor's time, interest in the topic, and quality of the work might need to be reassessed in light of the
propositions stated above. Proposition #2 suggests that time with the advisor might indicate a "troublesome" dissertation. Hartnet [1976] reported that advisor availability was important to the students' perceptions of a successful experience. It is important to note that advisors recognized the time consuming nature of dissertation advising.

Daniels-Nelson [1983], Hartnett [1976], Melnick [1971], and Dukelow [1980] all reported findings that support Proposition #1 of this research. The quality of the relationship between the advisor and the student seems essential to the perception of the quality of the advising and/or dissertation experience. There is agreement in the literature reviewed and with this research that the quality of the relationship is essential. It is suggested here that efforts, [e.g. retreat activities, workshops, joint writing efforts] could be undertaken to prepare students and faculty in ways to enhance the quality of the relationship. It was reported by advisors that the majority perceived their relationships and the resultant dissertation advising experiences to be positive. An additional suggestion is for faculties to identify what specific actions or what alternatives would be appropriate for students or faculty to implement when the relationship appears to have deterioriated.
Topic selection and its concomitant relationships emerged in this study as an important characteristic. The student's interest in the topic was reported as essential. The advisor's interests, although not perceived as essential, was viewed as a positive force in the outcomes for students. When there was congruence of topic selection with advisor interest, it was perceived as supportive of the behavior of the advisor toward critiquing the draft and responding in a timely way to student requests. As Hartnett [1976, p. 83] reported the degree of match of the students' expectations with those of the institution could be enhanced through a more active and accurate communications effort.

Suggestions for Additional Research

The problem studied: Advisors' Perceptions of their Doctoral Advising Experiences was undertaken to begin formulating substantive, grounded theory related to the doctoral advising experience. Substantive grounded theory often serves as a starting point for formal theory development. What is proposed here are some alternative ways for following up this study.

Subsequent research efforts of this nature could be conducted to provide a more detailed accounting of the researcher's perceptions and biases as he/she conducted
the research. The memos, an audit trail and discussions with committee members served to help this researcher account for his biases in the process. Some additional suggestions which might provide for a clearer accounting of the researcher in replicating a study similar to this investigation include:

- member checks with the respondents to determine the degree to which they support the findings and propositions,
- in an interview study of the perceptions of advisors which includes the perceptions of a sub-sample of doctoral students,
- while conducting the research in addition to maintaining a detailed research diary of the researcher's perceptions, report those perceptions as a component of the study,
- study and report the perceptions of pairs of advisors and students from beginning to the end of the students' dissertation experiences.

Some additional proposals for related research include:

1) Broaden the data base of this interview study to include similar data bases from advisors in additional colleges and universities.
2) Conduct a comparison study of doctoral advising in large research institutions and the smaller institutions more concerned with professional certification.

3) Further summarize the data from this study to identify a questionnaire for a broader based qualitative or quantitative study.

4) Interview deans of graduate schools to determine what characteristics or properties they perceive as essential to advisors and students in dissertation research.

5) Conduct a comparison study of the expectations and skills perceived as necessary by new aspiring professors prior to their advising doctoral students in dissertation research.

6) Conduct a study of novice advisors, those with only one or two dissertation advising experiences.

7) Study recent graduates and ask their perceptions of the doctoral dissertation experience.
8) Study the interpersonal characteristics of the advisor-student relationship in greater detail.

9) Conduct a study to determine the qualities and characteristics of exemplary dissertation advising.

10) Review ABD students' perceptions of their doctoral advising experiences.

11) Replicate this study with 20 different "experienced" advisors from the same population.

12) Interview advisors completing their first dissertation advising experience.

13) Conduct an in-depth study of characteristics that emerged as important in the advisors' perception of their advising experiences. [e.g. topic selection, personality characteristics of advisors and students as they relate to relationship building, skill deficiencies and/or strengths, conceptualization abilities.]

14) A study to determine the degree to which the propositions proposed in this study
are held to be accurate by advisors might provide support for this study.

Concluding Statements

This research as conducted and reported here has served as an initial study of advisors in graduate education. There has been little study of the process of advising graduate students. Conclusions resulting from this study include the need for advisors to broaden their understanding of creativity in dissertation work and what efforts they can take to encourage creative behavior on the part of their students. The most telling conclusion from this research taken together with research conducted concerning students in graduate education is the perceived importance of the nature of the relationship between advisors and students. Advisors need to take specific steps to encourage and nurture a relationship capable of sustaining the advisor and the student through the dissertation experience. Students might better be served if the problems of students leaving the institution (being off campus) and changes in advisors were addressed in a proactive manner by advisors and students. A caution to consider is the implied, perhaps simplistic, view that the best dissertation advising experiences are the least time consuming and inversely that troublesome dissertation
advising experiences are the most time consuming. Although the relationship is reported, it does not state that the least time consuming experiences are characteristic of the "best dissertations". As one advisor stated, the most creative dissertations are often characteristic of the more difficult advising experiences; based upon this research, they would be the most time consuming advising experiences.

Further study in the conduct of graduate education is warranted. The interest indicated by all the advisors interviewed, by the researcher's committee members, and in the literature reviewed in Chapter II provide support for such research.

The nine propositions that are grounded in the expressed perceptions of the advisors and reported here may serve as the basis for hypotheses is regarding future research efforts.

**Summary**

In Chapter VI a synthesis of the data derived and analyzed from the expressed perceptions of experienced doctoral advisors was presented for review. A set of nine propositions that emerged from the data were proposed which were derived through the constant comparative method
of data analysis. These were presented as a basis for generating substantive grounded theory expressed as propositions about advisors' perceptions of their advising experiences during their students' doctoral dissertation experiences. The study was an initial one in the development of bases for the establishing a more formal theory or additional sets of propositions. The chapter concluded with implications for practice, and suggestions for further research, and concluding statements.
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INITIAL LETTER TO SUBJECTS
December 10, 1985

Dr. James K. Duncan
122 Ramseyer Hall
29 W. Woodruff
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Dr. Duncan,

We are conducting research concerning the advisor's perceptions of their students' dissertation experiences. Doug Kammerer will be conducting interviews of major advisors during the end of Autumn and beginning of Winter Quarter (December, 1985—January, 1986.) Your name has been selected randomly from a list of advisors in the College of Education who have had at least five students complete their dissertations during the past seven years.

The interview will take 1 1/2 to 2 hours to complete. It will be an interview structured to explore your perceptions about the dissertation experiences of your students. The interview will be tape recorded in order to provide a rich source for an indepth comparative analysis of the data.

Prior to the interview, you will receive an outline of the interview schedule in order for you to be thinking about the advisor experience. The study has clearance from the Human Subjects Committee on campus and your anonymity and that of all individuals participating is assured.

The interview will occur during December or January at your convenience. Doug will be contacting you by telephone in the near future to establish a time and place for the interview. At that time, he will answer any questions you might have regarding the research or the interview.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Douglass E. Kammerer
Doctoral Candidate

Robert R. Bargar, PhD. James K. Duncan, PhD.
Associate Professor Professor

Program Areas
Curriculum and Instructional Development
121 Ramseyer Hall 614-422-5181

Educational Administration
301 Ramseyer Hall 614-422-7700

Higher Education, Student Affairs and Adult Education
301 Ramseyer Hall 614-422-7700

Humanistic Foundations
121 Ramseyer Hall 614-422-5181

Vocational-Technical Education
160 Ramseyer Hall 614-422-5037
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HUMAN SUBJECTS CONSENT FORMS
Research Involving Human Subjects

ACTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

With regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research protocol:

85B0164 A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF DOCTORAL ADVISORS ON THE ADVISING OF DOCTORAL CANDIDATES, Robert L. Bargar, Douglass E. Kaumeyer, Educational Policy & Leadership

THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN THE FOLLOWING ACTION:

_____ APPROVED          _____ DISAPPROVED

X  APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS*          _____ WAIVER OF WRITTEN CONSENT GRANTED

* Conditions stated by the Committee have been met by the Investigator and, therefore, the protocol is APPROVED.

It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least four (4) years beyond the termination of the subject's participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subject Review Committee for the required retention period. This application has been approved for the period of one year. You are reminded that you must promptly report any problems to the Review Committee, and that no procedural changes may be made without prior review and approval. You are also reminded that the identity of the research participants must be kept confidential.

Date: December 6, 1985  Signed: Theodore J. Kaul (Chairperson)

HS-025B (Rev. 3/85)
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child’s participation in) research entitled:

A Study of the Perceptions of Doctoral Advisors on the Advising of Doctoral

Candidates

Douglas E. Kammerer/Robert L. Bargar or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (or my child’s) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me. The information obtained from me will remain confidential unless I specifically agree otherwise by placing my initials here.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: __________________________ Signed: __________________________ (Participant)

Signed: __________________________
(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative) Signed: N/A
(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: __________________________

HS-027 (Rev. 11.81)-- To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.
APPENDIX C

SECOND LETTER TO SUBJECTS
Dear Dr. Sample,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our research. I look forward to meeting with you on Friday morning, 10:00 am, February 14, 1986. As you suggested, I will come to Room 1 Ramseyer Hall.

I have enclosed for your information and review an outline that I will use to direct our interview. The outline is general because the interview is intended to be open-ended. I will be audiotaping the interview to enable me to conduct an indepth analysis of the data at a later time. The interview should take one and a half to two hours.

I have secured approval from the Human Subjects Review Committee and will have a standard release form for you to sign prior to the interview. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the interview or the research, do not hesitate to call. (Marion City Schools: 1-387-3300 ex.243)

Again, thank you for agreeing to participate. I am most interested in securing your view of your students' dissertation experiences.

Sincerely,

Douglass E. Kammerer
Doctoral Candidate

Enclosure
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
Interview Schedule

There are five major areas of interest in the perception of the advisor which serve as the focus of this research. The study will explore through the interviews the following major areas:

1. the relationship: advisor to student,
2. the advisor's relationship to the dissertation, and
3. the relationship of the student to the dissertation.

In a larger or more global way there are two additional perceptions of the advisor which are of interest to this research:

4. the role of the advisor to the committee and the graduate school representative and to the student in the dissertation defense, and
5. how the advising experience fits into the larger world of the professor's work. Advising is only one of the expectations placed on a professor.

The following questions are organized to focus on the five areas mentioned above as central to this research. The first two question areas will serve as the focus for the
following subquestions. The first question area will be addressed following the initial introductions and a brief collection of necessary demographic data.

**Introduction/Demographics:**

Please give a brief professional history and include the following:

- **Professional Experience**
- **Graduate Degree Institution**
- **Title of Your Dissertation**
- **Program Area you are now working in**
- **Age**
- **Years at OSU**

**Question Area #1:**

Select a student's work that you would characterize as "your best advising experience." What is it that leads you to select this work? Describe the experience for me from beginning to end.

The following questions may serve to focus the interview as needed.

**Problem Clarification/Understanding:**

1. What are the initial experiences with the student like?
2. Do students have a clear picture? What is the nature of their early view of dissertations?

3. What do you do to assist the student in improving their understanding of the problem?

Relationship of the problem to the students' professional development:

1. Does the problem have the basis of becoming a dissertation?

2. Is there a connection to the students' sense of worth or contribution to their perception of a research problem?

3. Does the student have an opportunity to be creative, to behave creatively?

Major responsibility for the study and the decisions affecting it:

1. Whose problem is it? How do you know if it seems to be becoming yours?

2. What cues do you have about the ownership of the problem?

3. Do students expect you to "own" their research?

4. How do you resolve conflicts or disagreements?
Expectations for progress:

1. How do you establish an expectation for progress?
2. Do you prod students to work?
3. Is the "ABD" your problem or the students'?
4. What expectations do students make on you for their making or meeting the demands of the dissertation?

Assisting in the research experience:

1. What do you do to help the student enhance his or her understanding?
2. What resources do you bring to bear on the students' research project?
3. Are you to encourage creativity in the process?
4. How do you have students synthesize and analyze their work?

Critique and defense preparation:

1. What responsibility do you have to provide thoughtful, constructive critique to the student's work?
2. What other criticism is likely?
3. How do you help prepare the student for the defense of his or her work?
Question Area #2:

Now choose a "worst" possible experience in dissertation advising for you. Describe this experience from beginning to end. Why is it your worst experience?

The same focusing questions that were used above may be used to further develop your responses.

Question Area #3:

The focus of the interview will at this time shift to the feelings and their effect on the dissertation, the student and the advisor. The following questions will be addressed:

As you reflect on the two previous advising experiences, describe for me how the feelings affected the experiences.

What is the effect on the dissertation and the student of the feelings you have toward the dissertation topic?

What affect does your feelings toward the student have on the dissertation and the student?
What affects do the students' feelings toward you have upon the work and you?

What affects do the students' feelings toward the topic or methodologies used have upon the work?

**Question Area #4:**
The areas of a more global interest are explored through the following questions:

**Advisor/Graduate School, committee selection:**
1. What are your responsibilities to prepare the student for the graduate committee member's role in the dissertation defense?
2. Do you or should any advisor have influence in the selection of committee members?

**Question Area #5**
**Advisor/Institutional Responsibilities as Professor:**
1. How does your role as an advisor to graduate students fit into your role as professor?
2. Are you professor first, dissertation advisor second? Or are you advisor first, professor second? What are the implications of this choice for your students?
3. How has the advising of students complemented your work as a professor?

4. What contact do you have with the faculty/literature outside your area of expertise?

5. How do you feel about your role and responsibilities as an advisor?

Questions Added as initial analysis of data occurred:

1. How do you get advisees? How are they assigned?

2. Number of students for whom you have served as major advisor?

3. How do you know it's a dissertation?

4. Where did you learn about advising, how to advise?
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