BECOMING A PROFESSIONAL: EXAMINING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PRACTICES OF COMMUNICATION DOCTORAL STUDENTS

A Dissertation

by

RACHEL LYNNE RASHE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2012

Major Subject: Communication

Becoming a Professional: Examining Professional Development Practices of

Communication Doctoral Students

BECOMING A PROFESSIONAL: EXAMINING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PRACTICES OF COMMUNICATION DOCTORAL STUDENTS

A Dissertation

by

RACHEL LYNNE RASHE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	James Kevin Barge
Committee Members,	Katherine Miller
	Charles Conrad
	Charles Samuelson
Head of Department,	James Aune

August 2012

Major Subject: Communication

ABSTRACT

Becoming a Professional: Examining Professional Development Practices of

Communication Doctoral Students. (August 2012)

Rachel Lynne Rashe, B. A., University of Arkansas;

M.A., University of Arkansas

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. James Kevin Barge

Higher education is currently facing a number of challenges that are leading doctoral students to seek employment outside of the traditional research-focused institution. With students looking for different jobs, professional socialization and development activities need to be re-examined to understand whether current practices are meeting the needs of doctoral students. Sociologists have explored what it means to be professional at length, but a communicative voice is needed in this conversation. This research seeks to understand how to "do" professionalism in mundane, everyday contexts. Graduate student socialization, identity, and professional development literature was used as a backdrop for exploring this phenomenon.

Interviews with doctoral students in communication and directors of graduate studies in communication were conducted and documents were collected from graduate programs and the National Communication Association. This material was subsequently analyzed to explore what it means to be a professional, how to develop as a professional, and how professionalism is tracked and evaluated. The analysis suggested that what it

means to be professional is composed of traditional conceptualizations of research, teaching, and service, and a number of other practices and values such as independence, collaboration, collegiality, and work-life balance. This analysis also showed that while students developed these qualities through formal means, they relied more on informal methods of developing to enhance their professionalism. Formal assessment measures helped in the evaluation process, though they did not measure many of the characteristics of a communication professional. Informal means of evaluation served as a way to track some of these characteristics.

Findings showed several challenges that doctoral education currently face. First, students are increasingly pursuing careers outside the traditional Research I institutional context and increasingly pursuing more teacher-centric goals. While development opportunities should reflect student goals, a shift away from a research focus could undermine placement at Research I institutions and decrease the value of the PhD, given the increase in fixed-contract hiring at public and for-profit universities. Second, doctoral students and advisers are not adequately prepared to have difficult conversations about career goals, which may be connected to students feeling underprepared to go on the job market. Third, current assessment procedures do not measure many of the more abstract qualities and values identified as professional, which makes it difficult to assess student development. Finally, this research highlighted how the role of the body in white-collar work has been overlooked and how academic practices discipline the body in particular ways. Future research and practical

applications regarding each of these challenges were explored, and limitations were also

discussed.

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to my husband, Nathan Reed. Nathan, you have been an unfailing source of encouragement and support. You have put up with me through the best and the worst of this process and helped me every step along the way. You assured me that everything would work out…and you were right. And yes, you got that in writing. I couldn't have done it without you! Love you!

This research is also dedicated to my family. Mom and Dad, thank you for always supporting me, being proud of me, and being patient with me. Ashley, Noelle, and Anna, thank you for always believing that I would finish this project, even when I thought I couldn't. You all have provided endless support and I am thankful to have such a strong and loving family.

I cannot forget my daughters, Caitlin and Meghan. You have cheered me on to finish my dissertation, even though becoming a "doctor" doesn't mean I can diagnose your strep throat. I love you both and hope I make you proud.

I would not have been able to complete this project without Teddy, my Corgi. You are a man of few words, but always knew what to say to keep me sane!

I also couldn't have done this without my friends, Kylene and Brad Wesner, Kristin Mathe, Jackie Chinn, and Rachel Whitten. Each of you encouraged me to persevere and make it to the end!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Higher education within the United States has been subject to many critiques recently including being high cost and low quality, having high student-teacher ratios, exaggerating student earning potential, enrolling unqualified students, and hiring an increasing number of temporary instructors (Atwell, 1996; Baker & Lattuca, 2010; Basken, 2010; Boud & Lee, 2009; Carpenter & Bach, 2012; Dillon, 2007; Lewin, 2010; Pathak & Pathak, 2010; Potter, 2003; Wegner, 2008; Williams, 2012). Moreover, the traditional notion of what counts as an appropriate university education is currently being debated as a number of for-profit online universities such as the University of Phoenix have emerged, challenging accepted teaching practices as well as the growth of professional graduate degrees, which move people to reconsider the connections among theory, research, and practice (Bennett & Graham, 2008; Cameron, Frederickson, Lunt, & Lang, 2008; Carpenter & Bach, 2012; Crossouard, 2008; Davis, Evans, & Hickey, 2008; Fulton, Kuit, Sanders, & Smith, 2012; Kot & Hendel, 2011; Lee, Brennan, & Green, 2009; Loxley & Seery, 2012; Silvester, 2011). Though these critiques and challenges have been aimed mostly at the undergraduate experience, they also impact doctoral education in terms of the expectations universities hold for future faculty as well as the job prospects for employment in traditional universities and colleges. The customary goals of doctoral education have been to create intellectuals who participate

---

This dissertation follows the style of *Communication Monographs*.

in scholarly conversations and preserve the integrity of their field (Golde, 2006), yet these contemporary critiques and challenges may challenge these traditional goals.

For example, one problem in doctoral education is that the job market is changing, causing higher education institutions to hire fewer tenure-track positions (Baker & Lattuca, 2010; Boud & Lee, 2009). This trend has resulted in doctoral students seeking non-academic jobs. The traditional emphasis has been on developing research skills that prepare students for academic careers at institutions where the focus is on research and less on undergraduate instruction, which are commonly referred to as Research I institutions. However, non-academic jobs might require additional occupational skills that have been historically overlooked by doctoral programs. Because doctoral education is not systematically addressing these development needs, students may be underprepared to enter their careers after graduating (Ehrenberg, Zuckerman, Groen, & Brucker, 2009).

Because of these challenges, administrators and faculty members should re-examine professional socialization and development activities, which begins by revisiting what it means to be professional. Traditional conceptualizations of the term "professional" often refer to an educated population with expertise, power, and status, or groups that organize their resources to claim the market for their services (Carr, 1999; Carr-Saunders, 1966; Esland, 1980; Evetts, 2003, 2011; Freidson, 1994, 1986, 2001; Lowe & Gayle, 2010; Reed, 1996). Revisiting traditional notions of the professional and professionalism brings attention to current professional socialization practices and what goals they address and whether current practices are addressing the goals of

contemporary graduate students, the communication discipline, and the larger environment including the job market.

This dissertation addresses current practices used to develop communication doctoral students. Using data from directors of graduate studies (DGSs), doctoral students, and documents, I explored how professionalism in the communication discipline is constructed, how it is enacted, and how it is assessed. Exploring these topics gave me the opportunity to understand how professional socialization structures can be improved to facilitate the learning and development of graduate students. I also examined how professional socialization is connected to challenges higher education institutions are facing and its implications for communication professionals. The chapter is organized as follows: (1) challenges in doctoral education, (2) professions, professionalism, and communication (3) doctoral education and the development of the professional, (4) focus and rationale for the dissertation, (5) research questions, and (6) the organization of the dissertation.

Challenges in Doctoral Education

The overarching goal of doctoral education is to create competent scholars who are able to advance their discipline through research. The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate has identified three fundamental goals doctoral students should be able to reach when they graduate (Golde, 2006). First, PhDs should be able to produce innovative research that helps the field move forward. Second, PhDs should be able to demonstrate their ability to conserve the knowledge and contributions generated by past scholars in the field by building on and challenging past research. Third, PhDs should

have the ability to communicate their and their field's ideas to others in the discipline, across the academic disciplines, and to the public.

There are several academic milestones students must pass as they earn their degree, which prepare them to fulfill these three goals. A PhD is composed of three major elements: (1) coursework, (2) a comprehensive or qualifying examination based on course knowledge, and (3) an independent research project, usually a dissertation (Gardner, 2009b). Passing each of these milestones signals that students are moving toward accomplishing the three goals; however, the ability to accomplish these goals is often hampered by issues regarding student attrition, lack of student preparation, and inadequate evaluation procedures.

Attrition

Universities are experiencing high attrition rates within doctoral programs as half of those who begin a doctoral program will complete the degree (Golde, 1998, 2006; Nettles & Millett, 2006). The dropout rate in the humanities is near 70% (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992). Thirty to 40% of dropouts occur during the first year of school, when students are being socialized into their departments and learning. Diverse populations, such as women, ethnic minorities, international students, part-time students, older students, students with families, first-generation students, and students with disabilities have particularly high attrition rates (Lovitts, 2001).

Reasons for attrition include personal issues, unclear expectations, confusing requirements, inconsistent supervision, lack of funding, and orientation programs that do not match the needs of students (Ehrenberg, Zuckerman, Groen, & Brucker, 2009;

Gardner, 2009b). Although universities cannot account for students' personal issues, they can affect the aforementioned factors that lead to attrition. Attrition not only incurs financial costs for the department as money, time, and effort it has put into training, developing, and employing an individual is lost (Lovitts, 2001), it also incurs a reputational cost as high attrition reflects poorly on administrators and faculty members if they cannot maintain a graduate student cohort.

Lack of Preparation

Students who do complete the degree have been found to be unprepared to fulfill job expectations and requirements. Despite years of coursework and training, "many PhD recipients are ill-prepared to function effectively in the settings in which they work" (Golde, 2006, p. 5). Reasons for the lack of preparedness "include lack of faculty attention to providing students with systematic and developmentally organized preparation for their careers, insufficient clarity in expectations doctoral students should fulfill, and minimal feedback about progress" (Barnes & Austin, 2009, p. 311). For example, involvement in conferences or professional organizations is integral to assimilating into a graduate program, but students are not encouraged in a consistent or standardized way by peers or faculty members to participate (Gardner & Barnes, 2007). It is difficult for students to be adequately prepared for their careers if they do not actively participate in professionally related activities. In addition, a lack of understanding and guidance about expectations and assumptions often occurs during the dissertation writing stage. Students may receive less structured guidance about expectations because they are pursuing unique projects. This lack of structure can lead to

less frequent communication with advisors and faculty members, which can result in a misunderstanding or lack of knowledge about expectations (Blum, 2010).

Evaluation

Success in doctoral education is generally measured by progress in coursework, retention, degree completion, and the development of professional competencies, but institutions and departments often lack information about students' success in these areas (Austin, 2002; Austin & McDaniels, 2006). Evaluation of courses, development programs, and activities can be linked to attrition and lack of preparation in the way that evaluation is a reflective process by which departments track the effectiveness of their efforts. For example, there is a lack of knowledge about what PhDs do five to 10 years after graduating, thereby leaving programs' effectiveness and success unknown (Nerad, 2009). In addition, PhD-granting institutions do not keep good records of degree completion rates, despite high attrition rates (Denecke, Frasier, & Redd, 2009). One barrier to systematic evaluation across institutions is that universities quantify progress in different ways, making it difficult to have a unified understanding of success in doctoral education (Nerad, 2009).

Problems with attrition, lack of systematic preparation, and poor evaluation practices keep doctoral education from being as effective and productive as possible. This study helps address these problems by understanding how those in the communication discipline conceptualize professionalism, what activities are used to socialize and develop students' professionalism, and how communication programs evaluate student progress. Reflecting on current doctoral student professional

socialization and development practices will allow us to identify what facilitates and hinders the development of graduate students.

Professions, Professionalism, and Communication

Conceptualizations of professions, professionals, and professionalism have a diverse history rooted primarily in sociology. While communication scholars honor the foundation sociology has provided in this area of research, they highlight the need for research on professionalism through a communication lens. Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) specifically call for communication research about representing the professional in popular culture, performing the professional communicatively, and understanding how discourses politicize the meaning of profession and professional.

Sociological Approaches to Professions

Sociological conceptualizations of the term "profession" have been associated with two schools of thought. The first, profession as a normative value system, is the idea that professions are groups of people who are highly educated and skilled as a result of their training and work to better society while gaining status and autonomy. The second, profession as ideology of occupational powers, is the notion that occupations are groups of people whose organize their resources and knowledge to monopolize the market. The two dominant discourses of professionalism are combined to create a third school of thought, profession as discourse of occupational change and control (Evetts, 2003).

Rather than define profession and professionalism, authors have typically listed characteristics of the concepts. Freidson (1994) maintains that a sufficient definition

contains "specifying attributes, traits, or defining characteristics" (p. 16).

Professionalism is enacting the characteristics associated with a profession (Evetts,

2011). It is also the integration of multiple "professionalities," which can be likened to

the integration of multiple identities (Colbeck, 2008). Professionality is "an

ideologically-, attitudinally-, intellectually- and epistemologically-based stance on the

part of an individual, in relation to the practice of the profession to which s/he belongs,

and which influences her/his professional practice" (Evans, 2008, p. 26).

Professionalism itself is a tricky concept because of unstated assumptions, inconsistent

usages, and culturally defined contexts (Freidson, 1994; Helsby, 1995).

     Profession as normative value system. The word profession has its roots in Latin

as an "expression of intention or purpose," and has a bit of a religious overtone as

captured by the phrase "profession of faith" (Freidson, 1986, p. 21; Kimball, 1992). In

the 16th century, the word encompassed both secular and religious occupations, such as

law, medicine, and military. The medical, legal, and clergy professions were termed

"status professions," whereas others were lumped together as "occupational professions"

(Freidson, 1986). In recent years, several characteristics have been attributed to the

normative value system model, including expert knowledge and status gained through

education, claiming autonomy in actions, having a service orientation, forming

professional associations, and relying on ethical codes of conduct to guide actions

(Evetts, 2011). At the core of this model is that professionals are helping clients while

increasing in status and autonomy.

Claims to expertise backed up by degrees, credentials, and certifications earned through education are characteristic of professions (Abbott, 1988; Carr, 1999; Carr-Saunders, 1966; Evetts, 2003, 2011; MacDonald, 1995). Education is the primary reason professions "claim the right to act as guardians of knowledge and the means to access it" (Esland, 1980, p. 219). Members of a profession use their education to manage their knowledge, successfully fulfill obligations of their work, claim privileged status, and declare autonomy (Esland, 1980; Freidson, 1986; Lowe & Gayle, 2010; Reed 1996). Although education and knowledge are important characteristics of professions, education itself is a noteworthy profession (Freidson, 1986). Generating and disseminating knowledge is at the heart of the profession of education, thereby affecting every other profession.

Professionals also have a service orientation (Carr, 1999). Early scholars such as Parsons (1939) recognized that professionals rely on the client relationship to succeed. Professions work to fulfill the needs or requests of their clients; however, professionals are rarely performing manual labor that is traditionally associated with blue-collar jobs (Barber, 1965; Esland, 1980; Evetts, 2009; Starbuck, 1992; Nixon, Martin, McKeown, & Ranson, 1997). Having a service orientation helps the profession gain public recognition, which is pivotal because it helps legitimize the profession in the eyes of the public, which includes potential clients.

Professional associations play a central role in the normative approach (Carr, 1999; Evetts, 2011; Freidson, 1986; MacDonald, 1995). These groups help to protect professional status, knowledge, and regulate norms of behavior. Codes of conduct are

often created and sustained through professional associations (Carr, 1999; Carr-Saunders, 1966; Esland, 1980; Evetts, 2011). The codes include ethics that professionals are to uphold, especially when they are in professional settings interacting with clients. For some professions, such as medicine and law, the ethical and conduct standards are institutionalized, whereas in other professions the norms may be more implicit. Professional associations also allow for control of the professions by its members rather than an organization because workers' allegiance is to the profession, not the organization (Noordegraaf, 2011).

Profession as ideology. Traditional perspectives on what counts as a profession shifted in the 1960s as occupations in the middle class rose to prominence and competed for legitimacy (Freidson, 1986; Scott, 2008). With the rise of capitalism and industrialized society, professions are increasingly being integrated to the wage-labor system. The profession as ideology view came from critiques of the normative value system (Evetts, 2003, 2009; Nixon et al., 1997). The ideological system centers on professions as occupations that organize their knowledge, abilities, and resources to claim the market for their services (Johnson, 1972; Larson, 1977). This perspective is politically and socially charged (Freidson, 2001). Professionalization is a tool to increase pay, status, and power, and to monopolize control of work (Abbott, 1988; Evetts, 2009). Professionalism is key in this approach because it helps groups maintain stability regardless of how the market is changing (Nixon et al., 1997).

Professions use this approach to persuade others they deserve political and economic power, which are not "intrinsic to bodies of knowledge and skill" (Freidson,

2001, p. 105). Some of the same professions are considered in both models, but they are viewed differently. For example, in this system, the medical profession is not viewed as keeping patients healthy; rather, it is focused on status and power. Professionals have unique specialized knowledge and skill, and can use that to produce goods and services that will give them monopoly over the market. Groups that consider themselves professions may not define themselves using the normative approach, yet may have many of the same characteristics (Lowe & Gayle, 2010; Turner and Hodge, 1970).

In contrast to the normative value approach, this approach argues that professions are not built on collegiality and trust between the professional and client, but rather on dominance of the market and autonomy in work (Freidson, 1986, 1994). The ideological approach views professionals in the normative value system as not serving clients' needs as much as forcing the needs on them in an unaltruistic manner. For example, Larkin (1983) documented how the relationship between medical professionals and patients is characterized by dominance and gender. In addition, codes of ethics are viewed as being created to delineate between insiders and outsiders (Abbott, 1988).

Hoyle & Wallace (2007) propose a model that has similar components to the ideological system. They highlight ironies of policy and practice in professionalism in educational organizations. Ironies of policy are the discrepancies between policies set forth by a governing body and the feasibility of fulfilling those policies. Ironies of practice are the gap between what rules are handed down by the organization and the actions of those enacting the policies, such as teachers. Practitioners have to appear to be

fulfilling policies to the fullest extent even though they are bending the rules to meet the needs of students.

   Profession as discourse of occupational change and control. Evetts (2003, 2009, 2011) proposes a third approach that integrates the profession as a normative value and profession as ideology approaches. The discourse of occupational change and control model is useful because it avoids emphasizing one perspective at the expense of the other. It is unrealistic to think that in today's society the normative value or ideological system will work by itself. Rather, normative and ideological systems become occupational values that managers use to control professionals. Professions are no longer protected groups of workers who totally regulate themselves based on their knowledge and expertise; now professionals are employed by organizations that manage them. Individuals have some control over their actions, as they hold knowledge and expertise, but they must operate within organizational contexts (Evetts, 2003, 2009). Professionals used to be educated and trained to enact their professions in any organizational context, whereas modern professionals must operate within a specific organizational structure (Harries-Jenkins, 1970; Noordegraaf, 2011). Suddaby and Viale (2011) propose that professionals are the catalyst behind institutional change and that the projects they take on to increase their power and status have become connected with projects of institutionalization. In this approach, organizations do not totally control professionalism, because professionals may be "'controlled' by schooling and socialization processes that take place earlier and elsewhere" (p. 466). Prior professional

socialization necessitates occupational standards so organizations can manage professionals.

In organizational professionalism, managers try to exert control over other organizational members, whereas occupational professionalism occurs within groups of professionals who share allegiance and regulate each other (Evetts, 2009). In this case, the organization and the occupation may be in opposition to one another. Professionalism can be conceptualized as a threat to traditional hierarchies because it encourages personal development within the organizational hierarchy (Fox, 1992). This discourse of professionalism, which is driven by hierarchy, bureaucracy, and productivity, designates certain practices and behaviors for organizational members. Some of these include measurement of success and progress, performance targets and indicators, work standardization, and financial control by the organization. This new professionalism also affects individuals' occupational identities, as they identify with their profession and the organization (Fournier, 1999).

A Communication Perspective of Professions

Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) examine how the term profession and its derivatives have and can continue to be explored by communication researchers. They aim to "bring a missing communicative voice into a predominantly sociological conversation while honoring the enduring insights already generated by that conversation" (p. 148). The three overarching tenets of sociological research they aim to protect are the developments of (1) the division of labor in modern society, (2) legitimacy through expertise or class, and (3) ethics associated with professions. Cheney and Ashcraft

(2007) seek to answer the following question: "How can we craft a communicative lens that is both responsive to this palpable disciplined anxiety and accountable to sociological (and in a certain sense, economic) findings regarding the embodied, physical, and material dimensions of the professional?" (p. 155-156). They answer this question by suggesting three areas of inquiry for future research: (1) studies of popular culture and the professional (representing professional), (2) studies of routine, day-to-day interactions ("doing" professional), and (3) studies of the intersectionality of professional bodies, practices, and symbols (politicizing professional). Professionalism can be investigated in a broad number of areas and contexts, including organizational, interpersonal, rhetorical, critical-cultural, health, and legal communication.

Representing the professional. Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) maintain that the relationships between popular culture and the professional have been studied, but in communication, scholars tend to study one without focusing on the other. For example, "organizational and interpersonal communication scholars have taken interest in the professional but have scarcely examined popular culture, whereas scholars of rhetoric and cultural studies have emphasize popular culture but have rarely shown concern for constructions of work per se" (p. 159). The intersection is important to study because it relates to identity construction and development. Few studies have looked at popular culture and representations of the professional and, as a result, fail to bridge the symbolic and material pertaining to this topic. A notable exception is Holmer Nadesan and Trethewey's (2000) exemplary study exploring women's popular success literature

and viewpoints of professionalism from career women, showing how women use messages to form their professional identity.

"Doing" professional. Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) also call for an investigation of how professionalism is enacted in mundane, day-to-day occurrences at the workplace. The site of research can encompass traditional and non-traditional sites of organizing, including interpersonal and romantic relationships. Research of this type is "the study of how people 'do' professional in light of situated norms" (p. 161). This line of inquiry stems from Weber's (1978) conceptualization of professionalism as the development of rational expertise. This idea of professionalism is void of emotion. This view is clear in the "insistence on professional comportment immediately (re)frames the interaction, and any attendant decisions or actions, as ones where spontaneity, emotionality, and individuality are to be suppressed" (Cheney & Ashcraft, 2007, p. 162). Legitimacy is connected to "acting professional" in the way that if members of an organization act in a way considered "unprofessional," they are decreasing their legitimacy.

Some recent communication studies have taken more of a focus on how people "do" professionalism. For example, Ellingson (2011) examined patient care technicians (PCTs), who are paraprofessionals not formally trained like nurses and physicians, and their role in administering dialysis to patients with chronic kidney failure. Her findings show that PCTs adapt to individual patients' physical, mental, and emotional needs, take patient care seriously, work with other PCTs to provide quality care, and control their emotions in a high-stress work environment.

Kuhn (2009) reviewed legal professionalism, which is the sense of commitment legal professionals feel toward their clients and against their adversaries. This discourse means that legal professionals must balance pursuing their clients' cases "with all possible tenacity" while maintaining client confidentiality (p. 385). Legal professionals are willing to serve their clients, but their actions to win their clients' cases are separate from clients' actions. They also detest the idea of being considered a "corporate lackey" and have more allegiance to the profession than the organization. Legal professionals ultimately use discursive resources to identify with both professional and personal ethics, the policies of their firm, the idea that their morality is separate from their firm, and the ability to serve a social purpose. Identifying with these concepts helps them avoid the idea that they are slaves to their corporation.

Lammers and Garcia (2009) analyzed the profession of veterinary medicine as an institutionalized occupation and its role as an extraorganizational influence in the workplace. Institutionalized occupations are those that have structures in place operating at a local level that reproduce the organization. Participants, who work at a veterinary call center, have professional qualities similar to physicians, which are explored in depth in the literature. Those in veterinary medicine communicate profession by providing, sharing, and seeking knowledge, managing their behavior, emotion, and productivity, internally motivating themselves, having a service orientation, follow field standards and norms, and participate in a knowledge community beyond the workplace. These concepts generally match characteristics of professions listed above.

Tracy and Trethewey (2005) explored how the real-self<->fake-self dichotomy is performed in day-to-day actions and its implications for identity in organizational communication. Their analysis identified three identity construction processes in which organizational members engage to "real-ize" the institutionalized organizational identity (p. 178). First, members participate in strategic subordination, which occurs when members give the best of themselves to their work despite claiming to want more of an identity at home. Second, members create a perpetually deferred self. Although members have work and home life demands, they continually put off their desired home life and speak of it as continually occurring in the future. Third, organizational members incur "auto-dressage" (p. 180). This process refers to when people engage in controlled behaviors for the sake of preserving organizational symbols of professionalism.

When organizational members take part in these processes, they try to align their real self with the preferred self of the organization. The fake self comes into play when organizational members are encouraged to put forth a preferred self and compartmentalize characteristics of their jobs that are stigmatized or "dirty." Good "copers" are able to act in the way their organization wants them to and cover up the real self. The authors propose a crystallized self in which multiple facets are recognized and celebrated. Organizational members who take advantage of the crystallized self may be able to break free from the institutionalized, preferred and marginalized self.

Politicizing professional. A number of studies examine the politics of professionalism, specifically the intersection of gender, race, class, sexuality, nation, and others types of difference, which Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) term "intersectionality."

The authors see the label professional as perpetuating inequalities, although "the professional is in many respects constituted by intersecting discourses of difference" (p. 163). The authors make three claims based on intersectionality. First, workers and the work they do are placed into categories based on the differences noted above. Second, occupational identity is created and maintained by discourses of difference. Third, the dominant conceptualizations of what constitutes a professional "reflect gendered, raced, classes, and heterosexual vision of national identity" (p. 165). Therefore, unprofessional must refer to those who fall into categories of difference. The authors compare the professional-unprofessional dialectic to the civilized-primitive dialectic, which in the past has privileged a specific type of worker and work.

Several communication scholars have begun to research the intersections Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) identify. For example, Clair (1996) and Scarduzio (2011) explored the intersection between the material and the discursive. Clair (1996) examined the political nature of the phrase "real job" among college students and uncovered a bias toward white-collar jobs that are characterized by high pay, education, recognition, and status. Educated people are not supposed to take blue-collar jobs, typically filled by unskilled workers. Scarduzio's (2011) studied the intersection of power, professional work, organizing, and emotional deviance, or showing emotion that is typically prohibited in the workplace, of municipal court judges. They engage in privileged deviance, where a person in a position of power has the power to deviate from the rules and norms of showing emotion at work.

Meisenbach (2008), Ganesh and McAllum (2010), and Miller (1998) investigated identity in non-traditional organizational contexts. Meisenbach (2008) explored identity management of fund-raisers, who are stigmatized as dishonest and greedy. Fund-raisers struggle with traditional conceptualizations of professionalism because their job falls outside of normative and ideological views. Ganesh and McAllum (2010) showed how norms of professionalism are in tension with volunteering at non-profit organizations, where professionalism is assumed because there is little formal training. The giving of one's time, energy, and resources is being replaced by rules and regulations that keep volunteers in a cycle of administrative and prescribed work. Miller (1998) examined how the osteopathic medical profession has molded its identity by differentiating itself from other alternative treatments. The profession has shifted its identity to meet society's needs while maintaining its preference of holistic treatment while being recognized as a useful form of medicine.

Lucas and Buzzanell (2004) and Lucas and Steimel (2009) examined identity discourses in blue-collar workers. Lucas and Buzzanell (2004) explored how iron ore miners use occupational narratives to socialize other miners into the blue-collar career. Miners use *sisu*, or 'inner determination,' to define their identities and integrate others into the job (p. 280). Lucas and Steimel (2009) examined gender identity construction in female miners and mining families. They show how women balance being "feminine" while fulfilling the physical, mental, and social demands of the job.

Doctoral Education and the Development of the Professional

Literature on professional socialization, identity, and development is essential to exploring the professional development of communication doctoral students. Education literature delving into socialization and identity practices for doctoral students has yielded developmental models, which are grounded in the socialization and identity literature. Understanding how students are socialized into academic departments, how their identities shift throughout their education, and how professional development is currently conceptualized sets the stage for exploring professional development in the communication discipline.

Graduate Student Socialization

Socialization into an organization is the general process by which newcomers enter an organization, learn about its culture and norms, integrate some of those qualities into their personal values and norms, and become organizational members (Ashford, 1986; Brim & Wheeler, 1966; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Giddings, 1897; Jones, 1986; Moreland, 1985; Schein, 1968; Van Maanen, 1975; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Although individual experiences differ, newcomers generally assimilate into an organization through three phases of socialization: (1) anticipatory, (2) encounter, and (3) change and acquisition (Craig, 1996; Feldman, 1981; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Wanous, Reichers, & Malik, 1984). Other models of socialization, such as Jablin's (1987) model examine the entire life cycle of organizational socialization including: (1) entry, (2), assimilation, and (3) exit.

Formalized and structured socialization programs encourage newcomers to seek information from existing organizational members, reducing their uncertainty (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Black, 1996; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Comer, 1991; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Mignerey, Rubin, & Gorden, 1995). Examples of information-seeking behaviors in this context include overt questions, indirect questions, third parties, testing limits, disguising conversations, observation, surveillance, and feedback seeking (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Black, 1996; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Miller & Jablin, 1991; Ostroff and Kozlowski, 1992).

An overarching typology that describes organizations' roles in socialization is Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) organizational socialization tactics: (1) collective-individual, (2) formal-informal, (3) sequential-random, (4) fixed-variable, (5) serial-disjunctive, and (6) investiture-divestiture. The six organizational tactics are separated into three categories: (1) context, (2) content, and (3) social dimensions of socialization (Jones, 1986). Collective-individual and formal-informal both deal with the environment or context in which socialization is carried out. Sequential-random and fixed-variable tactics are content related because they deal with information exchange. Serial-disjunctive and investiture-divestiture are social facets in that these tactics have to do with interaction between newcomers and existing members of an organization.

Professional socialization is more role-specific than organizational socialization. It is how individuals assimilate to a profession "externally, in the requirements of the specific career role, and internally in the subjective self-conceptualization associated with that role" (McGowen & Hart, 1990, p. 118). Professional socialization can be

broken out into three "pillars": (1) cognitive mechanisms such as education and training, (2) normative mechanisms such as certificates and codes of conduct, and (3) symbolic mechanisms, such as mission statements and story-telling (Noordegraaf & Van der Meulen, 2008). These mechanisms guide behaviors and define work practices. In large part, people learn what is associated with a profession and a specific role by interacting with others in the organization, just like in organizational socialization (Merton, 1957).

Graduate students are simultaneously socialized into a university, department, and roles as graduate student and professional (Golde, 1998). Similar to classic socialization models, graduate student socialization occurs in four phases: (1) anticipatory, (2) formal, (3), informal, and (4) personal (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). The anticipatory phase is similar to Feldman's (1976, 1977, 1981) and Jablin's (1987) anticipatory and entry phases. The formal phase occurs when new students are informed of what is expected of them in their coursework, teaching, and research. During the informal stage, individuals shift roles and "begin feeling less 'student-like' and more professional" (Gardner, 2008b, p. 330). The personal stage is characterized by the internalization of the many roles associated with being a graduate student and the integration of those roles into individuals' identities. Building relationships with peers is fundamental to identity integration, as students observe how others have developed professional identities.

Graduate Student Identity

Weidman, Twale, and Stein's (2001) graduate student socialization model highlights the importance of identity in socialization. As students are socialized into a

profession, their identity shifts (Thoits & Virshup, 1997). Stryker's (1987) identity

theory, McCall and Simmons' (1978) role-identity theory, Tajfel's (1970, 1981, 1982)

social identity theory (SIT), and Turner, Hogg, Reicher, and Wetherell's (1987) self-

categorization theory (SCT) are part of the ongoing conversation regarding how

identities are formed through organizational socialization.

Social identity theory has three components: (1) the cognitive desire for positive

social identity, (2) the uses of identity in real-work situations, and (3) the shift between

the psychological and interpersonal factors (Phinney, 2008; Tajfel, 1978). SIT maintains

that people have perceptions of themselves based on group membership and social

relationships (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Identities include personal, group,

ethnic, and gender identity, among others (David & Bar-Tal, 2009; Echabe, 2010; Mana,

Orr, & Mana, 2009). The conglomeration of different identities forms the social identity,

or "the sum total of the social identifications used by a person to define him- or herself"

(Turner, 1982, p. 18).

In-groups and out-groups are both chosen by individuals and assigned to them

(Tajfel, 1959; Turner, 1982, 1985). The perception of belonging to certain groups and

not to others affects people's behavior in terms of both favoritism toward their in-groups

and discrimination toward their out-groups (Billig & Tajfel, 1973; Tajfel, 1970, Tajfel,

Nemeth, Jahoda, Campbell, & Johnson, 1970). Individuals strive to have a positive

organizational identity by comparing their in-groups and out-groups and conforming to

group norms and culture (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Hogg, 2001; Hogg & Reid, 2006;

Jenkins, 1996; Scott, 2007). The concept of nested identities can help explain how

people negotiate identification with multiple groups (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Identities range from high- to low-order, high being identification with organization and low being identification with a job. People's multiple identities are brought to the forefront when they participate in activities that require that a specific identity be displayed (Stryker, 1987). Identities can across the levels and are embedded in each other, but they can also conflict with one another. Communication is a tool to manage multiple identities (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001; Scott, 2007).

Although identities at all levels change, professional, or occupational, identity is the constantly shifting identification individuals have toward their role in a profession (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). Tracy and Scott (2006) define occupational identity as "a set of central, distinctive, and enduring characteristics that typify a line of work, is accomplished within a variety of discourses generated by occupational insiders and outsiders" (p. 7). Individuals have some agency in choosing to embody certain roles, but professional and personal identities overlap (Stryker & Burke, 2000; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). Overlapping identities often occurs by passing organizational milestones and gaining autonomy, authority, and expertise in an area (Colbeck, 2008).

There is a wealth of professional identity literature in management, communication, and education (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton 2000; Cohen, 2008; Dukerich, Golden, & Shortell, 2002; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Johnson, Morgeson, Ilgen, Meyer, & Lloyd, 2006; Jorgenson, 2002; Kuhn & Nelson, 2002; Morgan, Reynolds, Nelson, Johanningmeier, Griffin, & Andrade, 2004; Russo, 1998;

Scott, 2001; Tracy and Scott, 2006; van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). The professional identity most salient to this research is that of graduate students working toward their doctorates. Gardner (2009b) created a model of doctoral student identity development. Doctoral students face challenges and receive support through three phases in development: (1) entry, (2) integration, and (3) candidacy (Gardner, 2009b).

Upon entering a new graduate program, students can have a "hang-over identity," which describes the desire to keep parts of an identity from a previous culture (Goodman, Schlossberg, & Anderson, 2006; Sweitzer, 2009). Other challenges students face during the entry phase are challenging coursework, learning to think differently, and understanding expectations. They face these challenges by undergoing formal orientation and building relationships with peers and faculty. The integration phase begins as students are completing their coursework and preparing for their qualifying or comprehensive examinations. They are also challenged by a changing role as they begin to transition to the second half of the degree. They have continued support from peers and their advisor, on whom they rely but are finding their independence. After passing their comprehensive examinations, students enter candidacy and begin the dissertation writing process and job search (Gardner, 2009b). Students can feel isolated at this phase, and they receive support from their advisor, writing groups, and mentors. In addition to feeling isolated, students are undergoing another role shift from student to professional. Although students have more than half of their degree completed by this phase, about 30 percent of doctoral student dropout takes place in this phase (Sweitzer, 2009).

Throughout the identity development process, students can feel tension between roles (Colbeck, 2008; Sweitzer, 2009). Graduate students have the identities of student, teacher, and researcher, among others, and these identities are stimulated by being in different situations that call for the use of different identities (Colbeck, 2008). When students are feeling tensions between roles, they gravitate toward the identity they find most important. Choosing a single identity can result "in such problems as stress and reduced commitment to one or more roles" (Colbeck, 2008, p. 11). The relationships doctoral students foster as they progress through their graduate career help define and stimulate different identities (Sweitzer, 2009). Students may feel they have to choose the strongest identity and develop that one; however, it is possible for identities to coexist. Colbeck (2008) suggests creating a sense of shared meaning across the various identities that will relieve tension and create an overarching identity of professional.

If students are not encouraged to integrate their identities, they may lose the ability to balance their expertise in several areas, such as teaching and research, thereby minimizing their professionalism (Colbeck, 2008). As students learn about identity development from others, such as faculty members, they will become more skilled in attending to all parts of their identity, which will help them develop as a professional. Baker and Lattuca (2010) emphasize that "learning and identity development go hand in hand—it is through participation in the intellectual community in the field and the home institution that doctoral students build the knowledge and skills required for scholarship in their field of study" (p. 809). The socialization and identity literature helps clarify

how graduate students are socialized into the academic profession and how their identities shift as they progress through their education.

Graduate Student Professional Development

A relatively small amount of literature focuses on the professional development of graduate students (Evans, 2008; Friedman & Phillips, 2004; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Gardner, 2008a, 2008b, 2009a, 2009b; Miller, 2010).) We know that professional development takes place during socialization, is an outcome of socialization, and is a process by which professional identities are shaped; however, a definition and theoretical frameworks are lacking (Brown & Ferrell, 2009; Colbeck, 2008; Miller, 2010).

Several authors have attempted to characterize the nature and activities of professional development. Evans (2008) views professional development as a set of activities that helps individuals work toward being more professional, both in their tasks and attitudes. Watts (2009) sees professional development as a partnership that involves "the undertaking of professional education and training that are founded on a broad base of learning and culture that serves as a professional apprenticeship" (p. 687). Miller (2010) characterizes professional development as something that happens "'magically'" in the education and training process. While none of these is a definition, we know that professional development consists of activities, an apprenticeship, and occurs through training; however, it is unclear exactly how professional development takes place in day-to-day interactions.

The professional development literature is partially grounded in cognitive development from psychology and takes place through assimilation and accommodation (Gardner, 2009b). Assimilation is fitting into existing structures, whereas accommodation is changing existing structures to integrate new information (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). These elements of cognitive development are important in considering doctoral student professional development because students enter into an existing structure but adjust it by adding research and knowledge to their field (Gardner, 2009b).

Although a definition might not be clear, the constituents in graduate student professional development include the students, faculty members, advisors, and directors of graduate studies (DGSs) (Gardner, 2009b). Each of these parties is partly responsible for professional development, though they engage in different activities that aid development. Writing groups allow doctoral students to garner peer feedback (Aitchison, 2009; Parker, 2009). Interaction with peers may make individuals feel more integrated into a learning community and help build mutual trust and respect (Pyhalto, Stubb, & Lonka, 2009; Shortland, 2010). Mock oral presentations helped students develop because they had the opportunity to practice and receive feedback in a non-threatening environment (Church, 2009). Documents students are required to produce such as an annual report also help them keep track of their work and reflect on their development (Devenish, Dyer, Jefferson, Lord, van Leeuwen, & Fazakerley, 2009). Reflecting on research, writing, and teaching is an important part of development, especially in shaping future practices (Lee, 2008; Lyons, 2008; McArdle & Coutts, 2010).

Although the aforementioned activities can assist in professional development, they can be ineffective because departments and institutions focus on irrelevant topics, they do not assess their development programs, they are not systematic in their professional development, and they use one-shot development activities (Fullan, 1991; Guskey & Huberman, 1995; Holaday, Weave, & Nilson, 2007). These issues may leave students lacking the necessary knowledge, competencies, and skills required of a professional entering the job market. Doctoral students should be competent in conceptual understandings, research, teaching, service, interpersonal skills, and professional attitudes and habits (Austin & McDaniels, 2006). While teaching, research, and service are three areas traditionally reinforced as important for future faculty members, the traditional development training students receive is challenged because more PhDs are taking non-academic jobs after earning their degree (Van Note Chism, 1998).

Focus and Rationale for the Dissertation

This dissertation focuses on the connections among professional socialization and development, evaluation, and professional identity. Five overarching reasons inform the focus for the current research: (1) the socialization literature overlooks graduate student socialization, (2) formal socialization and the entry phase is the primary focus of many studies, which ignores the ongoing socialization and professional development of graduate students through their program, (3) the evaluation of formal orientation and professional development activities for graduate students is understudied, (4) relatively few studies look at the socialization of graduate students from the perspectives of

directors of graduate studies (DGSs), faculty members, or the academic discipline as a whole, and (5) the literature lacks a communication perspective on the development of professionalism in the discipline.

First, a relatively small amount of socialization literature focuses on graduate student socialization. A large body of research exists that identifies general organizational socialization tactics (Allen, 2006; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Jones, 1986; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), proposes phasic models of socialization (Feldman, 1976, 1977; Jablin, 1987; Miller & Jablin, 1991; Moreland & Levine, 1982;), and explains individual behavior in socialization (Ashford & Black, 1996; Comer, 1991; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Louis, 1980; Miller, 1996; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992; Slaughter & Zickar, 2006; Wanberg & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2000). However, such research tends to ignore the experience of graduate students and how they are socialized into academic disciplines.

There are some notable exceptions in socialization literature that emphasize graduate student socialization. For example, Bullis and Bach (1989) highlighted several turning points, such as settling in, socializing, and jumping informal hurdles, which characterized the socialization of graduate students. Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001), produced a four-stage model of graduate student socialization using the anticipatory, formal, informal, and personal stages similar to models describing the overall socialization process of newcomers (Feldman, 1976, 1977). Gardner (2008a; 2010) and Poock (2002) examined graduate student attrition and how the socialization experiences of marginalized groups, such as women, students of color, non-traditional students, and

part-time students were managed. Gardner (2008b) also investigated how socialization affected students' progression toward becoming independent researchers, creating a three-stage model of admission, integration, and candidacy to describe students' move toward independence. Gardner and Barnes (2007) focused on how graduate student extracurricular involvement affected socialization into the professional role, which is achieved through professional development. However, graduate student socialization tends to be relatively understudied phenomenon, particularly within the communication discipline.

Second, the literature does not explore the ongoing process of socialization following newcomer socialization and the entry phase as graduate students assimilate into and ultimately exit the graduate programs. Both the graduate student socialization and professional development literature focus mainly on formal orientation and the entry stage of newcomer orientation. For example, Bullis and Bach (1989) and Sweitzer (2009) sampled graduate students in their first year in school. Some studies acknowledge phases of doctoral education beyond the first year, such as Blum's (2010) analysis of factors keeping students from completing their dissertation. However, a number of activities associated with the socialization of graduate students, such as the role that comprehensive examinations, writing groups, research teams, and mentoring are often neglected in studies of graduate student socialization and professional development.

Third, the connections among feedback, socialization, and professional development of graduate students are also minimized. Evaluative feedback is important because students need to know if they are on track to becoming more fully developed

professionals (Gardner, 2007; Lovitts, 2001; Nettles & Millett, 2006). By knowing faculty members', advisors', DGSs', and disciplinary expectations and assumptions about progress through their degree programs, students can gauge their development and reflect on changes they could make.

Studying evaluation processes are also necessary for those implementing socialization and professional development activities to know if their efforts are successful. Because the field does not have literature tracking evaluation efforts, we do not know how the evaluation of socialization and professional development activities occurs. If evaluation of socialization and professional development activities is not being shared in the academic community, an important opportunity to capitalize on best practices and create the most useful development programs is missed.

Fourth, faculty members and DGSs are important constituents in graduate education, but their voices are often absent from studies of socialization and professional development. Most research relies on accounts provided by graduate students regarding their socialization experience (Bullis and Bach, 1989; Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Gardner, 2008a, 2008b, 2010). For example, Keltikangas and Martinsuo (2009) asked graduate students to explain how they acquired discipline-specific capabilities. The voices of others involved in graduate student socialization in addition to graduate students need to be heard because they may offer unique insight into socialization practices. Faculty members are key in understanding professional development because they often teach professional development classes and DGSs oversee entire communication programs. Professional development classes and graduate programs often employ a number of

resources such as syllabi, graduate handbooks, and other rubrics and templates, which often communicate disciplinary standards that guide students through professional socialization into the field. Disciplinary conventions are a "shared set of norms … entrenched within a single discipline" (Piekkarai, Welch, & Paavilainen, 2009, p. 568). Disciplinary conventions provide generally accepted practices or methods for how a member of that discipline should represent the field to others, how to conduct research, and how to be a successful member of the discipline.

Although the voices of faculty members, DGSs, and disciplinary conventions are often overlooked, some research does take the perspectives of constituents other than graduate students. For example, Barnes and Austin (2009) researched advisor-advisee relationships from the advisors' perspective and Gardner (2009) explored of success in graduate education from faculty members' perspectives. Nonetheless, the preponderance of studies tends to sample graduate students and do not include the perspectives of faculty and DGSs in their sample.

Finally, this study seeks to answer the call of Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) on exploring from a communication perspective how people "do" professionalism. The literature on professionalism relies heavily on sociology, psychology, and education (Abbott, 1988; Carr, 1999; Esland, 1980; Evetts, 2003, 2009; Friedson, 1986, 1994, 2001; Gardner, 2008a, 2008b; Lowe & Gayle, 2010; MacDonald, 1995; Parsons, 1939; Scott, 2008; Turner & Hodge, 1970). Communication scholars need to participate in the dialogue about professionalism. They can do this through a variety of ways, including

studying professionalism in popular culture, in day-to-day interactions, and the intersectionality of politicized facets of communication.

This study focuses on the day-to-day interactions in communication. Research on professionalism often focuses on the symbolic, not material, day-to-day enactment of professionalism. This research aims to identify concrete practices associated with professionalism of doctoral students in the communication discipline. Scholars have examined professionalism in communication, but have used communication as a tool to explore professionalism and another topic area.

Research Questions

This study poses three research questions based on the critique of the existing literature. The first research question is concerned with how the meaning of professional development is constructed. The overall lack of literature calls for an understanding of how the communication discipline articulates what it means to become a "professional." Understanding what it means to become a "professional" is important because it gives graduate students, faculty members, and DGSs a way to orient themselves to challenges regarding the professional development of graduate students. It is also important to understand what it means to become a "professional" from various perspectives to provide a more complex and nuanced notion of professionalism.

RQ1: How do directors of graduate studies, doctoral students, and documents

construct professionalism within the communication discipline?

While we have a relatively deep understanding of the professional development activities and programs that characterize graduate student socialization during the formal

orientation and entry stages, we have a limited understanding of how professional socialization and development are enacted in subsequent stages. The second research question seeks to identify activities that occur during the entry, assimilation, and exit phases and how they are linked using the perspectives of graduate students, DGSs, and the overall communication discipline.

RQ2: What development activities do doctoral students, directors of graduate studies, and documents view as enhancing doctoral students' professionalism?

RQ2a: What practices are associated with the effective formal orientation of incoming doctoral students?

RQ2b: What practices, procedures, policies, or activities beyond formal orientation are viewed as useful for enhancing students' professional development?

This study explores how faculty members and DGSs evaluate socialization and professional development. The literature suggests that we do not have an in-depth knowledge regarding what evaluation measures are used, how they are implemented, and how they affect professional socialization and development. These concerns lead to the third research question.

RQ3: How is doctoral students' professional socialization and development tracked and evaluated?

This research examines doctoral students', DGSs', and the communication discipline's perspectives regarding professional socialization and development with the

hope of establishing a vocabulary of professional development that will improve subsequent development activities and procedures. My hope is that this dissertation will generate several practical implications by providing DGSs useful information for designing development activities to enhance graduate students' professional abilities. I also hope to make doctoral students more aware of opportunities and challenges in professional development so they take a stronger role in their development. In addition, I hope this dissertation will produce ideas for creating innovative graduate student socialization practices concerning relationships among graduate students, faculty members, advisors, DGSs, and scholars across the field, for performing the various responsibilities of graduate education, such as research, teaching, and service, and how to get off to a fast start in one's graduate education with a sense of direction and an understanding of expectations and goals. If DGSs are able to improve development activities and students are able to take a clearer role in their own development, better scholars will be produced, thereby producing a stronger professional identity among communication professionals.

Organization of the Dissertation

The remainder of this dissertation is organized in the following way. Chapter II addresses the methods and data analysis plan used to explore the data. Chapters III, IV, and V present the analysis of Research Questions 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Chapter VI includes a discussion of the relevant themes and connections among the analysis of the three research questions. It also explains contributions of this research, its limitations, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data was generated from three sources to address the research questions posed in Chapter I: (1) interviews with communication directors of graduate studies (DGS) at doctoral-granting institutions, (2), interviews with post-comprehensive examination communication doctoral students, and (3) documents regarding professional development from communication professional associations, departmental materials pertaining to graduate student socialization and evaluation such as graduate handbooks and templates, and syllabi from professional development courses.

Qualitative methods were chosen to analyze the data because they allow for the retelling and interpretation of experiences. Interviews were chosen specifically to create thick description and gain local, emergent knowledge from participants (Ellingson, 2008; Lindlof, 1995; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). These kinds of data provide "thoughts, feelings and actions as well as context and structure" from participants' experiences (Charmaz, 1995, p. 33). Documents were chosen as another data source because they are more temporally durative and provide the perspectives of faculty members teaching classes, DGSs, and disciplinary standards. Each of the perspectives offers a unique take on the meaning and performance of the professional socialization and development of communication doctoral students.

Directors of Graduate Studies

Sample

Based on the sampling criteria, purposive and volunteer sampling techniques were used. Given the focus on top-comprehensive graduate programs, the sample was considered to be purposive because programs and participants were screened for specific characteristics (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). This sample was also considered to be a volunteer sample because DGSs were not required to participate (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2010).

Several criteria were used to identify potential participants and their academic programs. The first criterion was whether schools were comprehensive in their areas of study. Eighty institutions currently offer doctorates in Communication, according to a list released by the National Communication Association (NCA) in February 2011. Programs are designated as emphasizing one or more areas of study identified by NCA, including the following: (1) communication research (C), (2) speech and rhetorical studies (R), and (3) mass communication (M). To be considered comprehensive, programs had to have at least two areas of study included in their program. Sixty-one programs met this criterion. Twenty-five programs offered at least two areas of study, and 36 offered a PhD in all three areas. Institutions offering concentrated doctorates in just one area of study were excluded from this sample because this research is interested in garnering perspectives from programs that foster development in multiple areas of communication research.

A second criterion, geographical location, was used to narrow the list of potential participants. Four geographical areas in the United States are represented by regional organizations: Western States Communication Association (WSCA), Central States Communication Association (CSCA), Southern States Communication Association (SSCA), and Eastern Communication Association (ECA). WSCA includes Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, and Hawaii. CSCA is composed of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio. SSCA includes Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. ECA is comprised by Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Of the 61 comprehensive doctoral-granting institutions identified by NCA, 12 are in the WSCA region, 22 are in the CSCA region, 15 are in the SSCA region, and 12 are in the ECA region.

To draw a representative sample from each of the four geographical regions, high-ranking programs from each region were identified. The schools were chosen based on discipline rankings by NCA and the National Research Council (NRC). NCA released a 2004 reputation ranking that rank-ordered programs based on the scholarly quality of faculty, program effectiveness in educating researchers, and the quality change in the past five years. Faculty in each program ranked their program in each of these three areas, and the results ranked the top programs in nine specialty areas: (1)

Communication and Technology (34 programs ranked), (2) Critical/Cultural Studies of Communication/Media (33 programs ranked), (3) Health Communication (28 programs ranked), (4) Intercultural/International Communication (37 programs ranked), (5) Interpersonal/Small Group Communication (39 programs ranked), (6) Mass Communication Research (39 programs ranked), (7) Organizational Communication (27 programs ranked), (8) Political Communication (27 programs ranked), and (9) Rhetorical Studies (36 programs ranked). For any specialty to be considered in the ranking, at least 15 communication doctoral programs had to offer it.

Another ranking used to identify high-ranking programs was the 2007 NRC assessment of research-based doctoral programs ranked 83 communication doctoral programs in the following categories: (1) criteria that scholars say are important, such as citation rates and student time to completion, (2) faculty publication, citation rates, grants, and awards, (3) student-based criteria including student completion rates and financial aid, (4) diversity in gender, ethnicity, and proportion of international students, and (5) features similar to programs viewed by faculty as top-notch. To identify the features listed in the fifth category, participants were asked to grade a sample of programs in their field.

Top schools to be included in the sample were chosen based on how high they ranked in each of the nine specialty areas, the number of times they appeared on each of the nine NCA rankings, and how high they ranked on the NRC list. The sample used in this study was also based on the first NRC category, schools ranked by criteria that scholars say are important. This category was chosen to delineate high-ranking programs

because this research is interested in understanding the professional development of doctoral students as future scholars or stewards of the discipline.

Twenty-one schools were initially contacted to participate and appeared in a minimum of four categories on the NCA rankings. Because only 14 of those schools chose to participate, a second round of seven schools was identified for participation. Schools were not required to be ranked, though six of the seven were ranked in at least one category. The school that was not ranked represented a geographical division and was considered comprehensive. Of those seven schools contacted, four chose to participate. Nine additional schools were solicited for participation. Seven of the nine schools were ranked in at least two categories. Two schools from the third round chose to participate. Of the 21 schools that participated in this research, all but one was ranked in at least two of the emphasis areas, with three of the programs being ranked in all nine of the categories.

The first round of programs identified by the NCA rankings were in the top two-thirds of the NRC rankings. The second and third rounds of NCA-ranked programs did not all appear on the NRC list, but the two schools that were not on the list were ranked in seven and six of the NCA categories, respectively. Although some programs were not ranked in the NRC category, they were included because they represented a geographical area and were considered comprehensive.

Procedures

Interviews followed a semi-structured format and used open-ended questions (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Nine guiding questions and extensive probing were employed

to generate rich data (Creswell, 1997). The guiding questions were refined through two pilot interviews with former DGSs at one comprehensive, high-ranking program in the SSCA region and one in the WSCA region. Questions addressed topics such as types of professions for which doctoral students were being developed, how students are prepared for those professions, professional behavior, evaluation of professional development, and successful professional development. Sample questions include "What does it mean for a doctoral student to behave professionally?", "How do you know if your students are developing?", "What activities do you feel your department does particularly well in developing doctoral students?" Questions such as these allowed DGSs to discuss their experience in the professional development of doctoral students. Follow-up questions allowed participants to clarify their experiences and discuss topics that were not noted on the interview guide. See Appendix A for complete interview protocol.

Upon gaining Institutional Review Board approval, I e-mailed DGSs using contact information departmental Web sites. In one instance, the current DGS chose not to participate, but the DGS who has recently stepped down elected to be interviewed. Directors of graduate studies were contacted in the three rounds described above. I made the decision to stop soliciting and interviewing participants once saturation was achieved (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Another criterion used to determine when to stop soliciting programs was getting a representative sample from each geographic area. Of eight schools contacted in the WSCA area, four DGSs participated. In the CSCA area, 13 were contacted and seven chose to participate. Of the seven schools in the SSCA area

contacted, six participated. In the ECA area, eight schools were contacted and four

DGSs participated. Two DGSs from the same program were interviewed because the

department is structured in such a way that it has a general DGS of the school and a

DGS for the communication emphasis within that school. A total of 37 DGSs were

contacted, with 22 participating yielding a response rate of 59%.

Twenty-one interviews were conducted via phone and one was completed face-

to-face. All participants were interviewed one time. Interviews ranged in time from 22 to

55 minutes, with an average of 31 minutes. The average tenure as DGS ranged from two

months to nine years, with an average of 25 months. Twelve participants were female,

and 10 were male. All participants were Caucasian. See Table 1 for a list of participant

demographic information. Their pseudonyms indicate their last name.

Table 1 Director of graduate studies demographic information

Pseudonym	School	Gender	Ethnicity
DGS Anderson	1	Male	Caucasian
DGS Brown	2	Female	Caucasian
DGS Crawford	3	Male	Caucasian
DGS Davis	4	Female	Caucasian
DGS Evans	5	Male	Caucasian
DGS Franks	6	Male	Caucasian
DGS Grant	7	Male	Caucasian

Table 1 continued

Pseudonym	School	Gender	Ethnicity
DGS Harper	8	Female	Caucasian
DGS Irwin	9	Male	Caucasian
DGS Jones	10	Female	Caucasian
DGS Kenneth	11	Male	Caucasian
DGS Lawrence	12	Male	Caucasian
DGS Marks	13	Female	Caucasian
DGS Neal	14	Female	Caucasian
DGS Owen	15	Male	Caucasian
DGS Quinn	16	Male	Caucasian
DGS Ramsey	17	Female	Caucasian
DGS Smith	18	Female	Caucasian
DGS Taylor	19	Female	Caucasian
DGS Underwood	20	Female	Caucasian
DGS Patrick	21	Female	Caucasian
DGS Vance	21	Female	Caucasian

All participants were assured confidentiality, as outlined by the consent form

approved by Institutional Review Board. All participants agreed to be audio taped for the

entirety of the interview. During each interview, I made notes about follow-up questions and themes I saw emerging from the conversation. I also kept notes about common topics and ideas arising from all interviews. This process both showed me when I was reaching saturation regarding specific areas of discussion and allowed me to engage in preliminary analysis as I was conducting interviews (Charmaz, 1995; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

Each interview was transcribed verbatim. I transcribed nine interviews and had the remaining 12 transcribed by a professional transcriptionist, yielding 268 single-spaced pages of interview texts. I reviewed each transcript after I received it from the transcriptionist and corrected any errors or missing words. Listening to the interviews again also allowed for continued note taking and preliminary analysis.

Doctoral Students

Sample

The three criteria used to screen DGSs—comprehensive, high-ranking programs in four regions—were employed in doctoral student sampling. Programs whose DGSs participated in this research were also targeted for doctoral student participants. To participate in the study, doctoral students must have finished and defended their preliminary comprehensive examinations, which are usually taken upon completion of coursework. The reason for this criterion is that students who have gone through this stage of their degree have experienced at least 50% of their doctoral education, are in the last stages of earning a PhD, and are preparing to transition into an academic or non-academic profession. They were in a position to reflect on a large portion of the graduate

experience ranging from formal orientation to preparation for the job market. Interviews with doctoral students used purposive and volunteer sampling (Creswell, 2007, 2009; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2010).

Procedures

Open-ended, semi-structured interviews were guided by nine interview questions (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Semi-structured interviews allowed for the exploration of various topics, which leads to rich data (Creswell, 1997). The interview guide was created to mirror the interview guide for the DGSs, as this research was interested in getting various perspectives on the same phenomenon. The guiding questions addressed several topics, including the types of professions doctoral students plan to pursue, professional behavior in those contexts, and how they are developed for specific professions. Sample questions included, "What type of profession do you want to pursue when you graduate with your doctorate?", "What does it mean to behave professionally in your chosen profession's context?", and "Who do you talk to about what it means to behave professionally?" These types of questions allowed for participants to reflect on their professional development experiences in their doctoral program. See Appendix B for complete interview protocol.

After receiving Institutional Review Board approval, I contacted participants electronically. Some contact information was obtained from department Web sites. Other contact was made with participants through DGSs, who were sent an e-mail with study details and a request to forward it to the graduate student body. As stated above,

students were not contacted in any particular order according to program ranking; rather they were contacted at the same time.

Forty-two doctoral students were interviewed for this study. Twelve were from four WSCA schools, 15 were from seven CSCA schools, 11 were from four SSCA schools, and four were from three ECA schools. Of the 21 schools from which DGSs were interviewed, doctoral students from 18 of those schools participated in this research. Because some of the contact with doctoral students was made through DGSs, no response rate can be provided. All interviews were done via phone, and each participant was interviewed one time. Interviews lasted from 23 to 48 minutes, with an average of 31 minutes. Thirty-five participants were female, and seven were male. Age ranged from 25 to 61 years old, with an average age of 33 years. Time in the program ranged from two-and-a-half years to six-and-a-half years, with an average of four years. All participants received an informed consent form approved by the Institutional Review Board, and were assured confidentiality. All participants agreed to be audio taped for the entire interview. Interviews were conducted until saturation was reached (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). See Table 2 for a list of participant demographic information. Their pseudonyms indicate their first names.

Table 2 Doctoral student demographic information

Pseudonym	School	Gender	Ethnicity	Age
Emily	2	Female	Caucasian	28
Olivia	2	Female	Caucasian	27
Elizabeth	3	Female	Caucasian/ Native American	27
Hailey	5	Female	Caucasian	30
Jason	5	Male	Caucasian	30
Samantha	6	Female	Caucasian	33
Brian	7	Male	Caucasian	42
Alexa	7	Female	Caucasian	30
John	8	Male	Caucasian	32
Lauren	9	Female	Caucasian	56
Abby	10	Female	Caucasian	25
Eva	10	Female	Hispanic	30

Table 2 continued

Pseudonym	School	Gender	Ethnicity	Age
Natalie	10	Female	Hispanic	32
Charlotte	10	Female	Caucasian	27
Lily	10	Female	Caucasian	27
Alice	10	Female	Caucasian	26
Claire	10	Female	African-American	27
Madeline	10	Female	Caucasian	32
Avery	11	Female	Caucasian	29
Taylor	12	Male	Caucasian	30
Leslie	12	Female	African-American	31
Lori	13	Female	Caucasian	58
Steven	13	Male	No response	41
Matthew	13	Male	Caucasian	27
Khloe	13	Female	Caucasian	35
Brooke	14	Female	Caucasian	51
Riley	15	Female	Caucasian	31

Table 2 continued

Pseudonym	School	Gender	Ethnicity	Age
Julie	16	Female	African-American	27
Caroline	16	Female	Caucasian	30
Sophia	17	Female	Caucasian	30
Naomi	17	Female	Caucasian	31
Madison	18	Female	Caucasian	29
Izzy	18	Female	African-American	30
Savannah	19	Female	Caucasian	32
Zoey	19	Female	Caucasian	27
Sydney	19	Female	African-American	52
Marie	19	Female	Caucasian	53
Paige	20	Female	Caucasian	28

Table 2 continued

Pseudonym	School	Gender	Ethnicity	Age
Evelyn	20	Female	Caucasian	61
Don	20	Male	Asian	30
Vera	20	Female	Asian	33
Stella	20	Female	Caucasian	29

During the interviews, I took notes on the types of follow-up questions I asked

and themes that emerged from each interview. This note-taking allowed me to examine

similarities among the interviews, which aided in analysis after the interviews were

transcribed (Charmaz, 1995; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). All interviews were transcribed

verbatim by a professional transcriptionist, yielding 554 single-space pages of interview

text. Upon receiving the transcripts, I reviewed each one by listening to the audio

recording again, correcting any errors and adding missed words. I took additional notes

during this process and compared those notes to the ones I took during the interviews.

Documents

Sample

Three types of documents were sampled for this study: (1) professional

association, (2) departmental, and (3) professional development class. Professional

association documents included NCA-related documents such as Schiappa's (2009)

guide to professional development in doctoral education and Morreale and Arneson's (2008) student handbook. NCA was chosen as the professional association whose documents to analyze because it is the oldest scholarly communication professional association in the United States and it has around 8,000 members worldwide, which is more than other large communication associations such as the International Communication Association (ICA) or the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC). Departmental documents included graduate handbooks and rubrics or templates. Class-level documents included professional development and pedagogy course syllabi.

Professional association documents were obtained from the NCA Web site, and departmental and class-level documents were acquired from department heads, DGSs, faculty members, graduate student association members, and department Web sites. The same 21 doctoral programs whose DGSs participated were included in this study. The sample was limited to these programs to gain a third perspective about professional development.

Procedures

All documents were collected electronically. The NCA documents collected for analysis were Schiappa's (2009) *Professional Development During Your Doctoral Education* and Morreale and Arneson's (2008) *Getting the Most from Your Graduate Education in Communication: A Student's Handbook*. These documents were chosen because they directly related to student development.

A variety of documents were collected at the program and class level. Twenty graduate handbooks were collected for analysis. One program did not have a graduate handbook, but the DGS provided a document that the department used in place of handbooks. Other documents include the following: seven professional development seminar syllabi, five pedagogy seminar syllabi, and two annual review forms. Documents totaled more than 500 pages.

Data Analysis

The first research question was answered using all three data sources because I was interested in how each source constructed professionalism. Each of the data sources was also used to answer the second research question, as each offered a different description of professional socialization and development activities. All three sources of data were used to answer the third research question, as interviews of DGSs and doctoral students responses concerning evaluation could be compared, and documents explained the evaluation process and may include forms detailing benchmarks and the annual review.

Directors of Graduate Studies and Doctoral Students

Interviews were analyzed using Charmaz' constructivist approach to grounded theory (Charmaz, 1995, 2001, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Charmaz' grounded theory proposes that data are inductively, systematically analyzed to produce theory. Grounded theory also aims to develop ideas from the data, not force them to fit in preconceived categories. Constructivist grounded theory differs from Glaser and Strauss' (1967) version in that categories are created through the interaction

of researcher and participant. Points of departure are also an important tool in understanding that familiarity with a discipline or situation in that discipline should not restrain research to those ideas, but serve as jumping-off points for research. This analysis style works well with the open-ended approach to interviewing, because a grounded theory approach is open to the emergence of a variety of themes from the participants' perspectives.

I analyzed the DGS and doctoral student interviews separately using steps prescribed by the grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 1995, 2001; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). First, I coded the interviews using line-by-line coding, assigning each line a few words that described the actions or ideas in that line of text. Next, I engaged in focused or selective coding, which is the process of taking codes that appear often in the data and collapsing them into concepts. I then refined the concepts into categories, which represent significant common themes and ideas in the data. I chose to use the 1994 Carnegie Classification framework (Research I, Research II, etc.) instead of the 2010 framework (Research universities/Very high research activity, Research universities/High research activity, etc.) because the participants used the 1994 terminology.

Another step of grounded theory in which I engaged was memo-writing, which is an avenue to explore the biases, actions, and consequences within patterns at any point in the data analysis process. Examples drawn directly from interview transcripts can be included in the memo-writing, as it preserves active codes and helps keep the data from

becoming static. Memo-writing also helps researchers engage in the constant comparative process, which makes comparisons among the data.

I also engaged in theoretical sampling, which is gathering more data to help explain phenomena. I chose not to engage in traditional member checks because my sample represented DGSs and students from schools across the country. Because participants were from different organizations, participants might say that the analysis does not match what their school does. My goal was not to check to see if my analysis was "correct;" it was about maintaining my reflexivity through checking my perceptions and challenging my assumptions.

To accomplish this goal, I sent executive summaries to two DGSs and four students from each sample, which is roughly 10% of each sample. Two DGSs and one student responded, which is 10% and 5% of the samples, respectively. Directors of graduate studies received a summary of DGS analysis and doctoral students received a summary of student analysis. They were asked to reflect on the analysis and answer the following questions: (1) What surprised you about this analysis?, (2) What did not surprise you?, (3) What was absent from the analysis that you thought might be there?, (4) What is the most important finding you take to heart?, (5) What does the analysis suggest you need to pay more attention to as you finish up your degree? Less attention? (Doctoral students), and (6) From your position, what does the analysis suggest you need to pay more attention to? Less attention? (DGSs).

I reflected on participant comments and integrated them into my analysis when appropriate. Participants said that little surprised them, and pointed out a few areas in

which they think communication departments can improve. While part of this response might be because participants did not read the comparisons between the data sources, I needed to re-examine why the analysis was not surprising. What I found was that I was focusing too much on common experiences in the communication discipline and was not giving enough attention to data that stood out. I refocused to bring surprising or new information to the forefront. The parts of the analysis on which communication departments can improve confirmed the ideas I had about the analysis. In addition to these comments, participants brought up new ideas about the analysis. Their comments helped me shift my perspective to view the analysis through a different lens.

Documents

Documents were analyzed using a grounded thematic analysis that examines issues of themes and topics of professional development. This analysis draws on the template approach (King, 2004). This approach begins with the identification of basic themes, or codes, and works toward overarching themes, showing the connections among themes at all levels of abstraction. This method is very similar to a grounded theory approach, but is less prescriptive than grounded theory in terms of steps and procedures used in analysis.

I began by separating the documents into three types—discipline-, department-, and class-level. This separation identified the context of each document and the environment in which it is used. After separating the documents, I scanned each document and made brief notes about emergent themes. Next, I reread each document and labeled its sections (ie. administrative issues, interacting with advisor). After a third

reading, I noted basic themes, such as discussion topics, required or suggested readings, authors cited frequently, and requirements.

Conclusion

Analyzing data from DGSs and doctoral students using Charmaz' (1995, 2001, 2006) constructivist approach to grounded theory method and analyzing data from documents using King's (2004) grounded thematic approach allowed me to answer the research questions. These qualitative methods enabled me to identify local, emergent knowledge from participants and documents (Ellingson, 2008; Lindlof, 1995; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The analysis of each research question is discussed in the subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER III

CONSTRUCTING PROFESSIONALISM

> *"The RI is a dream for most people, that's like becoming a rock star; most people become musicians, not rock stars."* Steven
>
> *"I think that one of the most important ways in which graduate students develop is to continue to recognize that they don't know everything while becoming increasingly confident that they do know something."* DGS Evans

The above quotations highlight two challenges doctoral students face. The changing job market, both academic and non-academic, has reshaped the way those involved in doctoral education should approach the PhD. The era of a research-intensive academic career with teaching and service components is over; however, current selection and placement are still geared toward placing students at Research I universities. Students must now be prepared to search for a variety of jobs with varying emphases on research, teaching, and service. They must also develop skills, abilities, and values to make them competitive against new graduates and those who have had a PhD for several years. Faculty members, advisors, and directors of graduate studies have the arduous task of preparing students for the changing market. Having been trained in RI universities themselves, they have had to adapt development and training practices to prepare students for the shifting landscape of communication without abandoning the rigor of an RI education. Both doctoral students and faculty members face challenges in developing into valued colleagues in the communication profession.

Using interviews from directors of graduate studies (DGSs) and doctoral students and documents, the challenges associated with the professional development of doctoral students in today's market are explored. Each of these data sources helps answer the following question: How do directors of graduate studies, doctoral students, and documents construct professionalism? Three overarching themes emerged from this analysis: (1) a shift in professional goals and training, (2) "doing" professionalism, and (3) transitioning from student to professional.

A Shift in Professional Goals and Training

Communication programs have traditionally groomed students for careers at RI institutions, which place importance on research before teaching and service. Doctoral student selection and placement of graduates is geared toward RIs; however, the market is changing such that students are exploring alternatives to the RI, including Research II institutions (RII), liberal arts universities, community colleges, and non-academic careers. Academic careers other than the RI have a more balanced focus on research and teaching, and may even prioritize teaching. Non-academic careers offer a broader base for the job search. Despite the shift away from RI institutions, development and training programs are still training students for RI careers and slowly progressing to catch up with the changing job market and student goals.

Traditional Training

Students have traditionally received research-intensive training from RI universities with the hope that they will seek a career at the same type of university. Directors of graduate studies repeatedly indicated that students are not being groomed

for a specific type of career, but are being taught a skill set that they can apply to a number of careers. Handbooks echoed this idea, with one stating that faculty members recognize the PhD as a research degree. Handbooks specified the skills students should develop to become a good researcher, such as understanding the discipline, contributing to scholarly conversations, being able to articulate their research to academics across disciplines as well as non-academics, engaging in public scholarship, and participating in interdisciplinary work. These research skills are in line with what Golde (2006) considers to be the overarching goals of doctoral education. Each of these activities requires that students identify and hone an area of research in which they can become experts.

Although DGSs noted that their department is preparing students to use reaching and teaching skills in any type of career, students continually expressed that they think their department is trying to develop them for academic careers, specifically at RI institutions. Handbooks did not make a determination on how the research degree was to be used, but focused on academic careers in discussions of research and teaching expectations. Directors of graduate studies had mixed views about the types of careers students could pursue based on their skill set. Some acknowledged that students will be placed at all types of academic institutions and some non-academic jobs, whereas others viewed the RI as the ultimate achievement. They argued because students receive research training, "they're probably going to be the most suited to research universities" (DGS Neal). University administration affirms this sentiment. DGS Quinn noted that "high-level administration would prefer that we place students at research-intensive jobs

because they, um, equate that with, you know, academic prestige and credentials." In spite of the overall emphasis on RI careers, few students said they wanted to pursue RI jobs, though most wanted academic careers.

Academic Careers

Most students said they intend to pursue an academic career because they like research or teaching. Most chose a type of institutions based on its emphasis on either of those elements. Students who would like RI jobs are attracted to that type of institution because of the priority given to research. Layla wants to take a job that allows her to keep that focus.

> So I'd rather be in a program where I can teach one or two classes, which would be like at an RI, you know, and pursue my research, where that expectation is higher. So the idea of teaching maybe like a 4/5 load, or a 4/4 load, makes me kind of cringe.

For Caroline, who also prefers an RI job, "academia is the best place for me to answer the kind of questions I want to answer and do the work I want to do." In addition to selecting an RI because of its opportunities, some felt as though their skills will not be valued outside the academy. Brian, who studies communication and culture, said, "I honestly don't know what it would be good for beyond getting a job as a professor." The students that specified that they would like to find employment at RIs also said they would be open to finding a job at another type of institution because of the difficulty in finding tenure-track positions.

This perspective is similar to many others; all students identified their preferred type of institution, but said that they are open to exploring others. A majority of students said they would pursue jobs at RII or liberal arts schools because those types of schools

offer more of a balance between research and teaching. Liberal arts schools may even

emphasize teaching and have minimal research expectations. Schiappa's handbook

indicated that a majority of jobs for new PhDs are not at research-oriented, PhD-granting

institutions. Teaching balances the research and publication process, which "doesn't

always boost your self-esteem and make you feel like you're making a

difference…teaching is that day-to-day thing that I find to be a touchstone" (Hailey).

Some who want to go to a liberal arts college do not want to participate in research at all.

Sydney is pursuing a PhD for the sole purpose of being qualified to teach.

> I have no interest in research. And to be…I did very little research
> here…I did very little to no research on anything in this program. I want
> to maybe, which is bad, if you want to go to a Tier I. But since I have no
> interest in Tier 1. All I want to do is teach classes and go home. Um, it's a
> great job. If I, as long as I have a PhD from a decent school, I'm pretty
> much halfway there, as far as qualifications go.

Another student wants to teach at a liberal arts school because that is what she "was

familiar with, that's where I want to my undergrad, a smaller school" (Stella). A few

students indicated that they would like to work at a community college because of the

emphasis on teaching.

The students who indicated that they do not want to work at RIs said they chose

that path because they wanted to focus on teaching and they did not want to have the

lifestyle of their RI professors, which has pressure "to always be working" (Lily).

Students frequently indicated they think RIIs or liberal arts schools can offer them more

of a personal life. Izzy does not "want to be in the same type of pressure environment as

I was for, you know, for getting the degree itself." Directors of graduate studies did not

indicate that they associated a heavier workload with any one type of university; rather,

they saw different types of universities as calling on different skill sets and being suited to students' personal goals.

Selection

Although DGSs and students agreed that the RI path is not for most doctoral students, departments are still orienting their admission process to the RI ideal. Directors of graduate studies acknowledged that they use the admissions process to choose students who have the most scholarly potential and intention of becoming academics. They also choose students who they perceive will fit in well. According to DGS Franks, "we do feel as though we are training people to become academics and that is primarily, you know, the basis on which we accept people into our program." Although most students did not indicate why they chose their program, some told of how they were calculated in selecting their program. Charlotte chose her program "because that program was research intensive, and so I knew it'd prepare me for, to be on the job market for a research intensive track." Sydney chose his program because it supported the type of research methodology he uses.

The selection process is not without flaws. Admitting students is not totally within the control of the department and can cause problems with the faculty developing students for a research career. DGS Jones remarked that her program cannot always accept students they want because the program is housed in a state-funded university that pressures the department to accept state residents.

> So, um, sometimes, just the system makes it difficult for us in that there are some students who we would *love* to have in the program but we can't afford them, and some students who we don't think have the best chance of success, but it's who we can afford to make a class. And so I bring that

> up only because, you know, sometimes the socialization issues are a reflection of the students who we have and if we end up admitting students who you know, maybe didn't really have a strong background in research, don't necessarily want to go in that road, don't really know what they want to do, we take a chance, it doesn't go very well, we're like, 'Well we actually can see that in the admission process.'

This example shows that faculty members may not be able to admit students who have the most scholarly potential, and selecting students who may not be as serious about research is somewhat of a self-fulfilling prophecy in terms of their success. It is also evident that an RI education does not guarantee that students will pursue careers are RI institutions.

Placement

While DGSs encourage students to seek out RI jobs, they fully recognize that students will be placed at all types of institutions because "over time, people have, uh, uh, different goals," (DGS Owen). Although DGSs recognized that students will not all take jobs at RIs, students perceive there to be an expectation that they should strive for RI status. DGS Ramsey pointed out phenomenon she sees in graduate students' thinking.

> I know that sometimes our students feel as though, our doctoral students in particular, feel as though they kind of implicitly get the message that we're trying to reproduce ourselves; in other words, that they're not successful unless they become, you know, professors at, uh, at a, you know, high-research institution.

This example shows that faculty members support students vying for different types of careers. However, students may not recognize that faculty members do not expect them all to take RI positions because some faculty members do not encourage going outside the RI. Some faculty members promote the RI expectation through indirect means.

Vera's advisor has not necessarily pushed her to take an RI career but views the RI as

the preferred job for PhDs.

> [She] doesn't understand why I don't want it…[because] not trying to
> go to RI is just insane to her…just because you are a professor at an RI, it
> does not mean that you are a better teacher or you are just more
> accomplished in your, um, study or publications. I just think that the
> nature of the job is different.

Some students hold the belief that the RI is the highest achievement for PhDs. John said,

"everything else [besides an RI] is, it's kind of considered to be a, um, I don't know, um,

runner's up prize."

While several students believe that the RI is the sign of professional success,

others remarked that they choose not to believe the idea that an RI career is the

trademark of success. Lori highlighted a misconception that "getting a PhD means that

you have to be, it means you definitely have to go into academia, but I'm not so sure

that's true." This view does not consider jobs other than RIs not to be a success or failure

but a matter of personal goals; however, the dominant message is that students receiving

an RI education should pursue an RI career. Izzy noted the lack of support she feels

because of this mindset.

> What I've learned is that professional development follows a certain,
> you know, a certain track of how people feel like you should be
> developed, but if that's not your goal then it doesn't really apply to you,
> so at the same time the support is there. But it's not support that supports
> you…so it's really, doesn't really make a difference whether it's there or
> not.

In addition to faculty members not offering the right kind of support, they may not adjust

based on student requests. Eva explained that even though students have expressed an

interest in more diverse careers, faculty members have not responded.

> The department in the last couple of years has really seen a, um, a movement where you know, their graduates want to do other things besides go to Research I institutions. And so there's not a lot of resources or even anybody to talk to about, um, about those kinds of career moves because it's kind of controversial in our department.

If students lack resources, they are not being prepared to be competitive in their chosen career. A lack of systematic development will also stunt the growth of abilities necessary to be a competent faculty member (Ehrenberg, Zuckerman, Groen, & Brucker, 2009).

Although development practices, activities, and resources are provided by faculty members, students are complicit in their development. Several students revealed that they have not told their advisor they want to pursue careers outside the RI ideal because they feel it will negatively affect their relationship. Zoey recalls how as a Master's student she was warned by a veteran doctoral student to keep her desire of teaching at a liberal arts school a secret.

> She was like, 'So why do, why are you getting your Master's?' And I was like, 'Well, I actually want to go into teaching…because I want to teach, I really like teaching.' And she's like, 'Well, do you like research?' and I came from a liberal arts school so I really knew very little about research and I was like, 'No, not really, I don't think so,' and she was like, well, and she specifically told me, like, 'I wouldn't tell a lot of people that,' because you know, you won't get as many opportunities as you would and so I learned kind of at an early stage that in order to keep as many doors open as possible it'd probably be, you know strategically better for me to, um, not say that.

The advisor-advisee relationship is important to student socialization and identity development (Gardner, 2009b), and if advisors are not aware of student goals, they cannot help them reach those goals.

Directors of graduate studies and students are open to careers outside of the RI institution, although the RI generally considered a symbol of professional success.

Students expressed interest in pursuing jobs a variety of institutions and have adjusted to the changing job market. Faculty members seem to have caught on to the changes as well, but that change has not been communicated to students. Additionally, training, development, selection, and placement processes are still geared toward RIs.

The Changing Direction of the University

As DGSs and students pointed out in their discussion of academic jobs, the job market is changing in several ways, raising the question, "What's the role of the PhD in the 21st Century?" (DGS Ramsey). One reason this question now being raised is the smaller number of tenure-track positions available compared to the large number of doctoral students and PhDs vying for them. DGS Brown pointed out that "it's sort of the new face of the academy, it's more contract work and less tenure-track work." Schiappa's handbook echoed this claim. Contract work is less expensive for universities, but gives little stability to academics looking for full-time employment. In addition, liberal arts schools "are starting to align their research and tenure expectations more and more with the, with those Research I" (Samantha). This shift means students will have a heightened responsibility in teaching, service, and research, rather than a focus on research or teaching. It also means more competition for a faculty position at any type of institution. Because academic jobs are so hard to come by, students should focus their efforts during their doctoral education on the type of institution at which they want to work. Schiappa's handbook recommended students learn the skills they will need in their intended career. For example, those who want a job at a university that emphasizes

undergraduate education should make sure they can teach service classes or classes for the major.

Directors of graduate studies frequently addressed how they are encouraging students to adapt to the changing environment. DGS Neal's department recognized that "graduate school is somewhat different from what it used to be, and not all of our students are going on to the same kinds of jobs, and so we really try to cater it to, um, a number of different ways to think about it as a profession." Handbooks address alternative careers are common for those with PhDs, including research organizations, teaching organizations, business, government, media industries, and community organizations. Students should be thinking strategically about both academic and non-academic alternatives, instead of thinking "that if they do what they are interested in, they do what they care about, they will get a job and everything will be fine. That isn't the case anymore, if it ever were the case" (DGS Crawford). Steven echoed this idea, noting that looking for a dream job "does not equate to what's actually happening."

The concept of having to cast a wide net on the job search is apparent to students. Although all students denoted a preference in type of university, they repeatedly said they plan to apply to jobs at all types of institutions. Students also indicated that they do not feel their department is acknowledging the reality of the job market. Steven used the Coordinated Management of Meaning theory to illustrate his perspective.

> Within that there's one of the models that they use and it talks about the difference between stories lived and stories told. In this case, I think the stories told really are mis, are misaligned with the stories lived and I don't think that people are really acknowledging it because it's a dirty little secret that when you're first starting out your PhD to have them tell you the truth would really be harsh.

> That the RI is a dream for most people, that's like becoming a rock star; most people become musicians not rock stars. Um, these are things that I wish there had been more, more uh, uh not prompt, um, but upfront discussion about. And, and then helping people to cater to what it is they want to do too, then helping them try to achieve that within the program. But, but I haven't, that's, that, there hasn't been a ton of that. It's one of those things where if, if you strike up a conversation with your advisor or with a professor, they'll talk about it, but it's not a coordinated effort.

A few students maintained that their departments are trying to adjust their points of view by "trying to pull up its roots a little bit from the traditional expectation" (Riley). However, students repeatedly indicated that their departments have not acknowledged the changing landscape of the discipline. Julie recalled how not discussing the changing academic environment may be detrimental to those earning a PhD.

> I don't know if the department can continue to afford to not have discussions about what happens when you don't get the job coming out of your final year. Um, and so I think the department will need to in the future do a little bit more about how do we develop a Plan B. Not a second school to apply to…but what do I do if I have a degree…and I don't get the job, then what?

This illustration shows a mismatch in what faculty members are telling students and what they are facing on the job market. It is interesting that DGSs, students, and documents all suggest that students participate in development for their specific career goals, yet the discourse surrounding professional success centers around an RI career.

Another issue associated with the decreasing number of tenure-track positions is that it is increasingly difficult to get a job as an "all but dissertation" (ABD) PhD. Schiappa highlighted this disadvantage. Being ABD is a disadvantage because students are in competition with those who have already completed their PhD. Additionally, they are in competition for a shrinking number of positions. John has been told by colleagues

he is well accomplished for a doctoral student, but does not have as many achievements as those who have completed the degree.

> For who you are, you're amazing, like you, you can beat out other ABDs. But you get people in… people in tenure-track jobs who are competing against you, and you just can't, so like, what… the thing is, is that, in all honesty, you know, many of these jobs, we just have no chance at.

Directors of graduate studies did not address the disadvantage associated with being ABD, though they recognized the difficulties in finding a tenure-track job.

Directors of graduate studies, students, and documents all told of the changes that are occurring within the discipline right now. Students are being given an RI education, but many of them choose not pursue to or cannot find an RI job. Directors of graduate studies recognize that the RI ideal no longer exists, but this discourse persists. The economy, decreasing number of tenure-track positions, and the disadvantage of being ABD have led DGSs and students to reconsider the uses of a PhD in communication. Despite the tumultuous landscape of the discipline, students repeatedly indicated that they would like to find an academic job.

Non-academic Careers

Despite desiring an academic job, students frequently indicated that they will consider non-academic jobs in their search. Non-academic careers students have considered include research firms, consulting, non-profit organizations, think tanks, policy analyst, healthcare industry, or family therapy. Directors of graduate studies mentioned that students who had gone into non-academic careers had been placed in private industry, government organizations, research initiatives/centers, think tanks, non-governmental organizations, non-profit organizations, legal advocacy firms, and trial

consulting. Though they are using the same skill set, graduates pursuing non-academic career paths had to think "about taking the academic ideas and translating them in a way where they're applied in the real world" (DGS Irwin).

In addition to searching for non-academic jobs because of the limited number of academic jobs, participants are interested in non-academic careers because they might pay more than academic careers, it might be easier to find a non-academic career, or they decide they do not want to be academics. DGS Smith has known students who begin their doctoral education and "discover they like the program but they don't necessarily want to be academics for life." Layla, who has considered working at a research firm, said she is interested in that type of career because of the focus on research and the pay. She worked for several years before returning to graduate school and made more money than most junior faculty make. She expressed a need to feel like she was being compensated appropriately for her work.

Only one student indicated she only wants a non-academic job. The main reason she has chosen that path is because she does not want to feel pressured to always work, which is similar to why students indicated they would like RII, liberal arts, or community college jobs.

> Like, I think that the main thing is the lifestyle. Um, I… I mean I think I'm a hard worker. I, you know, put my all into my research and, um, I work part-time on campus at the social science center on campus and I work really hard at that but, frankly, like, I don't want a… I want a job that's, like 9 to 5 or like 8 to 6 or 8 to 7. Like, I want, like, set hours. I don't like the fact that there's like this pressure to always be working. It really bothers me.

She also remarked that she would rather do applied research in a non-academic job because it will be more helpful to the community.

Although non-academic careers are not the norm for PhD students, they are opportunities to which students are paying attention because of the decrease in tenure-track positions and increase competition for those positions. Because the academic market is shifting, students have to be open-minded about the type of career they want upon graduation. Students and DGSs have internalized these changes and students have broadened their perceptions on the use of a PhD. Directors recognized that earning a PhD no longer means an RI career, but this message has not been reflected in the dominant discourse and development. Regardless of the type of career students take, DGSs, students, and documents acknowledged contexts, practices, and values associated with how communication professionals operate.

"Doing" Professionalism

To understand how DGSs, doctoral students, and documents construct professionalism, the contexts in which they intend to perform professionalism were explored. Practices and values that are enacted in these contexts were also explicated. Although DGSs and students said characteristics are applicable to any career, they focus on scholarly work in the academy, so the contexts, practices, and values are discussed in terms of an academic career. The traditional expectations of research, teaching, and service emerged as a backdrop for enacting the practices of independence, collaboration, and the ability to speak to a broad audience, and the values of collegiality, initiative, avoiding bad behavior, and work-life balance. Overall, these contexts, practices, and

values move toward Cheney and Ashcraft's (2007) call for understanding how professionals "do" communication.

Contexts

Although the academic job market may be shifting away from exclusive RI jobs, the traditional research-teaching-service model emerged as important contexts in which professionalism can be performed. From seminar papers to conference presentations and journal submissions, students should strive to introduce their research into larger dialogues in and outside of communication. They should also develop in teaching and service, which are commitments that will increase as they transition out of the doctoral student role.

Research. A defining mechanism of professionalism in communication is production of original research. Students frequently emphasized that the expectation from the department is that "we should always be working on something…you never want to walk into a room and talk to one of your faculty about what's going on and say and not know what's next" (Hailey). By producing original research, communication professionals show that they take their work seriously and pursue it with rigor. DGS Crawford asserted "the term 'professionally' implies that you are a person who takes your work seriously." The rigor that stems from taking research seriously can encompass perseverance, practicing ethics, systematically creating a research program, and curiosity about research.

While there may be temptation to be involved in many different research projects, student should be selective in their work so as to become an expert in one area. DGS Patrick believes students should be calculated about their research.

> I think also kind of developing programmatic research so that it's not just completely haphazard. Oh, you know, 'Here's this topic I will write a paper on.' But really kind of thinking about their program of research and trying to develop multiple articles, you know, kind of building on each other and developing out a topic.

Having a specific area of research will help students on the job market because they will have an identifiable area that distinguishes them from other candidates. Students can create a research program by exercising curiosity, which can be developed in several ways. Curiosity can manifest itself in the way scholars ask research questions, particularly in a way they can be interesting to the discipline. It can also mean being creative in the way research questions, theory, and methods are used. Too much curiosity can hinder people's success, as they need to follow through with publications, both as a student and as a junior faculty member. DGS Marks recalled a student who developed curiosity over the course of several years in the program.

> As we worked together on her dissertation, she was maturing intellectually and um, I think, another value might be intellectual curiosity. And so I think that was, you know, it was something that she wasn't necessarily displaying when she came to the program. I think, you know, there's a sense of, 'Well, other people are smarter,' and, um, she was kind of a shy person, kind of reserved, and so I think it was there, but she, as she stayed in the program and especially during the process of dissertation writing, she became more, more willing to take risks in terms of what she was writing and kinds of questions she was asking and where she was willing to go to look for inspiration so I think it was just a matter of her taking more initiative as time went on. Really to me it showed a lot of development as a scholar.

This excerpt exemplifies both the need for curiosity in the creation and development of interesting original research and how the development process takes many years and does not end with doctoral education.

The production of original research employed with rigor is key in professionalism. Once research has been produced, the next step in professionalism is presenting that research in a number of arenas, namely conferences, peer-reviewed journals, and job talks. Each of these methods of presentation should enhance as students progress through the degree, and will set students up to be competent and successful researchers.

Ideally, students write up their final course papers for conference submission. Students repeatedly indicated that conference presentations, particularly at ICA, NCA, and the school's regional conference are expected by the department. The expectation may or may not be explicitly stated depending on department, but students know their department norms, "and if you're not doing that [presenting at conferences], then there's something wrong with you" (Emily). Schiappa's and Morreale and Arneson's handbooks and department handbooks pointed to ICA, NCA, and regional conferences as good places for students to get feedback on their work and build a professional network. In addition to expectations from the faculty members, advisors, and departments, students also put pressure on themselves to present at conferences. Madison said she began submitting and presenting at conferences because "I always felt like it was something that I would do because everybody was doing it."

Students conveyed the idea that simply attending conferences was not sufficient; they were also expected to maintain a certain threshold of good behavior, especially if students were receiving funding to attend the conference. DGS Lawrence expects good behavior because students are associated with a particular institution. He said, "We expect an academic professional to go to the conference and to present their work in an organized, coherent way, particularly when they have, you know, their name, comma, [the university's name] that follows their name in the program." Directors of graduate studies continually confirmed the expectation of good, or "professional" behavior, and characterized "professional" in several ways. DGS Davis remarked that she hopes students develop a number of good conference behaviors that become norms before they graduate.

> I think it's incredibly important for early career people to behave in ways that are hyper-professional at conferences and stuff. Like no matter how low you think your whisper is, don't say it 'til you get home, you know? I mean that kind of stuff. Um, and so you know, in the end I want people to go out of here with, with things that are kind of professional habits and ordinary norms to be things that they don't have to think about, that they just know. So they don't have to wander into a conference for the first time and say, how should I dress? How should I act? What can I talk about to people, what can't I? Can I actually approach a senior person that I admire? And if so, how? It's all right, those are things that ought to be hopefully within the first two or three years of graduate school, hopefully second nature.

Doctoral students are aware that they are expected to act in a certain way at conferences. In addition to being prepared for their own presentations, Julie indicated professional doctoral students "also attend others' presentations, um, and they're kind of 'on'…They are on their best behavior, they are not doing anything that might mar the image of the department."

DGS Smith noted that while sometimes "students aren't always as into the conferences as they should be or always as professional at the conferences as they should be," for the most part they are professional. Directors of graduate studies and students repeatedly pointed to drinking too much alcohol as an unprofessional behavior at conferences. While faculty members have high expectations for students, unfortunately, not all faculty members hold themselves to the same standard. DGS Davis recounted poor behavior on faculty members' part and why they are viewed as unprofessional.

> The people who are senior faculty members and are well known at conferences for being naughty…but the difference is that they can get away with it, right? Um, although, they don't, you know, earn any big reputation points for it either in many cases…there are differences because people need time to learn, you know, this, you know, how we act and how one should act and comport oneself…but it comes with time, and so, and experience.

Students should not imitate these faculty members because they are behaving in an unprofessional manner. However, the discipline is structured such that the faculty members engaging in poor behavior can "get away with it."

Professional behavior at conferences is an important step in disseminating research, as it is a way for communication scholars to solicit feedback before they publish their research. The hope is that scholars reflect on the comments they receive and integrate them into the research before submitting to a journal or book. Students repeatedly named publication as a hallmark of professionalism and emphasized that they know they should be "publishing your face off" during school (Naomi). The expectation

to publish begins with faculty members. Samantha explained how the message was communicated to her.

> I mean I really think the message that they wanna hammer home is what's going to be most important to you when you get in the job market is the number of publications you have. You know, so, you know, all of this other stuff is really, um, I think that, I imagine the faculty would say, perhaps, um, a distraction from what really you need to be concentrating on, which is you know, like finishing your dissertation and making sure that you have several publications, you know.

Even if they do not successfully publish before they graduate, the practice of submitting pieces helps students learn a number of skills, including how to submit an article, know how to respond to a Revise & Resubmit decision by an editor, and have experience revising an article. Students should have persistence and the "ability to write and rewrite and rewrite and rewrite and take criticism…you know, take reviewer comments and figure out how to respond to them" (DGS Patrick).

Job talks are not dissimilar from the ability to present at conferences or interact with editors during the publication process. Directors of graduate studies repeatedly indicated that students, especially those entering the academy, should be able to give a job talk that communicates their work to others. The skill to talk with those from other paradigms will certainly lend itself to the job talk, as those attending the job talk will be from a variety of research traditions. DGS Taylor explains, "by the time someone comes out of our program that they have not absolutely mastered, they're not, we're all learning all those things all the time, but um, they have a basic understanding, you know, how do the job talk." Students did not reference job talks as a sign of professionalism; rather, they spoke about observing others' job talks and whether they knew how to give one.

Teaching. In addition to research as a context for displaying professional behavior, teaching emerged as a context in which professionalism is performed. Teaching is important to being a communication professional because any junior faculty member is going to teach undergraduates or graduate students. It is less emphasized than research, but is still an important factor in the construction of a communication professional. Directors of graduate studies stressed having a repertoire of classes to teach, competence in professional relationships with students, "a student-friendly while still rigorous perspective on teaching, [and] making efforts to constantly improve one's teaching" (DGS Irwin). DGS Anderson has clear expectations for student teachers.

> As far as teaching goes, that, that they would follow what we would call 'positive teacher behavior,' in other words that there, that there, they should be appropriate, that they be well organized, prepared in advance, and that the assessment process be a fitting measure of what is expected as an outcome to that course.

If students are teaching assistants, they should be helpful and cooperative, completing the duties assigned them by the faculty member for which they work. In an instructor or teaching assistant position, students should look for opportunities to add to the course, "making it even better" (DGS Smith). Accomplishing this goal may be easier in an instructor of record position, as many teaching assistants' duties include grading papers, holding office hours, and making copies.

Students repeatedly indicated that they did not think their program prioritizes teaching. Emily finds teaching important, but "I feel like sometimes it's just something that people just think of last minute and get it over with so they can get back to their research." Participants did not talk about their departments being particularly student-

centered in reference to undergraduate education. Some see this focus to be problematic, as it may affect their ability to teach when they become junior faculty members. Elizabeth said "I don't want my, my students to suffer because I didn't get a good education on how to do that."

Graduate handbooks indicated that teaching is key in developing as communication professionals, but focused on the administrative side of teaching, such as how teaching assignments are given and what students must achieve to maintain their teaching assistantship. Similarly to students and DGSs, handbooks noted that an RI institutions place teaching after research. One handbook suggested that while teaching is valued, students need to consider their career goals and prioritize accordingly. The handbook suggests students discuss their career goals with faculty members to determine an appropriate combination of research, teaching, and other activities.

Service. While service may be the least stressed element of doctoral education, it is integral to being a faculty member. However, students frequently indicated that service is not a very important part of professionalism in graduate school, and DGSs and students pointed out that many schools shield graduate students and junior faculty from it. Service as a student is "if you choose, not be a priority or even part of what you're balancing" (Hailey).

Students repeatedly acknowledged that service is probably the biggest shift they will feel when they become junior faculty members. DGS Jones illustrated this view.

> Most graduate students don't really have a sense of what the job involves.
> So, um, the amount of time faculty meetings might take, the kinds of
> service commitments that you have on campus or for divisions of

associations, you're reviewing for journals. There's just a lot of service that students often times are protected from.

Students frequently indicated that they were involved in service projects of their choosing, but they pointed to service as a uniquely faculty member expectation. At RII, liberal arts, or community colleges, service will be a larger part of faculty members' job commitments in addition to teaching. Students repeatedly said they expected to be involved in service commitments such as faculty meetings, university or department committee meetings, and mentoring and advising undergraduates and graduates. Brooke, who is a faculty member at a Christian college, said of the service commitments, "you learn more in your first year than you probably were ever prepared for in school."

Directors of graduate studies frequently pointed out that if service takes time away from research and teaching, it should be reduced, both for faculty members and graduate students. DGS Kenneth suggested students do little service because "your priority should be your coursework and your dissertation." Morreale and Arneson's handbook warns against students becoming over involved, but encourages students to engage in some service. For those choosing to participate in research, DGSs encouraged students to connect their service with research or professional development because it is an opportunity to learn. Students can sign up to be moderators or paper readers for conferences. DGS Patrick noted that a faculty member in her department is a journal editor and works with students as editorial assistants. Students can serve in a civic role by volunteering like engaging prospective students or helping recruit students.

The traditional model of research, teaching, and service compose the contexts in which professional behaviors, practices, and values are performed. Each of these areas

contributes to what it means to be a professional in different ways. DGSs, doctoral students, and handbooks indicated that research is the top priority, followed by teaching and service, which usually takes a bigger role when students complete their doctoral education. Although many students indicated that they plan to look for jobs at teaching-focused institutions, they still emphasize research as the most important professional context. They also spoke of research practices more than they did teaching.

Practices

Within the contexts of research, teaching, and service, students should develop practices that will help them become better scholars. The practices DGSs and students identified as being integral to professionalism pertain in large part to research. They identified balancing independence and collaboration in research as well as developing the ability to speak to a broad audience.

Balancing independence and collaboration. Research can be generated independently and by working with other scholars. Directors of graduate studies and students frequently noted the importance of balancing independence and collaboration in research. Independence develops over time and should increase as students progress in their program. Students know there is the expectation of independence from the department. Savannah explains, "There definitely is kind of an expectation that if you're in the program, you're gonna be a self-starter and you're gonna get stuff done and, um, you just like don't want to be a slacker." DGS Franks explains how independence on students' parts should become clear by the dissertation stage.

> Um, you know, the question that we ask of every student is, do we have, um, confidence that they have the ability, and this ability has to be in

terms of their critical thinking skills, their ability to put ideas together, their ability to think creatively, and their ability to do research, research that isn't particularly guided by the advisor. Um, these are the, can they do all of those things that are necessary to write a dissertation?

By the time students get to the dissertation stage of their degree, it is time for them to "develop their own voice as a scholar" (DGS Harper). DGS Evans referred to a "humble confidence" students should have in their ability to be independent researchers.

I think that one of the most important ways in which graduate students develop is to continue to recognize that they don't know everything while becoming increasingly confident that they do know something. And I think that those individuals that are successful really figure this out early on in the process and really develop as people of confidence but who do not necessarily need to monopolize a conversation, who do not always have to be right, and who are capable of admitting, quite frankly, when they've made an error or when they're wrong, and I think that's one of the qualities that uh, a good graduate program seeks to instill in individuals, although there is of course, no you know, empirical or formal way to accomplish that.

Students identified confidence as a quality they need to be developing, but they frequently pointed to lack of confidence in some of the areas they have not practiced, such as publication. Avery explained, "What I feel like I'm lacking is the demeanor of a professional, like the demeanor of a faculty member who walks in with a lot of confidence."

The dissertation is one way to show independence from faculty members, and students identified several more ways they have achieved independence. Charlotte knows she is becoming more independent from her advisor because at conferences, peers and faculty members know who she is apart from her advisor.

I, at the conferences, started going up to people myself saying 'Hi' and that, um, the professors knew who I was. It was just like, 'Oh, I've seen that person with [my advisor]…But it wasn't just like, 'Oh, I've seen this

person. She's with [advisor]. She must be related.' But like, 'I know who [student] is.'

In addition to independence at conferences, students also experience independence in publication. Paige recently got her first solo-authored piece accepted to a major journal, and explained how the felt when the article got accepted.

> I'm really excited 'cause I finally just got, I have like my first, uh, first-author piece coming out in [the journal] next month and I'm really excited because it was a piece that I had submitted and it got R&R-ed and it felt like that process just took forever, but I just sort of look back in my email box and the documents that I got from other faculty when we had submitted to journals before…for how to write a good, uh, cover letter that would go with the article, and uh, how to really polish an article.

The process of working with faculty members to publish gave Paige the ability and tools to successfully go through the publication process on her own.

While the goal is that students feel comfortable conducting and disseminating research independently by the time they finish the degree, they must also know how to collaborate with others. Collaboration is achieved by encouraging students to work with faculty members on conference papers and publications, because "that's kind of a good strategy for getting published, it's kind of hard, you know, it's a lot harder to do it on your own as a doctoral student, but some students are, you know, publishing their own work as well" (DGS Patrick). Students continually indicated it is very easy to get on a faculty member's project and that is what they should be doing because "that's how we all build our CVs and that's how we find jobs when we go out on the market" (Charlotte). Some graduate handbooks facilitate the process of getting involved in faculty member's research by listing all faculty members, their areas of interest, recent publications, and current projects.

Collaboration is not limited to interactions among faculty members and students; students are encouraged to work with other students. Alice said she learns about the research process in general by collaborating based on the way they conduct the research.

> [We] all talk through the various pros and cons in design or ways to carry it out, we split up tasks of, you know, who's gonna take care of what. You know, this person can do the IRB approval. This person is going to put together the instrument, this person's going to collect, sort of, you know whatever it is.

Avery indicated that collaboration is not promoted in her department like she prefers, but she has sought help in her advisor.

> I really crave the collaboration on projects, so, um, I mentioned my advisor earlier and he's kind of taken on more of a mentor role where he does collaborate with me and we work together on projects, um, and I wish that there was more of that in the department where, you know, um, like on the first day of orientation, I would really, I would love it is our professors would come in and say, 'Here's the work I'm doing right now, and if you're interested in helping, um, here's things that I need help with right now.' And you could be, like more opportunities to be a second or third author on a project.

While this example was not what most students reported, it illustrates the idea that there is no one formal model for collaboration. Students will begin working independently at different rates than others, especially if their content area does not lend itself to collaborative research.

Ability to speak to broad audience. While DGSs noted that students should be able to speak to a broad audience in their job talks, they will use the skill in other contexts. Students repeatedly indicated that communication professionals should develop the ability to speak to a broad audience, both academic and non-academic. Morreale and Arneson's handbook lists the seven traditions within the communication discipline:

rhetorical, semiotic, phenomenological, cybernetic, sociopsychological, sociocultural, and critical, drawing on Craig's (1999) work. Within the discipline, scholars should be able to communicate within the paradigms. Lori identified what students should be able to do.

> So if your view is pretty much social construction and then you're talking to someone who's in language and interaction, there should be some way that, you know, you can, you can bridge the perhaps philosophical differences or the logical differences and really appreciate the work that those people are doing.

Being able to make arguments means that scholars should understand a variety of research approaches. This skill will serve students well in the way that they will be able to communicate with colleagues who may be in a different content area than they are. If they are not able to speak to a broad audience, they are not competent representatives of the field, thereby failing to reach Golde's (2006) goals of doctoral education.

The ability to speak to a broad audience extends to a non-academic audience. Students expressed an interest in doing "applied research that can actually affect a larger group of people than just academics" (Lily). Brooke indicated that the notion of public or engaged scholarship is waning in the university because of budget cuts, but that the relationship between the public and the academy can be useful for both parties. Olivia illustrated how her interest in public scholarship helps both her and her community.

> I do like outside activism and stuff, so as to have something that expands your worldview beyond the academy. Um, I don't really know if that's a value, but that's something that I think is really important, for, um, being, being a good teacher and being a good researcher to be able to bring a perspective that isn't totally sheltered…Um, definitely my research too, I mean, I write, you know, a, a lot about, um, a lot of my work is, is based on my activist experiences. So, um, and how that's developed in sort of political consciousness.

The practice of speaking to a broad audience, both academic and non-academic, is essential to achieving the professional ideal. That practice and balancing independence and collaboration in research help explain why research is an important stage for performing professionalism.

Values

By performing professional practices in the right contexts, students can move toward the professional ideal in communication. In addition to the aforementioned tangible characteristics, students should embody a number of values that will enhance their professionalism, including collegiality, taking initiative in development, avoiding bad behavior, and developing work-life balance.

Collegiality. Directors of graduate studies and students spoke about collegiality as being respectful and supportive of others, and being a good citizen in day-to-day interactions, such as volunteering to help cover peers' and faculty members' classes, help proctoring exams, and sharing resources and ideas. The hallmark collegial student "is going above and beyond and just everywhere all the time doing everything and still manages to do research and get great teaching evaluations. So it's kind of like this archetypal student" (Julie). Faculty can be both positive and negative role models for collegial behavior. Layla hopes the collegiality she sees among faculty members transcends departments. She explained, "I do sense a very kind of collegial tone amongst our faculty, which is, um, you know, comforting, as a graduate student, and I hope that that is, you know, similar to whatever institution I find myself in." Jason has learned what collegial behavior is *not* by "seeing the mistakes of the faculty I've dealt with."

Naomi pointed out that she does not always find interaction between students genuinely

collegial.

> There's a lot of emphasis here on playing nice. Uh, even if you're
> competitive, not appearing competitive, or trying to get along well with
> people. Um, and I do think that most people actually do that. They're not
> just pretending, but there are people that are doing more of the pretend
> side of things, you know…they are trying to look as though they're being
> collegial and on the surface, it's kind of a mean thing to say, but it is kind
> of, I think, an attitude that people in this department take or they see
> themselves that way…uh, not everyone is genuinely that way.

This quotation explained that part of being collegial is "playing nice." This idea

illustrates Tracy and Trethewey's (2005) concept of "auto-dressage," or controlling

behaviors in a way that preserves symbols of organizational professionalism.

One component of collegiality is showing support by attending department

events. DGS Smith remarked, "it's a dying art generally, but…one of the important

things about being professional is showing up…when your colleagues are winning an

award, you need to show up." DGS Quinn emphasized that students need to show up

even when they do not want to because it is a sign of respect.

> Part of being professional is to focus on, kind of, what's important to you,
> but to be respectful of other people and to be a good citizen. For example,
> I know, um, you know, there are some students that are not overly
> enamored with colloquium. Okay; however, I think what's important is
> that they be good citizens and give it a go, and they come to that, and they
> open themselves up for, uh, the opportunity to learn.

Students frequently said they know they need to show up to department events like

colloquia or job talks even if they do not want to attend. Lily recalled how she has felt

about showing up to events.

> Sometimes you're expected to just like play the game…like sometimes
> you do things not because you actually feel like collegial and happy to be

there but just to do that part of playing the game, um, but I do think that's just part of life. I mean, I really like my department but there are certainly times where I'm like, 'Ugh, I don't feel like doing this thing. Why is it important?' But, you know, you sort of like show up and grin and bear it.

Hailey has tried to shift her attitude to try to find useful information from department functions. She said, "I'll be sitting there for that [colloquium] and part of that is feeling like I need to be there as a citizen and part of that is I can benefit from that conversation, no matter what part in my own program." This student gives support by showing up, but also tries to see how colloquium can enhance her professionalism.

Initiative. A second value that communication professionals should embody is the desire to take initiative in development. Initiative applies to asking for help and resources in research, teaching, and any area in which students need assistance. Although graduate students are not faculty members, "it's kind of a time of transition when it's important to start…thinking about ways to, um, develop that may not be handed to you in a, you know, in a formal course, um, just kind of seeking out opportunities" (DGS Marks). DGS Ramsey acknowledged that not all students are going to take advantage of the opportunities available to them. She remarked,

> Not everybody is going to do this, or sometimes people wake up really late, and then suddenly they're on the job market and they freak out, and then they realize, 'Wow, I had all of this stuff available to me that I never took advantage of.' And that always makes me feel sad, but on the other hand I can't kind of stand there shaking my finger and saying, 'You know, you have to do this or that,' because that's, you know, I don't want to infantilize graduate students. I don't think that's good.

Students recognize that professional development is largely their responsibility, and "a lot of it is really up to the students to kind of make connections with people, ask questions, meet with folks. I mean I think a lot of it you just kind of learn on your own

just like any job" (Savannah). Students frequently indicated that faculty members are happy to help them, but are waiting for students to say, "This is what I need help with" (Charlotte). Student initiative is noted in the documents as well. Students are held responsible for knowing the content of the handbook, and many of the benchmarks described, such as exams and defenses, are propelled by the initiative of the student. Advisors are expected to guide students, but students can be as active or inactive in that relationship as they choose.

Avoiding bad behavior. Directors of graduate studies and students indicated that bad behavior can create a hostile work environment and is detrimental to a sense of professionalism. Participants largely identified these environments based on situations in which they had been involved or had observed. Problems include engaging in gossip, causing problems that affect others, and unethical behavior. Gossip can be detrimental to relationships when faculty and students are gossiping about others in the department. Lori highlighted times she has seen her colleagues engage in gossip.

> If you need to gossip, talk to your sister. You know, don't talk to your students about other faculty. Um, my faculty tend not to engage in gossip. The ones I work with most closely tend not to engage in gossip, which is, I think, very good. But there, I have, oh God, a couple of my fellow students, they have all kinds of stuff they spew forth that they heard from their advisor, and I'm like, 'Is this what you talk about?'

Faculty members should also practice this value, as talking ill of another faculty member to a student "starts to sever all kinds of ties and it starts to spread rumors. It just creates a lot of problems" (DGS Quinn). Similarly to what DGSs and students brought up, one handbook directly addresses how rumors should be handled. It contained instructions that noted that rumors are detrimental to the functioning of the department, that the

information is not to be trusted, and they should be brought to the attention of the DGS, chair, or advisor.

Other negative comments can cause a hostile work environment. Emily saw her colleagues become victims of sexist language or bullying by faculty members, which caused larger problems in the department. She identified how the harassment has affected her and other students.

> If you want to get an undergrad to help you with your dissertation research, there's this one professor who deals with that. And now none of us want to talk to her to get a grad, or an undergrad, to help us with our dissertation, because we'd have to go through her. So everybody's like, 'Nevermind. We're not going to do that. We're not going to get undergrad help because we'd rather just not talk to her.' That's like a very tangible thing that's happened because of this.

The problems caused in this situation are numerous. First, the number of faculty students want to work with is limited, and the morale of the department is decreased. In addition, students are not making the most of their time doing the professional activities in which they should be engaging, and they are not taking advantage of resources to help them pursue their research.

Developing work-life balance. Students denoted work-life balance as an important quality to separate themselves from their work so they can maintain professionalism and not become overwhelmed with their work. Many students talked about work-life balance in reference to not seeing it in their faculty members. They believe work-life balance is important because their faculty members are constantly working and not taking personal time. Paige illustrated how a faculty member encouraged her to prioritize her work over her personal life.

I remember one of the things he said was, 'You know, if you really want this,' um, one of the things I do on the side is, um, I like to do a lot of artwork and graphic design, and he told me, he said, 'You know if you really want to be a professor, you need to really give that up now, and you need to focus on your career.' And at the time, you know, I was kind of, I was kind of upset with him because I, I thought, okay, you know, I don't want to be told to give up things, but at the same time, like, and I haven't, you know I, I, I sort of am defiant, I haven't. But at the same time, I think there's something to just having a brutal honesty as well, um, that just isn't, that just isn't really discussed.

Students indicated they have taken measures to have more of a work-life balance. They recognize that having a personal life will make their work better. Claire suggested being "able to carve out time for yourself so that you are more, um, fulfilled in both work and non-work…fulfilled and productive." Students frequently indicated that they become more conscious of work-life balance when they have a spouse or partner or have a child.

Although students cited seeing their professors have a work-life imbalance as an influence in their decisions, DGSs recognize that balance is necessary to be successful. DGS Patrick emphasized understanding workload distribution.

With academia, there's always more that you could be doing, and you're never really done…but regardless of whether you have kids or you have a family or not, you know, I think that everyone needs to have a life outside of academia, so I think being able to kind of set the boundaries of knowing when to say 'no' and, you know, carving out personal time for yourself so that your work doesn't consume your life is important.

Others in students' lives may also affect how they approach the job market. Steven's partner has a job that would require recertification to work in another state, so he has taken that into consideration when he thinks about his job search.

It also has limited my, okay, do I have to go anywhere? Well, no. We've got a home and, you know, nine animals and we're perfectly happy where we are. Um, I'm, you know, I've got trees out in the back that I've planted that it'll take seven years for them to bear fruit. I'm not, I'm

> hoping something will come up, but in the meantime, I'm not planning on it, uh, because I can't count on anything, so I'm kind of trying to put my eggs in a lot of different baskets and then see what actually hatches.

Students repeatedly indicated that they feel as though the RI institution does not offer the chance for work-life balance, which is why they will seek a career at an RII or liberal arts school. Directors of graduate studies recognized that being a professor is a lot of work but note that making time for a personal life is necessary.

The values of collegiality, initiative, avoiding bad behavior, and work-life balance are instrumental in achieving professionalism. Students should embody these values and the practices of balancing independence and collaboration and speaking to a broad audience within the contexts of research, teaching, and service. Although students should begin enacting these behaviors and during their doctoral education, there are differences between being a student and having completed the PhD.

Making the Transition from Student to PhD

Although participants were asked about the differences between "professional" doctoral students and junior faculty members, DGSs and students repeatedly indicated that doctoral education is the beginning of a scholarly career. Doctoral students are "in preparation to be faculty members or professionals, so the should act like they're junior faculty members" (DGS Irwin). The professional practices and values students begin to form in graduate school should not be forgotten once they take a job; rather the habits should continue to be developed and enhanced. It is important to note that the development of habits occurs over a long period of time, like an "evolution" (DGS Kenneth).

Departments structure their doctoral programs in such a way to get students in the mindset of being a junior faculty member or employee. DGS Harper highlights how students are groomed to be faculty members. He pointed out, "I think that one of the things that's really remarkable about the academy is that the experience in grad school is very similar to the experience as an assistant professor and frankly as an assistant and a full professor." Although DGSs said doctoral education is the beginning of students' scholarly careers, they also noted a major shift in how much students are going to have to do as junior faculty members in particular. Students may be engaged in the same activities in graduate school, but as a junior faculty member a major difference is that "you need to prove that you can it on your own. And at double the rate" (DGS Jones). Directors of graduate studies certainly did not expect students to have mastered the habits by the time they graduated, understanding that the habits should continue to be developed well into their career.

Students repeatedly indicated that they know there will be a shift in expectations when they become junior faculty members, specifically an increase in workload. They have only been told about the types of things that will change when they are junior faculty members in a general sense so they do not totally understand what will be expected of them. Alice and Emily both said they are currently told "do your best" in reference to research productivity, but they know that will not be the case when they become faculty members. They do not know what exactly will be expected of them in terms of publications and conferences; they just know it will be more than they currently produce.

No matter the type of institution students pursue, they continually noted that they

hope the transition to faculty member is relatively smooth because they have received

rigorous training. The view the transition from student to communication professional as

occurring in the latter stages of their doctoral programs, although they recognize that

until they have completed the degree, they are still students. The transition from student

occurs gradually, as students are "moving from that sort of, this is my professor, to this

is m advisor, to this is my *colleague*" (Lauren). Although they hope the transition is

smooth, students indicated that they know parts of it will be hard. The transition can also

be hard because students are both students are often teachers during graduate school.

Taylor recalled the difficulty he has experienced in graduate school because "you're

kind of caught in this crossroads of, you know, one minute I'm a teacher, the next

minute I'm a student, and the next minute I'm teaching again, then I'm back to being a

student. " DGS Davis reiterated how difficult it can be to shift roles.

> I think the think that is particularly challenging about graduate programs
> is that so many people are both students and instructors at the same time.
> And that role shifting is really, you know, it makes you feel
> schizophrenic. Um, and it really does involve you in very different
> sensibilities about the university and the profession, et cetera, and I think
> that's the hardest role, is it's time consumptive, emotionally consumptive
> kind of role playing, which, you know, we all learn to do, you know, but
> it, it's hard and so I, so I think it's hard for graduate students to
> understand then that actually people who are faculty members are
> actually busier than they are. They've just learned the role thing, right?

This role identity shifting is addressed in the literature (McCall & Simmons, 1978;

Stryker, 1987; Tajfel, 1970, 1981, 1982; Thoits & Virshup, 1997; Turner, et al., 1987).

Students identify with the roles of student and teacher, among others, and have to switch

between these roles frequently. The multiple identifications can be explained with the

concept of nested identities (Ashforth, 2001; Ashforth & Johnson, 2001; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Students have to call on each of their identities when they are engaging in different behaviors.

Some students have taken measures to minimize the impact of the transition to faculty member. Students who have focused their development on research and teaching specifically do not expect a huge shift in expectations. Caroline has prepared herself to be a junior faculty member, and "except for maybe idiosyncrasies of different universities, that kind of thing might surprise me." Overall, the more students build these behaviors as habits during graduate school, the easier they believe the transition to faculty member will be.

Conclusion

Directors of graduate studies, doctoral students, and documents helped explain how the communication discipline constructs an understanding of professionalism. Despite changes in the job market such as a decrease in tenure-track positions, the hallmark of success in academia remains a tenure-track position at an RI institution. Students have adapted to the changing job market in that they plan to seek employment at a variety of types of institutions and non-academic jobs. Many do not even desire an RI job. Directors of graduate studies also recognize that the RI ideal is not realistic, yet the selection and placement processes are oriented toward the RI. In addition, research is prioritized over teaching and service, which are activities in which students should be well versed if they intend to be competent faculty members at RII or liberal arts universities.

Research, teaching, and service are the contexts in which professional practices and values grow. The practices of independence and collaboration in research and the ability to speak to a broad audience and the values of collegiality, initiative, avoiding bad behavior, and work-life balance characterize the communication professional. Although DGSs and students noted that these behaviors could take place in any type of university, research and the RI are privileged.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPING PROFESSIONALISM

I encourage them to, uh, kind of set down a schedule, and in fact we do sort of an activity during the orientation where they, uh, kind of list out everything they have to do and then make a schedule, uh, you know, that kind of says, 'Okay, here's what time I'm teaching, here's when I'm in my classes. When would be the time to do my class prep? When would be the time to do my reading for my seminars? When am I gonna go to the gym?' DGS Ramsey

"We went to the faculty director, the colloquium director and we said, 'We need to know how to do this stuff and we're not being taught, we don't know what to expect, so, and, um, it'll make the department look better if we know what we're doing going out, we'll look better at conferences, we'll get better jobs.' They kind of bought our reasoning and they bought into it." Riley

These quotations illustrate how students develop through formal orientation and during the school year. While Chapter III explored *what* professionalism is in communication, this chapter seeks to understand *how* the facets of professionalism are developed and achieved. The literature emphasizes formal orientation as a key developmental factor in newcomer socialization (Ashford, 1986; Brim & Wheeler, 1966; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Giddings, 1897; Jones, 1986; Moreland, 1985; Schein, 1968; Van Maanen, 1975; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979), but participants identified development opportunities during the school year as more significant in their

professional development. Formal orientation was a channel for administrative information and did not focus much on professional development. Formal practices during the school year center on professional development, but are still oriented toward training students for RI careers, which we know is not the goal of most students. Despite the formal practices in place to develop students' professional abilities, students revealed that informal development was more effective in helping them develop into communication professionals. This finding is interesting because communication programs have focused their energy on institutionalized practices. Students did not discount formal development activities, but did not find them as useful as they were meant to be.

This chapter answers the second research question: "What development activities do doctoral students, directors of graduate studies, and documents view as enhancing doctoral students' professionalism?" This question is divided into two parts, development during formal orientation and development throughout students' doctoral education. The first section of this chapter focuses on this question: "What practices are associated with the effective formal orientation of incoming doctoral students? Two themes emerged from this analysis: (1) disseminating information and communication expectations, and (2) teaching training. The second section answers this question: "What practices, procedures, policies, or activities beyond formal orientation are viewed as useful for enhancing students' professional development?" The themes of formal and informal practices emerged from this analysis. Specific activities and people who aid in development are discussed in reference to each group of practices.

Formal Orientation

The literature emphasizes newcomer socialization and the steps by which

newcomers fully integrate into an organization (Ashford, 1986; Brim & Wheeler, 1966;

Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Giddings, 1897; Jones, 1986; Moreland, 1985;

Schein, 1968; Van Maanen, 1975; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Although all

participants confirmed their departments host a formal orientation each year, they did not

talk about it as an essential component of professional development. They pointed out

that professional development is purposefully not emphasized as much as it is during the

school year. Formal orientation was regarded as a way for faculty members, directors of

graduate studies, and advisors to disseminate information and communicate expectations

about research and teaching. It is also a way for senior and junior students to interact.

Finally, formal orientation houses teaching training that new and some returning

students must take because they are funded through teaching assistantships.

Disseminating Information and Communicating Expectations

All schools in this study conduct a formal orientation for new and returning

students, though the logistics of the orientation varied greatly across the sample.

Directors of graduate studies and students frequently indicated administrative

information is discussed, such as how to get medical coverage, how to use the library,

where to obtain a student identification card, where to find a place to live, how to

maintain a teaching assistantship position, how assistantships are assigned, how funding

is applied, what courses are offered, enrollment information, an introduction of the

students and faculty members, and a welcoming back. The topics of formal orientation are in line with Weidman et al.'s (2001) model of graduate student socialization.

Students are given a graduate handbook or other informational materials that contain much of this information. Handbooks contained information about the structure and history of the department, enrollment regulations, housing, financial aid, list of program content areas, procedures for scheduling and defending examinations and dissertations, rules about copying, mailboxes, computer lab usage, desk assignments, office phones, courses offered, grades, grievance procedures, and the graduate student communication association. Graduate school- or university-wide orientations often take place in conjunction with departmental orientation, and cover many of the same topics as departmental orientation but on a more broad level because they are trying to reach graduate students across disciplines.

Directors of graduate studies also indicated there is some discussion of local issues, such as what it is like to be a student at that particular university, and what the university culture is like. Students did not agree that their department discussed enough local issues. Hailey suggested her department spend time at orientation "a little bit more wisely in terms of getting oriented to the town, to the campus, to the department, to many other things outside that course." Hailey expressed that her department orientation has a "very thorough preview of the pedagogy class" that students are required to take for two semesters. Although DGSs and students spoke about the informational component of formal orientation, a majority of discussion about was centered on training

students to teach or assist the basic course. This emphasis is surprising, given the emphasis on research as the hallmark of a communication professional in Chapter III.

In addition to addressing administrative issues, DGSs frequently reported communicating program expectations to new and returning graduate students. Expectations include program requirements pertaining to research and teaching. Directors of graduate studies, students, and documents did not indicate specific research expectations, such as a certain number of publications or conference papers each year. Although research was identified as a top priority in professionalism, the expectations for student research are not clear. Orientation is supposed to be a source of uncertainty reduction for newcomers, but because students are not given explicit expectations about research and teaching, they must obtain this information another way (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Black, 1996; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Comer, 1991; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Mignerey, Rubin, & Gorden, 1995).

Expectations are communicated during orientation because DGSs want students to be thinking about the trajectory of their program of study as soon as they begin. DGS Kenneth wants students to remember "things to be thinking about in the first semester especially, which for PhD students would include starting to think about which faculty members you want on your committee, your advisor, which content area do you want to focus on for your research and comprehensive exams." Although talking about benchmarks such as comprehensive examinations and committee members may seem daunting for a first-year doctoral student, it is never to early to start thinking about "professional activities," including conference participation and journal submission.

One way to help students understand and manage expectations is by emphasizing

time management Students will have to balance many responsibilities during and after

their doctoral education. If going into academics, students will have to balance research,

teaching, and service and structure their own time. To help students understand the

importance of time management, DGS Ramsey leads them through an activity that

creates a schedule for them to follow.

> I encourage them to, uh, kind of set down a schedule, and in fact we do sort of an activity during the orientation where they, uh, kind of list out everything they have to do and then make a schedule, uh, you know, that kind of says, 'Okay, here's what time I'm teaching, here's when I'm in my classes. When would be the time to do my class prep? When would be the time to do my reading for my seminars? When am I gonna go to the gym?'

This example shows that structuring time for professional and personal activities is key

in accomplishing them.

Students indicated that they are not in the right mindset to consider their

professional development over four years during formal orientation because they are

preoccupied with other tasks. Brooke said students are not thinking about research

expectations because they are concerned with other roles they must take.

> And then we had a one-day orientation in our own department about, um, just research advice, I guess. But again, I think the TA thing hits you harder because you're gonna enter a classroom in the next four days. So you know, you're really keyed in on, 'Man, how do I do this?' you know, 'cause that's coming at you really fast. Whereas when you sit in an orientation about your research expectations, you're kind of in that, 'Okay, I have to face this soon but not tomorrow,' you know, so.

Directors of graduate studies are aware that students may not take expectations as

seriously as they should because they are concerned with other roles they will have to

fill. DGS Jones admitted that her department uses orientation as an informational session because "what we find is a lot of what we say then is forgotten by the time it's relevant." The idea of privileging one identity over another is in line with the concept of conflicting identities (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Colbeck, 2008). When students have two role identities in tension with one another, they will most likely choose the more salient identity.

Departments also host social events during orientation to give students a place to interact and acclimate to the new environment. DGS Harper recognizes that "the grad students are better at helping themselves with that [administrative issues] than with us helping them, so a lot of times we do better plugging them into each other both in the new cohort and beyond." DGS Taylor remarked that orientation purposefully does not have many professional development activities but uses the time to connect junior and senior graduate students.

> At that point in time people are kind of overwhelmed, so there's not a lot of instruction in professional norms. But again it's an opportunity for the existing graduate students, the more senior graduate students, to role model for the younger graduate students.

Although most schools use formal orientation as a channel for information and expectations, one DGS stood out because his department has restructured orientation to focus on professional development. The orientation time is used for workshops about journal submission and how to write a journal article, discussions about the job search, and how to develop a CV, all skills that participants noted as "professional" in Chapter III. There is still some orientation for new students, but the focus is not information exchange.

> I think graduate directors during the last couple of years probably did it differently, where I've tried to kind of minimize what I would call the 'information about,' you know, here's the library, you know, so here's the course policies. Much more about getting people to think more critically about their craft when it comes to teaching or in terms of scholarship.

The reason the administrative issues are minimized is because "people can read these things, they can figure it out. But you need to spend some time on how you develop people's capacity for doing primary activities they're supposed to do as academics, which is writing and teaching." Caroline, who attends this program, likes that the time is used to develop her professional skills, but she also recognizes the tension that can occur between trying to introduce new students to the department and address issues of professional development.

> It's always been a tricky thing. I've noticed in the last few years balancing the need to do real orientation for these new grad students, because you've got 10 people or so who've never been here before and need to learn what the department is about and that kind of thing. Balancing that with doing professional development for older graduate students.

Caroline has pointed to a focus on professional development during orientation week as a good example for how to view development in general. It is important to "just [do] away with the idea, you know, professional development just happens at the beginning of the semester and then you don't think about it until the next semester starts."

Although this program approaches its formal orientation differently than most others, it still accomplishes the goals of information exchange and communicating expectations. It also provides opportunities for peers to interact. In addition to these components, teaching training emerged as an important part of formal orientation.

Teaching Training

Students spoke of teaching training as the most significant part of formal orientation. Despite the emphasis on research at RI schools, students repeatedly indicated that orientation was used to train them as instructors or teaching assistants for the basic course. DGSs agreed that the teaching training is largely for the basic course. Some schools do all of their training in the department, whereas others use a combination of departmental and university training sessions. The training includes discussions about how to deal with student behavior, practice teaching presentations, and general information about the content of the basic course. Those who are new to teaching found the teaching training helpful because "I was really nervous about teaching" (Stella) but students who have taught before did not find the training as useful. Julie has taught for a while and "I don't feel like I necessarily get anything out of those workshops." Students continually expressed that the teaching training is less useful for veteran teachers because they may be teaching or assisting in upper-level courses.

Some students attended campus-wide meetings for teaching assistants before school started. Abby highlighted that "it's not all that useful because it happens before school even starts. You get kind of these preemptory, 'Here are some examples of what happens.' But you don't really know what questions to ask yet." This example is similar to students not going through professional development activities during orientation because they are not prepared to digest the information. Directors of graduate studies and students agreed that most of the teaching development occurs during the school year, particularly in a pedagogy course and by actually being in the classroom.

Although a majority of formal orientation focuses on teaching training, students also receive information about various administrative issues and expectations for research and teaching. The expectations are vague, and do not clearly lay out what specifically is expected of students. Orientation does not greatly address professional development. Topics related to professional development are discussed more during the school year through formal and informal means.

Beyond Formal Orientation

Professional development occurs more in interactions during the school year than it does during formal orientation. Students engage in many formal and informal activities and practices with faculty members, peers, and others in the communication discipline. Directors of graduate studies and students repeatedly indicated that formal planned activities such as taking courses, participating in department-wide colloquium, and engaging in research, teaching, and service help students develop professional qualities. Informal methods such as mentoring, asking for advice, and interaction also assisted in their development. All of these activities help students develop "professional" skills and habits.

Formal Development

DGSs emphasized required professional development, pedagogy, theory, methods, and content courses as a site of professional development. In Chapter III, development of research, teaching service, and other behaviors and values were identified as signs of professionalism. Through a variety of courses both in and outside of the department, students can develop in these areas. Two courses that are generally

required for doctoral students are professional development and pedagogy seminars. Other sites of formal development include colloquium and engaging in the practices of research and teaching. Colloquium can take the form of department-wide mandated meetings or less formal gatherings that focus on professional development topics. Actually researching, teaching, and serving are some of the most essential ways for students to become stronger in each area.

Professional development course. While most departments require a professional development course during the first half of doctoral education, a few required such a course in students' last year, as to prepare them to enter the job market. The details of the course vary by school, but the content is relatively similar. Some of the things discussed in the seminar carry over from formal orientation, but many of the issues are related to the professional behaviors and values students need for academic jobs as discussed in Chapter III.

Seminar discussions include how to write an article, how to present at conferences, how submit for publication, how to do job interviews and talks, and how the tenure process works, among many others identified by course syllabi. Assignments for students include actually constructing some of the documents. For example, one professional development seminar focuses on grant writing, and the final assignment is to write and submit a grant proposal. The seminar may also have assignments meant to make students familiar with the academic environment. DGS Ramsey's school requires students to fulfill an assignment in which they look up where their school's alums are working, and research those institutes. The goal of this assignment is to answer the

question, "How do I understand what all these different universities are and how do I account for the differences between them?" (DGS Ramsey). Surprisingly, students did not talk about the professional development seminar as a significant source of their development and pointed to other formal mechanism as more useful. They mentioned it as a required course, but spoke of informal methods as more useful in their development.

Pedagogy course. Students spoke much more about their department's pedagogy course than they did the professional development seminar, though what they said about it was not positive. Similar to formal orientation teaching training, the pedagogy course is centered on the basic course, so students usually take the pedagogy course during their first year when they are teaching assistants, discussion section leaders, or instructors.

Directors of graduate studies pointed to the pedagogy course as a major influence in teaching development, but students did not generally find the course helpful in developing their teaching skills. DGS Irwin indicated that the course is a key tool for formal development because it focuses on "broader pedagogical issues" that may not be addressed during formal orientation such as day-to-day responsibilities associated with teaching, such as how to grade, how to encourage participation, how to create a lecture, how to post lectures online, how to use exercises and activities in the classroom, and challenges in moving between the roles of student and teacher. DGS Neal recalls that the pedagogy course in her department covers "everything from using technology in the classroom to dealing with difficult students to, um, putting together syllabi, learning goals, um, you know, organizing materials, using activities in class, so kind of the whole range of things." Assignments described by seminar syllabi reflect these topics and

require students to design quizzes and assignments, to lead class discussion, presenting

teaching ideas, write their teaching philosophy, and observe others teaching. The idea

behind these topics and assignments is to prepare new students to teach the basic course,

but also give them skills that they can use when they move onto stand-alone courses.

Although DGSs and document analyses suggest that the pedagogy course helps

develop students beyond the basic course, students disagree with that perspective.

Students, especially those with prior teaching experience, expressed that the course is

not particularly useful. Hailey highlighted how the course is not uniformly helpful.

> It's, I think it's more rewarding for some than others in our department
> because it's structured around our graduation-required, 100-level, uh,
> public speaking course. We have four versions of that course here. Um,
> and the pedagogy seminar is completely oriented around one of those and
> so if you are interested in or you develop, like, I went off on a different
> path and a different kind of public speaking course, so you're not, you're
> oriented towards one textbook and one class for and really the specific
> issues that come up with teaching that class. And then there's a little extra
> general pedagogical stuff. I think it's in the past few years that's been
> very according to the person who's in charge of that course. So, um, you
> know, without saying anything negative about, was it incredibly useful
> for me? No.

Zoey said that among her peers, "it's kind of looked at as a blow-off class, um, and kind

of a burden, I think to most people." Despite the variety of discussion topics and

assignments that would seemingly prepare students to teach beyond the basic course,

students indicated that the course is a requirement to fulfill and is not useful outside the

context of the basic course.

Methods, theory, and content courses. The professional development and

pedagogy seminars are classes designed to develop and specific components of

professionalism in students. Other required courses include theory, methods, and content

courses. By taking these courses, students are going through the research process and

developing their knowledge of the different traditions in communication. Directors of

graduate studies repeatedly indicated coursework is the environment in which students

develop the foundations of their research skills. In courses, students learn how to write a

good literature review, good research questions or hypotheses, varying methods, and the

different paradigms in communication. DGS Underwood explained how her department

prepares students to be competent in these abilities.

> We, um, believe very strongly that they should be um, well-versed, um, in
> a variety of approaches to research, and so this starts um, their very first
> semester in our doctoral program. They take a course called [name of
> course]. That course introduces them to meta-theoretical assumptions,
> um, across the board, so they're you know, entrenched in, um,
> epistemological, ontological, axiological, praxiological issues, um, that
> post-positivist or various interpretivist or various critical scholars,
> feminist, and the list goes on and on, right? Um, that these folks can
> bring to their research, and so we believe, um, very strongly that our
> doctoral students should be well-versed and able to, um, to communicate
> uh, with folks from other paradigms as well as be able to review work
> that maybe comes from a meta-theoretical perspective that's different
> from one's own.

Handbooks note that methods proficiency is integral to successful completion of the

program because students will need to use the knowledge they have gained in

coursework in writing their comprehensive examinations. DGS Grant illustrated the

specific ways in which courses prepare students to produce research.

> And the assignments that they get, you know will include things like kind
> of writing a book review, um, writing a literature review and uh,
> obviously kind of writing, writing up research papers, which can go to
> publication…In addition, you know, some of the classes are directly
> about research approaches or research methodology. So, for example, in,
> um, one of the ethnography classes that they are, a kind of introductory
> class that they do a brief ethnography…and they get kind of their hands-
> on experience to begin with.

This example shows how specific courses develop students by engaging them in meaningful writing assignments and research.

The only formal training for non-academic careers that emerged from interviews was an internship course, which is "designed because we didn't, we wanted to make sure our students felt like they could get their PhD and it not be about the academic world, so I'm not sure if we use it very often, but it is available to students" (DGS Neal). However, this type of preparation is more geared toward Master's students, not doctoral students.

Students tended to have a strong satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the feedback and training they received in courses. Those satisfied with courses received "very incisive and very good comments because it's always about improving the work and improving my understanding of something" (Lori). Alice recalled a professor who taught an organizational socialization and assimilation class and would use some of the class time to talk about professional development topics of the students' choosing.

> The professor there who obviously studies socialization, kind of, as her, as her thing, um, made a point of taking, like, kind of the last half hour or so of a three-hour seminar every week, um, to talk about socialization issues and so she kind of collected from the room what are things you are interested in, you know… Then she brought us in, you know, copies of R&R letters that she'd kept and, you know, talking about the various things…you know, what does it mean to go to an R1 versus to go to a teaching institution? You know, what does the teaching load look like? What do the research loads look like? You know, all these different, you know, kind of questions or things I think we're supposed to kind of learn by osmosis but don't necessarily always learn.

This example shows how the faculty member used class time to discuss topics related to course content in an applied way to enhance students' professionalism.

Students not fulfilled with course instruction cited lack of feedback and direction as reasons for their dissatisfaction. Samantha recognizes that the amount and quality of feedback depends on the course and professor, but would like more detailed feedback so she can work on developing as a writer. Stella indicated that she was not taught how to write a research paper. She was taught "'Oh, well, you should review other people's papers and then you'll learn how to do it,' which eventually that works, but it could be a long time.'" Because she was not receiving instruction she found useful in class, she turned to her advisor, who walked her through each step of writing a research paper. Riley expressed disappointment in the expectation to complete a research project in one semester.

> I feel like it's really easy to be completely consumed by uh, deliverables, you know, and just keeping on top of your inbox and submitting assignments X, Y, and Z and reading or skimming...And to never write a full paper because the length of this semester is really not amenable to running a full social science study…So they usually just have us write the proposal. So when are we supposed to finish up that study and actually go out and get all of the data? You know? When?

Avery recognizes that it is difficult to complete a research project over the course of one semester, and explains that she completes projects she started in class by working with her advisor over the course of a few semesters. Coursework is one of three elements that is supposed to help students reach Golde's (2006) goals of the PhD, but these examples show that coursework needs to be meaningful and carefully planned to develop students' professionalism (Gardner, 2009b). Authors have shown professional development efforts can be ineffective because of poor planning (Fullan, 1991; Guskey & Huberman, 1995; Holaday, Weave, & Nilson, 2007). Coursework is supposed to be a significant source of

development, so having its effectiveness decreased because of poor planning is

avoidable.

Student dissatisfaction may be something faculty members want to address in the

way they view courses. DGS Quinn remarked that his department needs to rethink

assignments so students can get the most out of them.

> I do think that one of the things that we're gonna probably do in the next year in terms of development is, you know, is have a faculty meeting where people really talk, not really so much about feedback, but for example, how do you construct a seminar so as to get the maximum learning out of it? You know, in terms of what kind of paper assignments would make sense and how do you do that?

Caroline, who attends DGS Quinn's program, illustrated how courses have transcended

research development and will affect the type of faculty member she is.

> I remember being in the second year and being burned out with classes and all that kind of stuff and just wanting to be done with classes and all that and instead of just being annoyed by them, I started to use them as learning opportunities and go 'Okay, let's look at how these professors are teaching their classes and what do I not like about this?' I realized I, I really dislike especially at the graduate level, the weekly little assignments like two-page response papers and things like that. I think that's fine for undergrads to teach them about writing. But grad students don't need busy work. And so if I teach a grad class, I'm not gonna have critical response papers due every week.

Caroline is both learning research skills and using courses to determine how she would

like to conduct her courses in the future. Unfortunately, not all students were as satisfied

with courses like she was. Satisfaction with courses hinges on how useful feedback is

and how clear the instruction is. Although courses are a method for development,

another institutionalized practice assists in student development.

Colloquium. Directors of graduate studies and students repeatedly indicated

colloquium meetings influence professionalism in research and overall behavior.

Department-wide, mandatory colloquia usually consist of guest speakers presenting their

research. Although this model is the traditional one, DGSs and students also noted other

research-related type of colloquia, such as students presenting their dissertation research

and giving mock NCA presentations. DGS Franks pointed out that the practice sessions

are a great opportunity to prepare for future presentations.

> We encourage our advanced students to participate precisely because it
> gives them that kind of experience of: how do you present your research
> to an audience? How do you handle questions? Um, and we have the
> opportunity to give feedback to people long before they, you know, ever
> have to go out into the job market itself.

DGS Lawrence noted that he has had students push back against giving their

presentations before NCA. His response to their complaints was that "we're sort of

doing our due diligence to make sure that before you go down [to the conference] that,

uh, you know what you're talking about or at least you can stand for 12 minutes and,

and, and give a coherent presentation." Church (2009) found that mock oral

presentations help students obtain constructive criticism and practice before participating

in their actual exams.

Like with coursework, students are polarized on the usefulness of colloquium.

Some students indicated that they found colloquia to be helpful in enhancing their views

on research and allowed them to be a part of a scholarly conversation. Lauren explained

that colloquia are "one facet where, you know, we learn to be part of the conversation

and to listen to colleagues and pose questions and thinking critically." Observing how

faculty members interact with the guest speakers also helps students "get an idea of like what kind of things do they really pull out of this discussion" (Madeline).

Other students expressed a dislike for colloquium being mandatory. Lily illustrated that while there are no formal consequences for not attending, it is detrimental not to go.

> I feel like, sometimes the grad students talk about concertive control. It's like if you don't show up, you're just, you're not viewed as favorably. Um, but once again, they [faculty members] sense you aren't seriously invested in your program. Like, you want students that you really want to, like, invest, that the professors want to invest their time in. Um, but I feel like you're just overlooked for things that you might otherwise be qualified for if you don't get, um, nominated for a fellowship, even if you have a good research record, it's like well, but you're not a good community member so, I don't know. I mean I can't, like that example I gave is not something specific that happened. It's just, I just feel like you're, you're just like looked on. You're not, um, viewed in the same esteem as students that are always, you know, showing up and being a good community member.

This example shows that students may not be attending colloquium because they want to enhance their research program, but because they want to avoid being perceived by others negatively.

Directors of graduate studies have noticed that some students are not interested in colloquium, but note that they should attend anyway because it is both an opportunity for them to learn and practice being a junior faculty member. DGS Jones encouraged students to "basically in a very small way do what faculty are required to do" because it is "good for students not just to hear about other people's research but to begin to learn how to start balancing these things so that the first year [as a junior faculty member] won't be as much of a shock." Directors of graduate studies also want students to see

that colloquium can be an easy way to get feedback on their research. DGS Brown noted

that students come because "it's a combination of seeing that the audiences give

constructive feedback and make constructive comments." Student attendance is also

important because students are going to have colleagues from all research traditions in

the future, "and you better kind of know how to talk to them" (DGS Ramsey).

Handbooks encourage student attendance because of these reasons as well. To encourage

willing attendance to colloquium, DGS Ramsey has constructed a way to make

colloquium more enticing for students.

> What I hope is that the narrative gets out among the people that were
> there like, 'Wow, that was really useful,' and that people start to think
> they'd miss something if they didn't go. You know? Or, 'Oh, you should
> have seen that interaction between these two faculty at the colloquium. I
> actually figured out a lot about them by being there and listening to that.'
> You know? So you kind of create the narrative that something's
> happening and you might be missing out.

This example is the exception, as participants did not generally discuss how to frame

colloquium to make it more attractive to students.

Many departments also hold non-mandatory colloquia, such as professional

development workshops or brown bag lunches. They cover topics research, teaching,

and general topics, such as job interviews, writing a CV, and work-life balance. Students

repeatedly indicated that they like discussing professional development topics in these

meetings because it refreshes their memory about things they may have been taught

earlier in their education. Over the course of four years, students can "get overwhelmed

after a while and you just forget it all" (Sydney).

In addition, students have a way to obtain information about important professional processes that may not be discussed in other formal channels, such as orientation or coursework. For example, a workshop at Samantha's school about the Revise and Resubmit process featured faculty members who brought in rejections letters and talked about their experiences publishing their research. These meetings also help students who are no longer in courses stay connected to the program. Izzy found that professional development workshop "tries to keep you kind of more grounded in the program so you're attached to it and keeps kind of moving forward so you don't feel like you're just all alone" during the dissertation stage of the degree.

Topics of these meetings range based largely on student interest. Directors of graduate studies mentioned that there has recently been some desire on students' parts to have more training for non-academic jobs. Students have asked for a colloquium on the difference between a curriculum vita and resume. Although DGSs noted that they have some trouble getting students to attend colloquium, students pointed out that they have had to convince faculty to provide development regarding professional development topics. Jason illustrated how he asked faculty members to hold workshops on varying topics.

> We went to the faculty director, the colloquium director and we said, 'We need to know how to do this stuff and we're not being taught, we don't know what to expect, so, and, um, it'll make the department look better if we know what we're doing going out, we'll look better at conferences, we'll get better jobs.' They kind of bought our reasoning and they bought into it.

With these types of negotiations, departments can identify areas in which students need or would like development and tailor meetings to address those issues. Mandatory and

voluntary colloquia serve as one way for students to see others present their research and discuss a variety of professional development topics.

Research. Students are formally trained to develop their research skills by identifying their content area of expertise, participating in and networking at conferences, and publishing. Schiappa's handbook suggested that while students are developing their niche area, they should craft a document that captures their research identity. This identity defines students' scholarship and helps them explicate the intellectual and disciplinary contributions. The intellectual identity is an explanation of academic subject-positions, such as social scientist, theorist, historian, or critic, whereas disciplinary identity, which moves down a level of abstraction, is the area in which students are working to become an expert.

Additionally, students should be participating in conferences and publishing. Schiappa's handbook suggested that students be strategic in joining regional or content area associations, but must join NCA. Directors of graduate studies, students, and Schiappa's handbook noted that attending ICA or NCA is instrumental to the job search because that is where students will form networks with potential employers. In addition, many schools conduct preliminary interviews at NCA. Networking at NCA can be accomplished by attending panel presentations of key scholars who do work in a content area, attending pre-conference seminars or short courses, building relationships with graduate students from other schools, and engaging in conversations with others who have similar interests. Schiappa's handbook also included advice about how to act, such as avoiding "getting drunk and engaging in inappropriate behavior," being prepared to

present papers "as a performance of your scholarship that matters," perusing the book fair for ideas about the state of scholarship, meeting the "big" names in the field, and using the conference to explore innovative ideas and where the discipline is moving in the future.

Students indicated that they received e-mails from faculty members each year instructing "everybody stay professional at NCA, don't get drunk and say stupid things" (Zoey), echoing Schiappa's advice. In addition, students are formally prepared for conferences by participating in practice presentations, which are commonly held during a colloquium session. Students mentioned that if they wanted to present in front of faculty and peers, they would receive "friendly, constructive input" (Layla). Lily said the practice presentations prepare her for conferences because "that's like way scarier than actually presenting at a conference…you know, you get nervous presenting in front of your department and then by the time the conference comes, it's like, 'All right, I got this, like, this is fine.'"

Another formal way to promote conference participation is offering department funding as "positive reinforcement" for submitting and presenting (DGS Jones). The amount of funding students can expect is detailed in graduate handbooks, two of which even rank order conferences. Priority is given to general communication conferences such as ICA or NCA, subject area conferences, regional conferences, and finally conferences outside the field. Despite being able to apply for travel funding, students are highly encouraged to search for funding outside the department, in the form of

scholarships, fellowships, and grants. DGS Neal recalled a formalized way her

department recognizes student research achievements.

> Whether they're going to an academic position or not, but particularly
> academic positions, that gets talked about really, um, quite often. And
> then we have, one of the things that we have, we have a bulletin board
> where um, the first page of every publication a student has goes up and
> it's right outside the, where the students' offices are, so that's a big deal.
> There's also a lot of, graduate students have a listserv, and there's a lot of
> stuff that goes on there where people congratulate each other about
> publication and getting jobs and finishing their different part of their
> degree like when they finish exams and all that so it's a lot of support that
> goes on in that community.

A variety of incentives to participate in the presentation of research exist, but regardless

of rewards, students should participate in conferences and submit to journals to develop

their ability to create and disseminate original research.

After conference presentations, publication in the next step in developing one's

research program. Students frequently indicated that they did not receive much formal

training about how to publish outside of coursework, and even that was minimal.

Schiappa and Morreale and Arneson's handbooks offered "how to" guides on several

facets of publishing, including an overview of the submission-review-publication

process, how to write a cover letter, how to avoid common pitfalls of rejected articles,

and how to interact with journal editors.

Many students said they felt their department did a good job of developing them

as researchers, but said they felt like they have a lot to learn. Some feel as though they

are left to learn the nuances of researching on their own. Eva illustrated how she feels

the research process could be made clearer.

> I do think there could be maybe more support for strengthening our research skills or maybe having, um, everybody really being true to the scientific method. Some people I think, you know, maybe rush research to get data, to get published, just to get it out there. And so sometimes, um, for young scholars, we don't necessarily see all of the steps being met. So that can be frustrating but when you're in charge of your own study, you really do get to learn a lot and see how, you know, to see how everything comes out from beginning to end.

Jason would like more clarification on the research process as well. He maintained that "there's this whole kind of brick wall around it [the publishing process] to a lot of grads, especially coming right in they don't know how to like get past that. So I think kind of demystifying that process would be important for students too." Samantha said she uses her imagination to "kind of come up of what we think that's [publishing] like" but has no way of checking her perceptions.

Teaching. Most students expressed that they are underprepared to teach because their department's primary concern is research. Julie said she doesn't "know if the department has done necessarily as much as the department thinks it's done to help me" develop teaching skills. Although they generally feel unprepared to teach as junior faculty members, students said they received formal teaching training outside the pedagogy course in the form of staff meetings. During staff meetings, students receive materials like a syllabus, textbook, and activities they can use in their classes. Beyond these meetings, students feel as though they are expected to develop themselves as teachers.

Some students have taught stand-alone sections or upper-level courses and feel more prepared to teach because of the experience. Savannah explained "it would be very hard to be prepared if you didn't get to teach. 'Cause even if you TA, it's not quite the

same as preparing your own syllabi and assignments an grading everything." Charlotte

indicated that students at her school are less prepared than doctoral students at other

schools.

> I feel like I have to develop that all on my own…they're pretty ill-prepared coming out of this program, I'd say, because I see other graduate students who have directed a basic course, or taught several different classes on their own as instructor of record. No one coming out of my program would have that.

Many students sought out additional development from their university's center

for teaching development. The centers host workshops that cover issues beyond what

might be discussed in the pedagogy course and weekly meetings, such as how to

structure a class, write tests, develop lectures, develop class assignments, develop

grading rubrics, and create a teaching portfolio. Many universities offer a teaching

certificate through the centers. The certificate requires activities like observing a faculty

member teaching and reflecting on the observation by having a conversation with the

faculty member. DGS Ramsey reported that many of her students used the center.

> They have this really nice certificate program where if you do a couple of workshops with them, and, um, you know, have a class visitation and some other things, um, you can get a certificate in, uh, university teaching, and so that's a nice way for your CV to say, 'I'm a good teacher. I care about teaching.'

For some, the teaching certificate is too much work because it is on top of existing

research and teaching loads. Layla has thought about trying to earn the certificate, but

has mixed feelings. She explained, "if I really want to shoot for an R1, they [faculty] tell

you 'Don't worry about the college teaching certificate.' But at the same time, I'm going

to be teaching regardless," so she has to develop that skill set. Schiappa's handbook

maintained that because most students will take jobs at universities with a significant teaching focus, they have to learn how to be good teachers.

An area related to teaching students said they feel is not formally addressed is how to mentor and teach graduate students as a junior faculty member. Students are trained to teach undergraduate courses, but not taught how to develop, prepare, and execute graduate seminars. Layla does not know how she is going to teach graduate students. She explained, "I feel already, I felt unprepared for teaching at an undergraduate level. I feel even less prepared to teach at a graduate level. And I feel like there's this expectation that you're supposed to kind of fly by night, make up your course, and deal with it." Students do not receive formal training in how to mentor students, and learn to mentor "by drawing from what we do and don't like from what our advisors do" (Charlotte).

Lacking formal professional development. In addition to shortcomings in formal research and teaching training, students pointed out several other areas their departments lack professional development activities. First, they maintained that their programs lack structure in terms of professional development programs. Students acknowledge that their departments recognize the importance of professional development activities, but do not have a well-developed program for fully developing all students. Claire maintained that her program does not have a systematic approach to professional development.

> The department as a whole, you know, I don't think they have, like, an agenda to care or to think about our professional development in a systematic way…I think students have to seek out those opportunities for professional development…I've been lucky to have in, like, really

engaged advisors, so advisors who want to help with my professional development and my socialization. Um, other people just like, lost in the sauce, or like floating without a sail.

Samantha agreed that her department has "a general lack of instruction on professionalism. Um, I mean, like I said the grad students have fought for more conversations with respect to professional development in our colloquia, but, um, but I feel like that's one thing our department can really improve on." Timing is also important in professional development. Students admit that they may not pay attention as closely as they need to in the first few years of their program because they are "keeping my head above the water" (Lauren).

Informal Development

Students spoke of informal development activities as being more effective and useful in developing them as researchers and teachers. Although the literature emphasizes formal activities and practices in socialization and development, it overlooks the importance of informal development (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Black, 1996; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Comer, 1991; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Mignerey, Rubin, & Gorden, 1995). Informal behaviors include mentoring, asking advice, interacting, and socializing. Students engage in these behaviors with advisors, faculty members, and peers. This section is organized by group rather than behavior because the behaviors are often intertwined.

Faculty advisors. While the advisor-advisee relationship is somewhat institutionalized in that all students must have an advisor, the dynamics of relationships vary by individual, and much of what occurs between advisor and advisee is informal

training. Students repeatedly indicated that they depend on their advisors' guidance to develop the skills and habits necessary to be a junior faculty member, specifically research-related activities. DGS Evans explained how advisors are expected to prepare students.

> The advisor's responsibilities with respect to helping someone become research adequate is the advisor needs to be able to explain to the student what are the technicalities in the process of actually doing the kind of research that the person's engaged in, and then second, the advisor's job is to essentially help them do the exercise of performing that in the early stages of their education.

Many DGSs referred to doctoral education as an apprenticeship between a student and advisors or faculty members. Morreale and Arneson's handbook illustrate three models of advising that are commonplace in universities. The first is the model of replication, where the student follows the advisor's lead in research and agency lies with the advisor. The second model is the apprenticeship, where advisor oversees the advisee's research, though the advisee works through each of the stages in the process of research. The third model is one of co-creation, where agency lies with the student. This model is most common during the dissertation stage of education, and although the advisor has more expertise than the advisee, the student is working through the research project. No one model is better than another, and they will work differently based on individuals.

For some faculty, the apprenticeship model is at the crux of doctoral education. DGS Harper explained how his program conceptualizes the apprenticeship relationship.

> We see our grad program for doctoral students as kind of an apprenticeship toward, um, academia, and we emphasize, um, you know, both reading broadly across theoretical traditions and writing, um, as

well, developing one's own capacities as a scholar and so in that regard, you know, we emphasize, um, methodological preparation as well as kind of theoretical and conceptual knowledge and application as well.

Students repeatedly indicated that advisors are supposed to help them understand the nuances of academia. Stella expressed that a lot of the "'this is how you do research' kind of stuff happens between the advisor and the grad student." Advisors help students meet the benchmarks to make timely progress through the degree.

Advisors' roles are not limited to research-related topics. Advisors are also supposed to help students develop in teaching, help in the job search process, and help students understand academia in general. Eva seeks teaching help from and observed her advisor. She said, "not only do I go to her and ask her questions but I've also been her TA so I get to watch her a lot and see maybe how she conducts her course." Participants noted that because they are getting an R1 education, the focus is less on teaching, so they have some difficulty finding mentoring for their teaching. Madison thinks "maybe advisors are supposed, or, or, or, encouraged, uh, to sort of come in the classroom and at least observe once…but I've never had, um, I've never had anyone come in my classroom."

Students believe good advisors should look over job application materials and "answer questions big and small" about the process (Hailey). Students going into non-academic careers get individualized advice from advisors, as "some students may talk with their advisor about different kinds of job options, but, you know, pretty much, like, academics are trained in academic careers, so that's what we kind of know how to train

people in" (DGS Patrick). Jason recalled that his advisor did a nice job of showing him

how academia works.

> My advisor and I have a relationship where most of what I've learned has
> come directly from him…a lot of people just get pushed through, and
> they're expected to know how things work when you get out, but, um,
> he's been good enough to kind of advise me on a one-to-one basis about
> what exactly I can expect and the way to kind of play the game in
> academia.

Many students explained that their advisors are happy to mentor them or give them

advice about any topic. Unfortunately, many advisors have never had a non-academic

career and only know RI institutions. Because the academic environment is different

today, "they can give me advice, but the advice is dated. And they're both very

cognizant of that and so what they're telling me is, 'Well, this is what I did, this is what I

can recommend you would do, but I don't know if it's gonna work'" (Steven).

A majority of students expressed satisfaction with their relationship with their

advisor; however, a few students illustrated dissatisfaction with the relationship.

Elizabeth remembered how her advisor has not given her the help she has requested. She

explained, "I asked my advisor to read it [a research paper] and give me feedback. And

I've seen her every month, at least once a month since this summer, and I always remind

her about that, and she always says that she's getting to it. So I mean, she hasn't even

opened the file." Riley agreed that she is not being groomed by her advisor to produce

the best work possible. She recalled, "while the professors' names are on the project I

don't feel like I'm being mentored in methods, you know, like sitting in my little desk

next to their elbow, you know, uh, with them as much as I think would be productive."

Directors of graduate studies also recognize that the advisor-advisee relationship is not

always as effective as possible. DGS Jones reflected on how the advisor-student

relationship can be ineffective.

> If that faculty member tends to be absent, they're not really on the ball, then that student's maybe going to kind of spin out a little bit or at least not develop in the ways that they could…I think that students who are handed opportunities, um, that they didn't necessarily earn and don't see kind of what it typically takes to get it, I don't think that's doing a very good service to students either.

DGS Jones said the opportunities students did not earn refer to being added as an author

on their advisor's conference or journal submission when they did not really work on the

project. Not only is this a disservice to students, but it is also unethical.

Although DGSs and students spoke of the importance of an advisor, they did not

talk much about how to choose one. DGSs mentioned that they are often students'

advisors upon entering the program, or that students are assigned an interim advisor until

they choose a permanent advisor. Schiappa's, Morreale and Arneson's, and graduate

handbooks offer advice on what to consider in choosing an advisor, including

intellectual fit, personality, writing style, communication style, and general

compatibility. A student should talk about these issues with the person he or she is

considering asking to be the advisor.

Faculty members. Faculty members were also identified by students as

touchstones regarding professional behavior, research, and teaching. Students repeatedly

reported learning how to develop their professionalism by observing and modeling

faculty members. When students are engaging in modeling, they are "mirroring, okay,

this is what this faculty member does and I'm preparing to become a faculty member, so

my behaviors, my, uh, work habits, my, my goals, uh you know, stuff that I'm learning"

(DGS Lawrence). Samantha indicated that her department has "a lot of terrific academics in our program and, um, in a lot of ways, you know, they very much lead by example. Um, and, you know, we have to emulate them in terms of how prolific they are and well respected."

Faculty members help students in their research by engaging them both in research teams and individually. Savannah explained how she likes research teams because "I think really doing it hands on and working with professors and getting help and seeing how it all works has been kind of instrumental." Julie remembered that "those [research projects] that ended up actually coming to fruition, um, it was because there was a professor in place who made that happen…I think the push has to come from faculty to get it done and not just keep it at the idea phase, or, you know, early phases." This type of guidance in research helps students achieve the independence and collaboration noted in Chapter III. Students also indicated that watching others give research presentations as a way to learn how to present. Elizabeth remembered how she knew what to do during her first conference presentation.

> When I first did my very first conference presentation I just assumed it was going to be like a guest speaker giving a 20-minute lecture or a 15-minute lecture instead of an hour-long lecture, and so I just did, basically did that, and that was what it ended up being like, so I just dressed professionally and tried to act like them.

Students continually pointed to observing others present their research as more useful than the mandated presentations before NCA.

Students noted that they feel underprepared to teach, and did not express satisfaction with the formal teaching practices and activities. Faculty members are a

source of development for their teaching. In a department that is not particularly focused on undergraduate education, Paige sought out professors who she knew prioritized teaching and they helped her become involved in another department that "focuses primarily on teaching" so she could develop skills necessary for her desired job at a teaching school. Especially for those who TA and do not teach stand-alone sections, observation is a method by which they can gain experience without actually having taught their own courses. By observing professors, students can "see what's good and what's not, what's effective and what's not effective" (Eva). Elizabeth used observation to identify what practices she does not like. She takes note of "teachers that don't do very well at it and what they are doing badly…most of the teachers in my department, I wouldn't want to teach like them…I still pay attention, it's just more of like what not to do." Although students maintained that observation does not necessarily make them feel more confident or prepared to teach, it is better than having no training whatsoever.

In addition to teaching, faculty members help students learn how to give a job talk. Students cited observing faculty members and graduating students give job talks. Many students indicated that they had the opportunity to see actual job talks because their departments were hiring at some point during their doctoral education. Students are able to see what an actual job talk looks like and how job candidates behave. They are also able to talk with faculty afterwards about the types of things they look for during the interview process. Eva's faculty are going to meet with students to debrief the interviews.

> They're going to meet and, uh, just sort of talk to us about the process and sort of, uh, what went into maybe the, a little bit about what went into the

> decision making or how they kind of narrowed down the candidates and made their, I guess, ultimately made their decision…but I'm seeing how the candidates, you know, are conducting themselves and they have really long exhausting days it seems like, and you know, everybody has grilled them in a way with questions at the end as they talk and they, you know, they have to be on their feet.

By having these conversations about their observations, students can get a feel for what faculty expect in an interview. Matthew admitted that "I don't know that they [faculty] would have set aside that time [to talk about the interview process] if we weren't doing the searches." Students noted that observing job candidates gave them a good idea of what they will need to do in the near future.

Faculty members are integral to student development in many of the same way advisors are. It is important to distinguish between a faculty mentor and advisor, as they are different. While having an advisor is the right of each student, a mentor is optional. A mentor is someone, usually a faculty member, in or outside of the department, who guides a student's professional development. Not all students will pursue a mentor, and a mentor and advisor can be the same person. Two schools have a document that differentiates between an advisor and mentor, and told how to choose and interact with each. One school includes a six-page document in its handbook that defined the difference between advisors and mentors, what each can add to the doctoral student experience, the procedures for choosing an advisor, and guidelines advisors and mentors should follow to act within their role. Advisors and faculty members are two constituents that are essential to students understanding of facets of professionalism discussed in Chapter III. Although these groups include individuals who have completed their PhD, peers who are recent graduates or are in the last stages of completion are useful.

Peers. Peers in the graduate cohort and a few years ahead of students are used as a source of advice in addition to faculty members and advisors. Peer advice and sharing resources occurred in reference some to research and conference presentations, but mostly in terms of teaching development. Students said part of the way they learned how to act professionally at conferences is by asking students who are a year or two ahead of them in the program. Students also talk amongst themselves about research and the pressure they feel to produce because they are getting an R1 education, even though they may not want to pursue a career at an RI. Unfortunately, sometimes this informal mentoring can cause false information to be spread in the student body. DGS Jones talked about how information gets passed among students.

> Students don't really know and then they ask other students who don't really know, and then they get these unrealistic expectations, like you need to have 10 publications when you come out of graduate school to get a job!...Once we realized last year that there was just this panic among some of the new students because they just really had a warped sense of what they needed to do, that, um, we didn't realize that, and now that we have, we're going to try to adjust it.

Faculty can stop misinformation from being spread by keeping open lines of communication with students, while still encouraging them to interact with each other.

Discussions about teaching often take the form of exchanging advice. Julie recalled, "I'll ask them [peers] informally as we walk from, I don't know, our classroom to lunch or something um and so I'll just kind of pick people's brains, whatever chance I get if had an issue." Students are also available to offer mutual support if they all feel unprepared or lack confidence in teaching. Matthew explained, "we sort of are able to prop each other up a little bit even though all of us are, you know, still trying to figure

those things our ourselves." By talking with peers about teaching, students are encouraged to reflect on their teaching development. Julie called the process "trial and error and if you are willing to be really honest and self-reflective, um, then you can…kind of figure out how to fix those errors." Students use the tools that they learn from the various formal structures in place, but they hone the craft of teaching by actually doing it, making mistakes, and correcting them.

Peers are also a source of advice for the job market. Samantha recalled that "based from my conversations with other people who have just gone on the job market…it's always an uncomfortable situation to be in and I think you're always wishing you felt more prepared than you do and that's just part of it." Students also give advice to those who are younger in the program. Claire "gave a lot of my stuff from when I was on the job market to the people who are on the job market this year." The documents she gave them included application letters and other application materials.

Socializing also helps students to support each other throughout their program. Students showed initiative to socialize with each other, and did not acknowledge department involvement in their social interactions. Jason explained that his department does not emphasize socializing enough, which is detrimental to development. He explains, "I think unfortunately the faculty probably, um, they reinforce that, uh, "your entire life should be work" attitude…there's a few faculty here and there that they do recognize that people need to be social to be sane" (22). This example reifies the imbalance between the work and personal lives that students identified in Chapter III. Olivia is part of an ABD support group that she says is "a really nice space that,

although we all sort of get together under the guise of having this sort of like school-related focus, it's a really like, um, it feels very healthy to, to be with other women and just be able to talk."

Participants did not talk about non-academic careers, though it was mentioned in Schiappa's handbook, which included advice from PhDs who have gone into fields such as organizational consulting, health organizations, communications, and trial consulting. Those interested in non-academic jobs should take courses that will help them pursue their career, explore internship and teaching opportunities, build a network outside of academia, volunteer in organizations that represent their interests.

Family. Several students cited using family members who have or are pursuing PhDs as touchstones during their doctoral education. Students rely on aunts, uncles, and siblings who are in communication and non-communication fields to exchange information. Steven's uncle and aunt are PhDs in communication and give him advice about a variety of issues, one of which is whether to enter the job market ABD. He remembered, "One of the things that both my aunt and uncle told me, and I, I've, you know, I've been hearing this since fourth grade, a lot of people leave and never finish." Sometimes talking with family members can show students how much they have developed. Madison recalled when her sister, who earned a PhD in a different field, was asking her for advice.

> My sister got her PhD a couple of years ago…And um, I guess I was just shocked when she went on the job market, the questions that she was asking me. And I was, you know, a couple years behind her at this point. You know, I, I knew all the answers to like, she was like, 'I don't even know what a, um, I don't know what a, a job talk is, and I don't know what a teaching presentation consists of.' And so these were all things

that she just like had no preparation for whatsoever, and it, it's just something that like obviously we, we talked about in my department.

Students use family members both to get and give advice, showing them what they do and do not know about development.

Conclusion

By exploring formal orientation and training during the school year, it is clear that students are developed more effectively by informal practices with advisors, faculty members, peers, and family members. Formal orientation activities serve their purpose of orienting students into an organizational culture, but do not focus on professional development. Orientation is useful for disseminating information, communicating basic expectations for incoming and returning students, and training students how to teach or assist in the basic course.

Formal practices such as coursework, colloquium, and engaging in research and teaching are somewhat helpful in developing students' professionalism during the school year, but are aimed at the RI. These activities helped students develop research and teaching and the practice of speaking to a broad audience, but there are no formal ways to develop independence, collaboration, collegiality, initiative, avoiding bad behavior, and work-life balance. Informal interactions help students develop some of the values, such as independence, collaboration, and work-life balance through socializing. The same people conducting formal orientation and activities during the school year, advisors and faculty members, are more helpful to students in informal interactions in which students can ask for advice and observe how advisors and faculty members act. It

is interesting that so much effort is given to institutionalized practices during and beyond

formal orientation, yet students identified informal methods as more effective.

CHAPTER V

ASSESSING PROFESSIONALISM

"I think there is some kind of switch that goes off at some point, it's where the magic happens, where people really do develop a certain set of competencies that they do know what they're doing, and they also have the good sense to ask when they don't." DGS Davis

"I compare apples and apples. I compare my own, my own CV accomplishments to theirs to see if I, if I'm up to snuff…That's how I tell I'm doing a good job." Sydney

These quotations illustrate the difficulties in assessing how students develop. Although formal methods of evaluation, such as benchmarks and annual reviews, measure tangible results of progress, poor feedback can render a formal evaluation useless for students. In addition, a significant part of development takes place informally, is not institutionalized, and may not be amenable or measurable by the standards departments currently use. Directors of graduate studies and students use observation, comparison, and interaction to identify student development. The literature shows that evaluation is necessary to understand whether development efforts are effective (Austin, 2002; Austin & McDaniels, 2006). However, the literature refers to formal evaluation, which was characterized as being less helpful by students for assessing their progress.

This chapter answers the third research question: How is doctoral students' professional socialization tracked and evaluated? Three overarching themes emerged from data to answer this research question: (1) formal evaluation, (2) informal evaluation, and (3) difficulty in evaluation. Formal processes track student completion of milestones through an annual review process that yields individual feedback. Informal evaluation encompasses observation, comparison, and interaction among and between faculty and students. Despite these efforts, students have difficulty knowing whether they are developing into communication professionals.

Formal Evaluation

Student progress is formally tracked by meeting benchmarks and an annual review of research, teaching, and service achievements. Directors of graduate studies find these methods useful for tracking student progress, whereas students did not find the annual review in particular very helpful. Two major issues with the annual review are that feedback students are supposed to receive is not uniformly effective and students do not know the goal of the annual review. However, they clearly understand the use of benchmarks in tracking their development.

Benchmarks

There are a number of benchmarks that students should meet throughout their doctoral program to indicate whether they are making satisfactory progress through the degree. Benchmarks include some of the hallmarks of professionalism discussed in Chapter III, such as completing coursework, producing and presenting research, and completing and defending qualifying and comprehensive examinations, the dissertation

prospectus, and the dissertation. Gardner (2009b) described these benchmarks as major elements of a PhD, and maintains that as students meet each one, they gain expertise and autonomy. These benchmarks are also focused on research, rather than teaching or service, which mirrors the importance on research identified in Chapter III. Students repeatedly indicated that they use these categories to gauge their professional development, and focused on specific achievements and milestones within them, such as conference acceptance rate, passing defenses on time, being asked to review a peer's manuscript, being invited to participate in research projects, solo-authored or independent publications, being invited to submit to a special issue of a journal, awards and honors, teaching evaluations, and plans of study.

Although students did not mention a specific time frame in which they needed to complete the degree, they noted that finishing their dissertation and graduating was important to both them and their department. Handbooks more clearly explained time-to-completion expectations. In general, the doctoral degree should be completed in a four-to six-year period of time, which is reflected in the number of years students are funded. While completing the degree in a timely fashion is essential, students must also make satisfactory progress, which is characterized by a minimum GPA and reconciled grades of incomplete in addition to the benchmarks already listed. To help keep students on track, many handbooks included timelines or checklists for students broken out by month, semester, and year. These documents told students when they needed to schedule and complete specific benchmarks to stay on track. Some handbooks included general milestones, such as coursework, plan of study, comprehensive examinations, proposal

defense, and dissertation defense, whereas others indicated specific research hours in which students should enroll, encouraged students to join dissertation writing groups, and listed what forms needed to be completed and with whom they need to be filed.

Handbooks devoted quite a bit of space to comprehensive examinations, which are a sign that a student has completed coursework and is prepared to design and execute a dissertation project. Comprehensive examinations test student knowledge of methods, theory, and area of emphasis, which was taught in coursework. DGS Patrick echoed this idea that comprehensive examinations delineate between those who have developed the ability to move on and write a dissertation and those who have not.

> We have these other milestones like the qualifying exams in place for kind of determining whether someone is able to write a dissertation. Sometimes people don't go on after quals. Earlier in the program, we don't really have any formal mechanisms for like weeding people out, but in the core classes, there is a core series and the core methods class that everyone takes where we do kind of talk about, we get feedback on how people are doing and just try to see if, you know, people need extra help or not.

Students also rely on passing defenses to know whether they are developing. Passing defenses is one sign that students have developed, but how they feel about interactions with faculty members is a key sign that they are developing in their knowledge and ability. Lily recalled times when she knew she was developing in confidence and ability.

> I think like defenses are another big thing. Like, uh, becoming more confident in like speaking up and really arguing my point and not necessarily just, you know, if my committee says one thing, not necessarily just saying like, 'Yes, you're right. I'm wrong.' I mean, obviously being respectful, but also being willing, I guess being willing to stand your ground in defenses, you know, in conversations with my advisor. Those are the two main things. Like through my writing and often just like through becoming more confident in my ideas to the point where I, I don't just automatically accept whatever my advisor says.

This shift of confidence and independence reifies what DGSs and doctoral students identified as qualities of professionalism in Chapter III. Defenses serve as gateways to the next phases of the doctoral degree. Achieving the benchmarks discussed here are clear signs that students are moving toward developing the skills, abilities, and behaviors of a communication professional.

Although the benchmarks did not refer to teaching development, students have the opportunity to work with faculty members to check their development in this area. At DGS Neal's school, faculty members monitor every course students teach by observing them teaching. In subsequent years, students have a faculty member observe their teaching once a year to make sure they're doing well teaching. Handbooks urged students to seek outside evaluation of their teaching, such as observation, reflection, and discussion with faculty members or senior graduate students. Ideally, a person from one of these groups observes a student's teaching, talks with that student about their strengths and challenges, and gives the student advice about how to develop their teaching. While some handbooks contained policies that mandated class observation, others viewed it as a suggestion for students wishing to focus on teaching. Regardless of whether the observation was compulsory, students were expected to take initiative and communicate with those who were to observe them, soliciting feedback on the observation. Sophia was observed by a faculty member but was not given with much useful advice.

> With one of the classes I taught um the faculty member like wanted to see
> us teach, so she actually came and observed um… and that was actually
> not as helpful as I thought it would be, like I was really excited for her to

> come and I thought she would have like really helpful feedback but her feedback was more like, it wasn't about the content for my class activities or anything like that, she was just like… they were like very odd things, like, 'You should turn this light off and you might want to use a microphone,' and it's like, that's really random stuff so it's like 'Do you have any feedback for the like activity I did, or like, you know, how I knew everyone's name, like did you notice any of that stuff?'

Teaching progress as well as the benchmarks are captured in the annual review, which faculty use to determine overall progress toward degree completion and professional development.

Annual Review

Although the benchmarks are evaluations in and of themselves, schools review student progress annually. Directors of graduate studies, students, and graduate handbook show that students submit information about achievements and activities, progress through coursework, teaching evaluation scores, teaching awards, conference participation, top paper awards, and publications. Administrative information such as credit hours, name of advisor and committee members, date of last meeting with advisor, dates of exam and defense completions, and projected completion date for dissertation were also required for some reviews. Required information varied by school, but encompasses research, teaching, and service. Many handbooks included an annual review form that students are to fill out and attach to their CV. The information required for the annual review and on the CV serves as a jumping-off point for faculty members and advisors to review student progress. Although the handbooks list minimum requirements, students are expected to surpass them. One handbook noted that the culture of the department is such that students view handbook requirements as the bare

minimum and use department resources to achieve high standards of research and teaching. Handbooks suggested that students meet with their advisors before the meeting, as advisors will speak on their behalf during the review. Once all the information is submitted, all faculty members meet and discuss each student's progress.

Faculty members use the annual review process to identify students who are having problems making sufficient progress but also to recognize student achievements, ideas that are echoed in graduate handbooks. In general, faculty members review students' activity in terms of "indicators that we look at in terms of, uh, are they taking on sort of the values and the, the goals and principles that we espouse, that we say, claim to make, you know, successful academics" (DGS Lawrence). Although the checks are done to make sure students are not having problems, they should not be viewed as negative. DGS Harper emphasized that annual reviews are in the students' best interest.

> We have a graduate review where we talk, um, in some detail about each person who is enrolled in our department and how they're making um, progress toward their degree. So we do have an institutional process by which we as a group, as a department evaluate progress toward the degree and that is, it serves to both find out where um, there are issues or you know, concerns with progress toward the degree as well as the opposite, as well as really outstanding accomplishments…We often, we go down our list and we might say, 'Oh, so-and-so just presented two papers at NCA or so-and-so has an article accepted in such-and-such journal,' and so we do try to keep track of successes and challenges, you know we also might say, 'So-and-so kind of struggled a bit as he or she taught, you know, COMM whatever 100-level course, last semester,' so we do have a conversation and we follow up with those students and offer them resources.

Many schools use the annual review process to determine who will be given awards at the end of the school year. One handbook asks that students submit any achievements each month so they can be listed on the department web site.

In terms of teaching, teaching evaluation scores should show "a trend going up, or if they're already a high level, they should be, then they should remain where they are" (DGS Quinn). Handbooks, DGSs, and students indicated that only quantitative information from teaching evaluations was required for the annual review, not student comments. In addition, different departments used the information about teaching differently. Some programs want to make sure students are meeting basic teaching expectations, whereas DGS Taylor's department uses the information to rank students for receiving funding, as not all the students in her department are fully funded. Students did not always find evaluations to be an accurate reflection of their abilities. For Elizabeth, "those [student evaluations] are, you know, always only so helpful because half of them [students] don't really complete it or take it very seriously, and the other half only have, you know, good things to say or nothing to say." Teaching evaluations are not the only way, however, of tracking teaching

Directors of graduate studies did not report an institutionalized way of recognizing whether students have developed the professional practices and values such as independence and collegiality they noted in Chapter III. DGS Davis responded that she can tell when students are developing these characteristics, but it is difficult to pinpoint. She said, "I think there is some kind of switch that goes off at some point, it's where the magic happens, where people really do develop a certain set of competencies that they do know what they're doing, and they also have the good sense to ask when they don't." Although it may be difficult to identify exactly how students develop professional behaviors outside of research, teaching, and service, the annual review is

the current method faculty members use to recognize student progress. The review

results should get students thinking about future directions with their research, teaching,

and service.

Students repeatedly expressed dissatisfaction or apathy with the annual review

process. Students frequently indicated that the review is a formality in which they must

participate and do not consider in their professional development. Those who were

dissatisfied with the process were frustrated because they do not know what occurs

during the faculty meeting. Students indicated that they knew the general goal of the

meeting, but beyond that they did not know what was said about them. Student

illustrated his conceptualization of the faculty meeting.

> From what I've heard, the meeting is usually everyone is usually sitting
> around chatting happily, I mean, about the grads. But certainly there are
> people who are not meeting their benchmarks obviously, then they get a
> letter telling them that. Well, we all get letters regardless of whether it's
> good or bad. Sometimes the letter is more positive, that comes from the
> graduate director. I think what goes on in the meeting is confidential so
> they aren't really allowed to tell me what people have said about me**.**

No student mentioned ever having received a negative review and indicated they were

making sufficient progress through the program; however, they did not like that the

meeting was kept secret and did not perceive the review as helping in their development.

Not all schools sampled in this research utilized a formalized annual review;

however, all schools required students to meet with their advisor, DGS, or chair at least

once a year to review progress. For example, one school that does not have an annual

review requires students to submit a statement of yearly progress and includes a

timetable for dissertation completion, according to the handbook. Samantha, whose

school does not conduct an annual review, expressed interest in an annual review because "we grad students, we feel like we are floating around and just like, I don't know, we are in a space where we don't you know, are we doing okay? Are we not?" Students who are reviewed annually did not express satisfaction with the process, but the lack of an annual review leaves students confused about their progress. Much of the lack of satisfaction stems from the feedback process, which occurs after the annual review meeting.

Feedback

Directors of graduate studies, students, and handbooks asserted that students receive feedback summarizing the outcome of the annual review meeting. Feedback can come in the form of a letter from the DGS, chair, or advisor, or can be communicated during a meeting with the advisor. Although progress may be communicated by a number of faculty members, the advisor is the point person for following through with addressing problems, according to DGS Grant. Ideally, students and advisors meet to discuss the contents of the letter and make a plan for development in the upcoming year, though students are responsible for initiating a meeting. One school requires students to write a report summarizing the meeting with the advisor, including plans for the upcoming year. No matter the format, feedback is a necessary step in completing the evaluation process. DGS Ramsey emphasizes about the importance of communicating feedback to students.

> We don't really have a formal kind of way you have to do it, but for my students, I usually write them a letter that says, 'Here's what I see you've done last year. Here are the milestones you've reached or haven't reached. Here was the general tone of the conversation about your work

in the meeting, and then here are some things that you're doing well, things you need to work on,' and then I give them that letter, and then we use that as kind of a basis for a meeting or a conversation. Um, and so ideally the students get feedback like that every year so that when it comes time especially to, you know, write letters of recommendation or, uh, you know, prepare students for things beyond the graduate degree, the advisor has a lot to draw on in terms of knowledge and information about that student.

DGSs repeatedly noted that they used to only report the meeting results to students who were not making sufficient progress, but now try to recognize the successes students have had in the last year.

For students not making sufficient progress, the letter will often include some resources that students can explore to enhance their research or teaching skills. DGS Irwin created a form faculty could elect to use in communicating feedback to the students. The form "is very much analogous to the faculty evaluation process, where their advisor can either give them a check-off form or there's a boilerplate letter uh, very much like the boilerplate faculty evaluation letter."

Students confirmed that the letters they received were most often form letters that contained little information about the student. Even though she has received positive reviews, Charlotte is not satisfied with the way feedback is communicated in her department because it is not tailored to individuals.

None of the graduate students take it seriously. But, well, it's not that we don't take it seriously. It's just that it's sort of almost one of those blanket form letters that, you know, insert name, kind of insert, you know, the facts here. And then send it off. So it's not necessarily as personalized as it could be.

Although students repeatedly indicated that they did not hold the feedback letter in high

regard because it was not personalized, other problems with the feedback process exist.

Riley explained how the feedback letters have been of little use to her.

> In my 1st year, I felt like what they had to say wasn't that productive.
> And maybe a little reprimanding about needing to focus more. My second
> year, um, is when I spent the summer [out of the state], and they sent it to
> my old apartment and I never got it. And I asked them in the fall if they
> would give me a copy again and they never did, which I need to follow
> up on, so I didn't get that one. Then after my third year, I got it and it was
> fine. It wasn't really that productive and it was also, it had one inaccuracy
> or it said something about 'Well, you might want to schedule your
> qualifying exams' or something like that. And I'd already written them in
> May. So, yeah. I don't really feel like that's real productive.

Because the feedback is not totally tailored to students, and may not always be accurate,

students have not used it much to track their development. Barnes and Austin (2009)

cited minimal feedback as a cause of lack of preparedness to be a junior faculty member.

If students are not receiving useful feedback that they can integrate into their

development, they may not be fixing problems or improving in areas of weakness. Few

students indicated that they use the feedback to reflect on their professional development

path. For Julie, the letter "starts to give me some, some layers to what my advisor and

even some of the other members in that committee, um, what we've talked about over

the semester." The feedback she receives from faculty members helps her shape the

research and teaching she does.

Another form of feedback students repeatedly mentioned is awards given at the

end of the year, after the annual review meeting has been held. Although awards are a

good way to acknowledge student performance, the process by which students are

selected is unclear to students. Zoey remembered how she became aware that her

department was not using information she submitted in the way she thought.

> I guess the only acknowledgement that we know that they know we are developing is every year at the end of the year we have an awards, kind of ceremony, I guess, where they give out like awards to graduates…what's kind of scary is like recently the department was like 'We want to do a better job of giving those awards so can you send us like all of your CV all your teaching evaluations and all this stuff?' and I was like 'Are you kidding me? Like they haven't been doing that for the past four years? Like how you have they been judging us for those awards?' Like it was just mind-boggling to me because I thought this whole time all that stuff was being accounted for, so that was kind of frustrating um, but I guess I'm hopeful that like the faculty members in our department look at that stuff and like say 'Okay, so-and-so is doing a good job here' and that stuff, but I honestly don't know how much it actually happens because after that I was like 'Well maybe they've never even seen our teaching scores,' like, so… I'm really not sure how much, and I know they're super busy, but that's not, especially at an R1 school, like that's probably not their top priority.

This quotation reveals a significant flaw in the review process and reiterates the focus on

tracking research development over teaching development. Meeting benchmarks and the

annual review meeting and feedback processes are institutionalized means of evaluation.

Directors of graduate studies and students identified informal evaluation practices as

more useful in tracking development.

Informal Evaluation

Participants continually reported using informal evaluation tools, such as

observation, conversations, and interaction to track progress. These three tools are used

by DGSs to recognize student development and students to identify their own

development. These forms of evaluation are reminiscent of ways newcomers reduce

uncertainty during organizational socialization (Ashford, 1986; Ashford & Black, 1996;

Berger & Calabrese, 1975; Comer, 1991; Cooper-Thomas & Anderson, 2002; Gruman, Saks, & Zweig, 2006; Mignerey, Rubin, & Gorden, 1995). Like with the informal development practices in Chapter IV, informal evaluation seems to be more effective in helping students understand how they have developed.

Observation

Observation can be used to judge progress toward the benchmarks identified in formal evaluation. The difference is that observation yields results that cannot necessarily be quantified or articulated. Directors of graduate studies repeatedly indicated that they used observation to know whether students are developing throughout the year. Observation reveals how students develop at different rates and in varying ways. Observation highlights that some students are "sort of better at juggling…just looking at kind of the work that they're doing, the types of activities they're involved in, and just kind of how they seem to managing and balancing everything" (DGS Patrick). Students who are able to balance research and teaching loads and can do it with confidence show faculty members that they are developing their professionalism.

Faculty can see changes in research, teaching, service, practices, and values identified in Chapter III. DGS Quinn has observed students progress in research. He can tell that they are developing when they show their ability to "weave, you know, relatively sophisticated and nuanced arguments about what they're doing…and they're able to actually put competing theories into conversation with one another…so I think that ability to connect, integrate, synthesize, and analyze is a sign of professionalism." Other facets of students' research may also show that they are developing toward

becoming a research professional, like the ability to speak to a broad audience. DGS

Davis remembered students who have improved in the past.

> I get a research statement from somebody who's on the job market for the second time, and it's brilliant. Not because, not, and I'm not even saying because the research is brilliant, although, you know, that's good too. But it's like, it's, it can speak to people beyond a very narrow group, right? So it takes skill to do that and when I see that happening, I'm like, 'OK, you've, you've gotten someplace that's really good.' When somebody says, I really felt good about submitting this publication, and I think it's going to go, and, you know, a few weeks later, or a month and half or two months later (laughter), they get, you know, even sometimes, the, you know, like, minor revisions, but, you know even a Revise and Resubmit is good, so they made a judgment that was good.

Development can pertain to research, but it can also refer to the overall socialization of

individuals into academia. DGS Neal recalled how she saw two students develop

together.

> There are two students that came in this year that are in my area. And they're taking most of their classes together, they spend a lot of time together, so, um, you know, I can see that they're doing, and then they're, they're doing the kind of things together. They're doing things with other students also, so I kind of watch them and I can tell that they seem to be fitting in pretty well, and I meet with them every once in a while.

If students are not engaged in the department and with faculty, it is much harder

to track their professional development, because "we have no way of measuring that

exactly or assessing that exactly, other than anecdotal, um, how the students are doing"

(DGS Brown). In a way, students' absence communicates their development. DGS

Ramsey noted that she knows students are lacking professional development if they do

not participate in departmental activities.

> If I haven't seen somebody for a while, if nobody's showing up at things, if somebody kind of disappears and doesn't really appear to be engaged with what's going on in the community, um, if, if the work suffers, in, uh,

> to the extent that, you know, the person is not able to keep up with the kind of basic things that they should be on top of, deadlines and milestones and things like that.

While observation can reveal students who are disengaged, it can also show student development. Observation helps directors of graduate studies evaluate student progress toward many of the same benchmarks listed in formal evaluation.

Comparison

Students used comparisons between themselves and other students as measuring sticks for development. These comparisons are partly based on observation. Sydney recounted how she compares herself to other students. She looks at other students' CVs, which are posted on the department Web site.

> I compare apples and apples. I compare my own, my own CV accomplishments to theirs to see if I, if I'm up to snuff…That's how I tell I'm doing a good job. Because when I see a 20-year-old student who's got four publications and has gone to 50 conferences and has gone to every country and every island in, in the world and has done research and qualitative interviewing, um, then I, I get scared, and I feel inferior, because it's like I'm 52 years old and I haven't done a damn thing.

Students frequently noted that their programs post students' CVs on the department Web site, so they can easily access other's information.

Students also recognized changes in themselves as they progressed through their degree. Caroline compared "myself now to what I was like when I first got here. And I think my first semester or so, I still treated this a lot like college, in a sense. Um, even though I'd been out in the professional world for a year or so." In addition to feeling a change in attitude toward the degree, students also compare their knowledge and abilities at different points in the degree. Savannah looked back on "that paper that you wrote for

a class and like then you see three years later it actually became something published and you're like, 'Wow, I really learned so much in that class.'" John knows he has developed when he sees changes in his research and teaching.

> I go back and I read a book that I thought I couldn't get, and I totally get it…I mean, I, I, I, read the stuff that I wrote a year ago, and I'm like, 'Wow, I could have…did that…I could have done that better." Uh, I look at the stuff that I've been doing in classrooms, um, you know, a couple of years ago, and I was like 'Wow, this, uh, I just, I totally, I, I see things differently…I mean, when I look at the stuff that I've written, I say I'm better than that now. And I can honestly say that and know why I'm better, and I look at the kind of stuff I'm, I was teaching, and I'm, and I saw, 'I can totally improve that this semester.' Um, yeah, I think that's good…I think that's, I think that, I, I think that's the way that you have to gauge yourself, because you can only really gauge yourself against yourself.

Not only did students compare themselves at various points during their degree, they also compared themselves as professionals in non-academic careers before returning to school. Many doctoral students worked before coming back to school for their Master's or PhD, and admitted they already knew how to be professional because they had to exercise professional behavior at their previous jobs. Evelyn explains that she did learn things about being professional throughout school, but already had a foundation of professionalism.

> I was professional when I came here. And I knew what professionals do. They put their head down and they do their work…I've always had to conduct myself as a professional. Um, I didn't, uh, punch a time clock. This was my own business. So, um, I was, you know, I became aware of what it took to, uh, to work with clients and to work well with them.

Natalie agreed that she maintained professional comport before coming back to school and saw other students who did not have work experience lacking professionalism.

> I actually, um, like took a big break between my undergrad and returning to get my Master's and PhD. I worked for eight years in the news industry. So I've had professional experience just beyond, but I see a lot of you know, people in my program who have just come straight from undergrad straight through, who are just lacking kind of some professional skills, and I don't know what that would really fall in but just even appropriate attire and, you know, um, just how to kind of maintain conversations with people just beyond you know…I don't know really what it is but I think it's just something you get from being in an professional work environment that I don't think an academic environment has. And so, I just felt, I had always felt a little more comfortable in my skin and, and kind of how to present myself professionally…Where I see some of my other friends and colleagues in my program struggling a little bit with that. Even just being dressed appropriately for a conference or things like that.

More than a quarter of students worked outside of academia before returning to earn their Master's or PhD, and noted that they partially learned how to be professional by engaging in an environment outside of academe. Goodman, Schlossberg, and Anderson (2006) discuss a "hang-over identity" that students can have when they begin graduate school and the students here used their previous work identity to lay a foundation of professional behavior.

Interaction

Advisors and faculty members were identified as constituents in formal and informal development opportunities in Chapter IV. Directors of graduate studies and students continually indicated that these groups of people are also integral to understanding student progress because they interact with the students frequently. Advisors are sources of feedback, sounding boards for professional activities, and models for students. In many departments, it is the advisor's responsibility to stay in touch with students during the year so that any problems can be resolved throughout the

year instead of during the annual review. DGS Underwood stated how pivotal the advisor is in student development.

> I think the advisor kind of in many ways serves as, um, kind of the, I guess the, one of the primary individuals who gives feedback on you know, what someone should be doing in terms of professional and academic development, and, um, you know, just, just trying to touch base with the students as often as possible on those kinds of things.

In addition to the development activities throughout the year, advisors should also talk with their advisees about conference participation, journal submission, and teaching and research statements to gauge how students are developing. DGS Evans indicated how important interaction is in keeping students on track and involved in the department.

> If the students, there are some students um, are so independent that they meet with their advisor, they've decided that they don't want a mentor, they just kind of go off and they do their own thing, and then you only hear from them at the major milestone parts of the program, uh, in those instances you almost never know whether they're developing particularly well or not. But what a good director of graduate studies will do is that he or she will either on their own or with the help of two or three faculty that they trust, try to do regular um, interviews and conversations with different members of the um, graduate students in order to kind of understand not just are they meeting our expectations, have they finished all the courses and don't have any incompletes, for example, but more importantly are they evolving, is their creativity evolving, is the quality of their writing evolving, those things.

Certainly some advisors are more responsible about doing these things than others, and DGS Davis acknowledged that the advisor-advisee relationship does not benefit all students equally.

Other people students may have frequent conversations with are committee members, who have an important role. Although committee members may be viewed as a group of faculty members who judge students progress at the major benchmarks, their

role goes beyond these events. Students interacting with their committee members is an opportunity for students to practice being a junior faculty member interacting with senior faculty members. Handbooks also contained information suggesting that committee members are also responsible for helping students develop professional skills and characteristics.

Students agreed that a way they tracked their professional development is by talking with their advisors and committee members frequently about their goals and expectations throughout the year. By discussing these things, advisors keep students on track to meet benchmarks. For example, Khloe told her advisor she wanted to complete her dissertation by a certain date, knowing her advisor would help her achieve that goal. Julie's advisor "wouldn't overlook the fact that you're drowning" but pushes her to be a high achiever. Students say they trust their advisor to guide them; however, advisors become more hands-off during the later stages of the degree, such as the dissertation phase. This shift has been seen as detrimental to student progress because it leaves students without guidance about specific expectations (Blum, 2010). In this situation, though, it appears that students are becoming more independent but still have their advisor if they need help.

Students also notify their advisors when they have won an award or get an article accepted for publication. Students said they tend to meet with their advisors as needed when they are in the dissertation phase. Hailey works with her advisor closely, but also recognizes that faculty members are busy with their own work. She reveals, "my sense would be from all my faculty is that they care about your as a person but the brass tacks

of your relationships is really finishing and moving on" (Hailey). Madison is pleased

with her advisor-advisee relationship and the benefit it has done her in the development

of her research. She remembered how the relationship developed over the course of

several years.

> Um, so in my Master's program, she would help me with anything I wanted, but I wouldn't say that we were like really good friends. Um, but as we sort of worked on, you know, my Master's project and then the reason I chose to stay like, the number, I mean there were other reasons, but the number one reason I chose to stay at [my school] was because of her, for my dissertation. So um, just through that process and through, um, her helping me with submitting articles for publications and coming up with ideas for my dissertation and stuff, like we've just become just really good friends, and really good colleagues. Um, and I think it's not like, overbearing, like I don't see her every week, but if I wanted to see her every week, I could.

Although this story represents those who are satisfied with interaction with their advisor,

others do not think they benefit as much from their interactions.

Several students admitted that they do not think their advisors keep track of their

development. For example, Izzy said, "I don't think she [my advisor] knows at all" about

her professional development. She explained that throughout her time in the program,

she kept in touch more with her course coordinator, who knew more about her career

goals. Advisors can be too focused on their work and be "the classic absent-minded

professor…I remember that…when I started going on the market, like he, like, I

remember he was like, 'Oh,' he looked at my review he was like, 'Oh, I didn't know you

worked on this'" (Paige).

Students also indicated that they wish their advisor would focus on development beyond doctoral education. Alexa described how her advisor talks to her about the future.

> A lot of my interaction with my advisor is 'We'll cross that bridge when we get there.' He's really very much about not putting the cart before the horse. And sort of only revealing things a, as are necessary. So I don't think he does this in a detrimental way in the least. Um, but there are certain things that he is less inclined to sort of speak more concretely about until it gets closer to the time.

Things that will happen in the future that students want to talk about include the tenure process and other aspects of being an assistant professor. Although most participants said they keep in close contact with their advisor and committee, some said they do not discuss careers. Izzy let her committee members know early what she wanted to do and there has been little discussion past that.

> We don't really talk about, you know, career plans. I think the extent of that was my committee asking me what do I want to do after graduation. I let them know, community college teaching. And I think that actually let them know how to help me at this point, so, I don't see them pushing me to publish and pushing me to do those kind of things, because they already know that's not something I need.

Interaction with advisors and committee members helped students know whether they were developing because they could discuss progress in research and teaching. While some students were satisfied with their advisor-advisee relationship, some did not find the relationship to be as helpful in determining progress. Despite informal means of evaluation, students frequently indicated that they have difficult knowing whether they are developing professionally.

Difficulty in Evaluation

Even though students have formal and informal methods of evaluating their progress, they have a hard time knowing whether they were developing. In preparing their job application packet, students relied heavily on advice from faculty members and peers who are a year or two ahead of them. Despite talking to others, "the advice I got was just to sort of go out there and you really won't know until you get out there, just because different schools look for different things" (Paige). There is no one model for hunting for jobs, and students used the advice they could get to develop their job materials. Also, students have the opportunity to look back on their work in school and recognize the development they have made. Hailey explained how she can tell she was properly developed.

> You know, having the benefit of hindsight now you see it in the results so you know that you're somehow being groomed and guided in the right way…I feel like the proof is kind of in the pudding in terms of 'Well, I got through that hoop so I must have been mentored well enough to have done that.'

Although being able to look back on progress is helpful, there may be better practices for helping students know whether they are developing during school.

Elizabeth said she has a hard time know if she is developing professionally because the annual review does accurately reflect achievements and contributions. She explained, "it's really more about like tallies on a sheet, you know, how many things that you've done. So it's hard to know if I'm actually, you know, getting smarter or contributing something meaningful to the, to the knowledge out there." Even when students know that they are developing, it might be hard to show that development.

Caroline noted that "you spend all this time in grad school going through professional development but until you have that job and are doing the job of being a professor or whatever you end up wanting to do, it's hard to show that you've really learned how to be a professional." Madison revealed that "in some ways you feel like you're never prepared" for your future career.

Another way students evaluate their development is by realizing that they are lacking training. Naomi recalled when she learned she was unfamiliar with an important part of the publication process.

> I had like a really serious wakeup call last fall with that with page proofs…And it became very clear very quickly that I had not been well trained in dealing with page proofs. I submitted some stuff that the editor got really upset and she kinda tore into me and that was kind of a moment where I realized that I actually never got any formal training about what does and doesn't happen at this stage and even reading all the instructions and even like the publisher's guidelines didn't prepare me for that.

Naomi chose not to go to her advisor because she was afraid she would be reprimanded. Instead, she talked with her co-authors about how to respond to the editor because she did not know what to do. One of their mentors gave them advice about how to respond to the situation.

Although students have formal and informal means of evaluating their progress, they have difficulty knowing whether they have developed professionally because evaluation is not always as simple as annual reviews and comparing CVs. Advisors and faculty members help in formal and informal evaluation, but there are other ways of understanding development. Sometimes students have to find out they are or are not developing by experiencing and managing a difficult situation.

Conclusion

Regardless of whether students participate in annual reviews or comparison of themselves to other students, knowing whether they are developing professionally can be a mystery. Students may not know whether they have developed until they land their first faculty position; however, it is important for students to understand how they are developing during their doctoral education so they can make needed changes. Informal methods such as observation, comparison, and interaction with faculty members and peers help students make sense of their progress throughout the school year. Formal evaluations like benchmarks and an annual review are more helpful to faculty in tracking student progress than they are to students, especially because students do not receive quality feedback that they can integrate into their pursuit of professional skills, practices, and values. The evaluation process brings the identification of what it means to be a communication professional and how to achieve that professionalism full circle in that it shows whether students are successful in their endeavor.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

This study speaks to Cheney and Ashcraft's (2007) call for research on professionals and professionalism through a communication lens within the context of doctoral education. Specifically, this research explores how professionalism is "done" or accomplished in day-to-day, mundane interactions in the development of communication scholars. This research joins a growing body of communication literature that explores the performance or "doing" professional identity (Ellingson, 2011; Kuhn, 2008; Lammers & Garcia, 2009). My examination of DGSs, doctoral students, and documents begins to reveal what a communication professional is, formal and informal ways to achieve professionalism, and how doctoral student development is evaluated. In this discussion, I revisit each of the research questions and summarize the findings. Second, I draw connections between my findings and the existing literature, highlighting theoretical and practical implications. Finally, I explore the future of professional development research regarding the communication discipline.

Revisiting the Research Questions

The goal of the first research question was to identify how DGSs, doctoral students, and documents defined and constructed professionalism. In keeping with Golde's (2006) work, the results suggest the model communication professional aims to produce original, dynamic research, conserve knowledge created by past scholars, and be a good representative of the discipline to those in and outside of the academy.

Additionally, tenure-track positions at RI institutions have long been and still are considered what a communication professional should strive for; however, DGSs and students acknowledged that the assumption that RI positions represent the pinnacle of professionalism is challenged given the changing state of the academy (Baker & Lattuca, 2010; Boud & Lee, 2009; Mahoney, Mondello, Hums, and Judd, 2004). Directors of graduate studies and doctoral students indicated that most students desire junior faculty positions at institutions with more of a balance between research and teaching, such as RII institutions. Few students are considering non-academic careers that will use their research or teaching skills. Although students indicated they would like to work at specific type of university (RI, RII, liberal arts, community college), they expressed fear that they would have difficulty finding a job after earning the PhD, so they planned to pursue a variety of academic and non-academic career opportunities. Most students repeatedly indicated that they would like an RII or liberal arts career because of the focus on teaching with research as a secondary expectation. DGSs and students seemed to be aware of this shift in student goals, yet development practices were described as being focused on training students for RI jobs.

Despite the mismatch in student goals and actual training, DGSs and students agreed on several characteristics of communication professionals, including the traditional concepts of research, teaching, and service. In addition, as students progressed through their program, they should become more independent from their faculty adviser, specifically in terms of their research activity. While striving for independence, they should also develop the ability to collaborate on research with

faculty members and peers. An overall research goal is to speak to an audience spanning a variety of academic disciplines and to a non-academic audience. In addition to building these skills, students should develop professional values, including collegiality, taking initiative or responsibility, avoiding bad behavior, and work-life balance.

The external actions and internal values echo McGowan and Hart's (1990) description of professional socialization as a process of meeting tangible requirements and shifting the view of the self to match the professional role. DGSs and students identified the qualities listed above as characteristic of communication professionals, and emphasized that students should begin acting professionally during their doctoral program because the scholarly career does not begin once students graduate. Rather, it begins during school when students are building their professional identity and reputation. Students expressed some difficulty in beginning the scholarly career during doctoral education because they experienced tensions between the competing roles of student and teacher. Professional identity is always changing based on individuals' perception toward their role (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). Colbeck (2008) found that role identity can cause students to favor one identity over the other or experience stress.

To avoid this tension, Colbeck (2008) suggests creating an overarching identity that combines the multiple identities. Based on DGS and student responses, it does not appear that this overarching identity has been achieved by students, nor have strategies for creating it been taught by faculty members. If students are not able to create an overarching identity, they will have difficulty knowing whether to prioritize their

student, teacher, or research identity and when. The ability to prioritize identities at varying times signifies that students have reached a higher level of professionalism. Another consequence of identity tension is that the professional identity can overtake the personal. Students acknowledged that work-life balance is a value of a communication professional, noting that most of their professors have not found a balance between work and personal identities.

While the first research question sought to answer *what* a communication professional is, the second research question asked *how* students can attain these characteristics. Specifically, the second research question explored socialization practices, both during initial formal orientation and throughout their program. Departments were found to have socialization programs that hearken to traditional socialization models (Feldman, 1981; Jablin, 1987; Jones, 1986; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Wanous, Reichers, & Malik, 1984). Departments have formal orientation that is meant to introduce students to department norms and culture. Formal and informal activities throughout the program help students assimilate to the norms and become fully integrated members of the department.

Students had little to say about initial orientation and pointed to activities and interactions during the school year as more useful to their development. DGSs and documents detailed orientation activities, revealing that the focus is not professional development so much as it is an informational introduction to department policies, procedures, and expectations regarding research, teaching, and service. Orientation is also an opportunity for senior graduate students to interact with new students. Because

many incoming students are funded through teaching assistantships, a large portion of orientation is devoted to training them to teach or assist in the basic course.

Activities beyond formal orientation were found to be more useful in developing students' professional characteristics and values identified as hallmarks of professionalism. The activities were categorized as formal or informal, similar to Weidman, Twale, and Stein's (2001) model. Formal activities include taking coursework, attending colloquium, engaging in research training outside of coursework, presenting at conferences, publishing, and teaching. Taking professional development and pedagogy seminars and various theory, methods, and content courses helped students learn how to enact professional behaviors. Students expressed both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with course instruction. Some students felt that their professors were providing them with sufficient guidance and feedback to develop their research and teaching abilities, whereas others expressed disappointment with feedback they received from course projects.

In addition to courses, colloquium, both mandatory department-wide and less formal, professional development-focused meetings, were found to develop students because they could see examples of research presentations and spend time talking with faculty about various professional development topics. Practice conference presentations often took place during colloquium to prepare students to present their best work. Professional expectations were also communicated to students throughout their program regarding appropriate convention behavior and how to represent the university and department well.

Although students received formal training to participate in conferences, many cited a lack of formal training in how to publish. Documents formally explained the process, but students pointed to informal development as a way they learned how to publish. Students also expressed disappointment in the formal teaching development they received. They felt that beyond the basic course, they were left to develop their teaching skills on their own. Students identified areas in which their department lacks formal training opportunities, such as a systematic professional development structure and no formal opportunities for non-academic careers. Lack of systematic development has been cited as a factor in doctoral student attrition and poor evaluation practices, and the inability to perform as competent faculty members (Austin, 2002; Ehrenberg, Zuckerman, Groen, and Brucker, 2009; Golde, 2006; Nyquist, 2003).

The areas that students expressed were lacking in formal training were addressed much more in informal development activities. Research and teaching training is accomplished by interacting with faculty members and peers and learning by doing. Interaction is a main way members of an organization learn their specific role (Merton, 1957). In addition, seeking advice from faculty members about how to do activities like research and teaching helped students balance the different parts of their identity (Colbeck, 2008). The practice of mentoring by advisers and faculty members was essential to learning how to do professional activities. Observation also served as a way students learned how they should and should not act as they are performing professional behaviors and activities. Observation has been found to be a primary means of acquiring information for newcomers (Miller & Jablin, 1991; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1992).

Although the students sampled for this research were not newcomers to their

organizations, they were newcomers to some of the scholarly processes, such as

presenting and publishing research.

Peers were found to be a source of support because they share resources and

activities and exchange advice. This finding is consistent with the idea that peers are

vital in professional development (Gardner, 2009b). Fickey and Pullen (2007), in their

discussion of the importance of informal peer networks, note that peer support can be

found in many environments, such as courses or through external social interactions.

Family members with PhDs in communication or another discipline also served as

touchstones for students. Similar to a lack of formal instruction in how to develop for

non-academic careers, networking was the only informal activity pointed to for this type

of development.

The third research question sought to understand how students' professional

development was tracked and evaluated. This process was separated into formal and

informal categories of evaluation. The main way DGSs tracked student achievement was

through an annual review, which identifies whether students have met department-

mandated benchmarks, such as completion of coursework and defense of the

comprehensive examinations, dissertation prospectus, and dissertation. As suggested by

previous studies, these benchmarks are and should be in line with the goals of a doctoral

degree (Austin, 2002; Austin & McDaniels, 2006; Gardner, 2009b).

Students said that the annual review process is mysterious to them because they

do not really know what is said about them, even though they receive feedback about the

results from the faculty meeting where their performance is discussed. Students expressed mixed feelings about the feedback; while most received positive feedback, it was not particularly useful and sometimes inaccurate. This response is in line with Ashford's (1986) finding that the usefulness of feedback decreases as newcomers assimilate into an organization. Devenish et al. (2009) noted that annual reviews are a method by which students can keep track of their progress and reflect on their development, but participants did not confirm that the annual review was an opportunity for them to reflect. Rather, it was a requirement that they had to fulfill.

Although the annual review measures tangible progress in research, teaching, and service, there are a number of other professional behaviors and values that cannot be measured by an annual review. Informal evaluation includes taking note of how students' work improves as well as how their actions become more professional. Students engage in self-evaluation when they compare their achievements in research and teaching to other students'. They also compare how their achievements and abilities have progressed over the course of the program. Many students said they came in with an idea of what it means to be professional because they had worked prior to their doctoral education. Although Goodman, Schlossberg, and Anderson (2006) found that students can have a "hang-over identity" from previous organizations, it appears that students perceived hang-over professionalism from previous jobs as a positive influence in their development. Another informal means of evaluation is interaction with an adviser, committee members, or other faculty members. Evaluation is not without its difficulties. Students mentioned that they could not tell whether they were developing

and said they would not know until they got their first job. Students also realized that they were not adequately trained until they ran into a problem.

Each of the three research questions seeks to understand a different part of professionalism and professional development in the communication discipline. By exploring what a communication professional is, how professionalism is attained, and how development toward professional is evaluated, we can begin to understand how to "do" professionalism in communication. In the next section, themes and issues raised in the analysis are explored in depth to identify implications and areas for future research.

<p align="center">**Challenges and Research Implications**</p>

The findings of this study are important in understanding professional development in the communication discipline because they continue a dialogue that Cheney and Ashcraft (2007) started about the need for research about representing, doing, and politicizing the professional. What this study adds is an understanding of some day-to-day ways to enact professionalism, rather than describe professional development on an abstract level. The following challenges that emerged from the analysis are explored: (1) mismatches between the job market and student expectations, (2) having difficult conversations with advisers, (3) difficulty measuring professional values using current assessment procedures, and (4) the difficulty of accounting for role of the body in white-collar jobs, such as education. These challenges are connected with opportunities for future research.

Mismatches Between the Job Market and Student Expectations

A tension exists between the actual decrease in tenure-track academic positions, caused in part by the economy, and how departments continue to train doctoral students. Directors of graduate studies, students, and documents all recognized that there is a decrease in tenure-track jobs and increase in fixed-term contract work at all types of institutions and an increase in the number of students who take non-academic jobs (Keep, 2009; Walker, 2008). In 2007, the number of full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members composed about 25% of universities' instructional staff (American Federation of Teachers, 2009). A 2010 Department of Education Report showed that of the 46% of faculty members at public universities, 21% had tenure, 9% were on the tenure track, 10% were not on the tenure track, and 7% were employed at universities that did not offer tenure (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Ginder, 2010). At public, doctoral degree-granting institutions, graduate student instructional staff increased from 37.5% to 41% over the course of 10 years (American Federation of Teachers, 2009). Despite the recognition that tenure-track jobs are on the decline, DGSs and students noted that research is the primary focus of doctoral education.

Not only are the number of tenure track jobs declining, but the purpose of tenure in the university also has been questioned. Wilson (2010) indicates that the lack of tenure-track positions is detrimental to universities because instructors will be less inclined to bring up controversial topics in the classroom for fear of losing their jobs. On the other hand, Trower (1999) argues that tenure does not have a system of accountability. Wilson (2010) points out that some scholars do not think the

disappearing tenure system is a bad thing because it no longer meets the needs of the academy. Trower (2009) asserts that today's students do not value the traditional models of teaching prevalent in tenure-track systems. The author calls for the academy to rethink the traditional tenure system to include tenure positions focused on teaching and non-tenure options with higher pay.

The changing job market and a desire to balance research and teaching have led students to pursue jobs at all types of institutions and some non-academic careers. Many students indicated they want teaching-centric careers that do not prioritize research. Teaching is often about knowledge transfer, whereas research is knowledge generation. Despite students' changing focus to teaching, training and development opportunities continue to focus on research training for an RI career. Although student goals emphasize teaching, a focus moving away from research not only undermines placement at an RI university, it also hurts the unique status of the doctoral degree. Teaching can easily be commodified, which diminishes the earning power of those completing the PhD. If students prefer to transfer knowledge and programs begin to deemphasize research, the knowledge that students obtain through a doctorate becomes less valuable and unique among a growing population of fixed-contract employees who are hired to deliver lectures. With the rise of for-profit universities that employ part-time teachers, it is imperative that traditional universities protect their reputation and the rigor of research and teaching (Berg, 2008; Carpenter & Bach, 2012). Doctoral students need to recognize the importance of the research-teaching nexus and its implications.

The link between research and teaching is well documented (Brew & Boud, 1995; Spronken-Smith & Walker, 2010; Visser-Wijnveen, van Driel, van der Rijst, Visser, & Verloop, 2012; Webster, 1985). Research can inform teaching in several ways, including researchers as lifelong learners who can identify with their students, researchers who are enthusiastic about their course topics, and delivering the most up-to-date material in an emphasis area (Healey, Jordan, Pell, & Short, 2010; Jenkins, Blackman, Lindsay, & Paton-Saltzberg, 1998; Robertson & Blackler, 2006). Even those who emphasize teaching will benefit from researching. Those who are earning a PhD for the sole purpose of teaching have unrealistic career expectations because institutions that have been traditionally focused on undergraduate education are requiring more research from faculty members. With the teaching and research requirements of all types of institutions becoming more aligned, students should take a vested interest in developing a range of skills in their doctoral education. Future research might include exploring student perceptions of the connection between research and teaching and how students identify their career goals. They might also include a comparison of the research, teaching, and service expectations of different types of institutions.

Another reason training is not matching student goals is that not all students who want to pursue careers outside the RI context are communicating their goals to their advisers. Although many students told me that they do not intend to pursue an RI career, I do not know what message they communicate to faculty members and advisers. As noted in the analysis, several students admitted that they have not been honest with their faculty adviser about wanting to pursue a career outside the RI context because they fear

their adviser will put less effort into training them. In an adviser-advisee relationship, the adviser has more power than the advisee, and students might believe if they deviate from their adviser's goals, they will be viewed as less valuable.

Eisenberg and Witten's (1987) ideology of openness and Eisenberg's (1984) notion of strategic ambiguity may explain why students are not open with their adviser. It appears that students have not disclosed nonpersonal information, such as career goals, to their adviser for individual, relational, organizational, and environmental reasons. Students are also being strategically ambiguous when they withhold this information from their advisers or let their advisers assume they would like to pursue a career at an RI. However, not disclosing information can negatively affect student goals. If students are not communicating to faculty members that they want a different type of career, faculty members may assume they want to pursue an RI career and train them as such.

An additional explanation for the mismatch between student goals and development opportunities is that students are too broad in their career goals. Students want to conduct a broad search because of the poor job market, but the broad search may make it difficult for faculty members to tailor training and development to students' needs. The PhD is a degree of specialization, not generalization, and as such it is not possible for students to be effectively trained for all types of institutions and non-academic jobs during their doctoral education. Students casting too wide a net make it difficult for advisers or faculty members to help students reach their goal. Directors of graduate studies spoke of research as a skill set that can be applied to many careers, so the issue may also be that this application needs to be more clearly defined for students.

If students have clarity on the usefulness of research skills, they might hone in on one career goal rather than pursuing a range of academic and non-academic careers.

With tenure-track jobs disappearing, the tenure system being questioned in general, and student goals reaching across a variety of academic and non-academic careers, departments need to reflect on their current training and development systems to encompass careers outside the RI context. Departments could integrate activities such as job talk training and CV writing into existing development opportunities or they could create new opportunities altogether. It seems that departments have outlets for discussing these types of topics, but are focusing on research. I do not suggest departments abandon the research focus, but I do recommend departments reframe their existing development opportunities to include training regarding research, teaching, service, and the various practices and characteristics discussed in Chapter III. Future research could identify communication programs implementing development activities addressing contemporary needs and explore how they have affected student preparedness.

Having Difficult Conversations with Advisers

Neither students nor advisers have been trained to engage in difficult conversations. Several students indicated that they are not open with their adviser about non-RI career goals because they fear the adviser will not put as much effort into developing them. Mentors, who are usually faculty advisers, are essential to developing students' professional qualities (Cronon, 2006; Bell-Ellison & Dedrick, 2008; Halse & Malfroy, 2010; Paglis, Green, & Bauer, 2006; Stacy, 2006). Creighton, Creighton, and Parks (2010) identify the mentoring relationship between students and faculty members

as the most significant factor in predicting whether students will complete their doctoral degrees. Despite this evidence that mentoring is essential to student success, Hall and Burns (2009) note that PhDs are rarely taught how to mentor and they usually mentor students how they were mentored themselves. Modeling mentoring behavior does not ensure that PhDs know how to mentor, as mentoring is not "one size fits all."

Hall and Burns (2009) propose that mentors should create a space to discuss students' confusion about their identity as a researcher. Gilbert and Rossman (1992) divided the mentoring relationship into two categories, the professional and the personal. The professional is aimed at coaching students through benchmarks and helping them network. The personal focuses on helping students develop the confidence and self-esteem to complete tasks. This model, as well as the co-creation model, may be useful in understanding how to create a safe space for having hard conversations (Doss & Doss, 2008). In the co-creation model, the adviser facilitates conversations about students' research, helping both individuals to come up with new ideas about the project. Future research could compare adviser and student perspectives on mentoring and what each group finds challenging and helpful.

Difficulty Measuring Professional Values Using Current Assessment Procedures

Evaluation processes measure research and teaching achievements and progress toward benchmarks, but it is very difficult to measure more abstract characteristics such as independence, collaboration, collegiality, initiative, good behavior, and work-life balance and the quality of student work in meeting benchmarks. Directors of graduate studies said they can just "tell," based on observing students, but they usually referred to

their advisees. It would be interesting to identify if and how advisers communicate these observations about development to students. Based on the interviews, it does not appear that advisers discuss this type of development with their students.

In addition to measuring the concrete qualities, the discipline is in need of a more uniform way of tracking students' progress in developing some of the more abstract qualities. One way qualities like these have been studied is in the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) literature. Organizational citizenship behaviors are performed above and beyond what is expected or required of a job (Organ, 1988). They include altruism, volunteering, a positive attitude, organizational loyalty, dependability, cooperation, punctuality, volunteering, conscientiousness, and avoiding complaining (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988, 1997; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Joorman, & Fetter, 1990; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). The literature on OCBs provides a jumping-off point for exploring the abstract qualities of communication professionals in an academic context.

A re-envisioned annual review would measure benchmarks, assess the quality and quantity of research, teaching, and service, and track abstract qualities and values students should develop during their doctoral education. The review process would also encompass a feedback process that is more formalized than most programs have. Feedback is of utmost importance to evaluation (Aspland, Edwards, O'Leary, & Ryan, 1999; Ferguson, 2007; Kumar & Stracke, 2007; Sambrook, Stewart, & Roberts, 2008). The feedback process is integral to evaluation in that if students are not communicated expectations and changes, they will not develop in a positive direction. Future research

could explore how to reframe evaluation processes to measure abstract qualities and values and could examine how feedback can be better communicated to be most effective.

The Role of the Body in White-Collar Work

Another concept to consider in thinking about professional socialization is the role of the physical body. The literature on professions refers largely to white-collar professions such as medicine and law (Abbott, 1988; Carr, 1999; Carr-Saunders, 1966; Evetts, 2003; Freidson, 1986, 1994, 2001; MacDonald, 1995). The mind is a part of the identity for these types of professions because they are characterized by elite knowledge. This literature privileges the role of the mind, but does not emphasize the role of the body in work. Literature on emotional labor and burnout helps to explain the mental toll work can take (Hochschild, 1983; Maslach, 1976, 1982; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Tracy, 2000). Emotional labor describes work in which part of workers' jobs is to exude a specific set of emotions. Tracy (2000) defined organizational burnout as "a general wearing out or alienation from the pressures of work" (p. 95). Burnout comprises emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or impersonal responses toward the recipient of work, and reduced feelings of personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1976, 1982; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Burnout has been examined in the white-collar and blue-collar contexts (Divaris, Polychronopoulou, Taofik, Katsaros, & Eliades, 2012; Schutte, Toppinen, Kalimo, & Schauufeli, 2000). What literature on the professions is missing is research on the role of the body in white-collar work.

The role of the body in blue-collar, or "dirty," work in communication has been researched extensively (Ashcraft, 2005; Berkelaar, Buzzanell, Kisselburgh, Tan, & Shen, 2012; Cowan & Bochantin, 2011; Gibson & Papa, 2000; Lucas, 2011; Lucas & Buzzanell, 2004; Meisenbach, 2010). Some research on white-collar professions hints at the role of the body, but research has not addressed it intentionally. West, Shanafelt, and Cook (2010) found that medical resident well-being, which encompasses mental, physical, and emotional health and fatigue, does not affect medical knowledge competence. The authors measured competence in knowledge, which tests the mind, not the body. However, the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) limited the duty hours of medical residents to 80 hours per week averaged over a four-week period to mitigate physical and mental fatigue. This rule shows that the body affects the work of white-collar professions.

Participants hinted at a few ways the body is at work in professional development. Directors of graduate studies and students brought up the problem of drinking too much at NCA while they are socializing with colleagues and friends. Participants pointed to NCA as a platform for presenting their research to top scholars in the field as well as an environment in which job interviews take place. It follows that students would want to be on their best behavior during conferences and present their most professional self. However, they were warned against drinking too much and engaging in unprofessional conference behavior.

Participants also spoke of their hobbies as a way to relieve their stress. One participant noted that she enjoys doing artwork as a hobby, but a male faculty member

suggested she focus more on her academic performance to be successful. From his perspective, her artwork was infringing on the time and effort she could spend doing research; however, it could be that doing artwork helps her decompress and recharge so she can perform well in her academic work. In this situation, the professional practice of research governs the body's actions by taking priority over non-academic activities. This example is reminiscent of Blair, Brown, and Baxter's (1994) exploration of how the discipline promotes a masculine ideology and set of norms that force us to speak, write, and act in a way that constrains the feminine in scholarly work. We do not know whether activities outside of the academic ideal are beneficial or detrimental to academic success. It could be that hobbies renew students' vigor in research. Future research could examine how extracurricular activities are connected to the development of professional characteristics and values.

Practical Applications

Many practical implications stem from this research, some of which relate to the aforementioned challenges. The first challenge explored student goals of pursuing careers outside the RI context. Doctoral programs' are currently structured such that the curriculum trains students for RI institutions. It would be interesting to understand how a curriculum centered on teaching would differ from the current research-oriented curricula. Professional doctorates, which focus on teaching and practical application, are gaining popularity in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia in the nursing, counseling, psychology, education, and theology disciplines (Bennett & Graham, 2008; Cameron, Frederickson, Lunt, & Lang, 2008; Croussouard, 2008; Davis, Evans, &

Hickey, 2008; Fulton, Kuit, Sanders, & Smith, 2012; Kot & Hendel, 2011; Lee, Brennan, & Green, 2009; Loxley & Seery, 2012; Silvester, 2011). A comparison between professional and traditional doctorate curricula might reveal similarities and differences in topics and modes of instruction.

The second challenge highlights the challenge that advisers and students have not been properly trained to communicate with each other. In addition, mentoring is rarely evaluated, so we do not know whether advisers and mentors are doing a good job (Walker, 2008). One way to understand how advisers interact with students is to put some standards for advising into place. I do not want to suggest that advising be totally standardized, but I do recommend a clearer system of checks and balances to hold advisers and students accountable for a relationship beyond meeting benchmarks. One standard that could be implemented is a requisite number of times students and advisers should meet each term and topics that they could discuss outside of benchmarks, such as how to create a research identity. Weick's (1976) notion of loose coupling resonates with this idea, in that advisers should be given enough flexibility to personalize and individualize advising, but they should be given enough structure to be accountable for developing students. The advising relationship is more than meeting benchmarks; it should be thought of as a relationship in which students and advisers have conversations about all the professional practices and values students should develop.

The advising relationship is also often thought of as an apprenticeship in which the faculty member trains the student. The problem with this model is that it makes the adviser-advisee relationship the key relationship (Cronon, 2006; Ellis & Bell-Dedrick,

2008; Halse & Malfroy, 2010; Paglis, Green, & Bauer, 2006; Stacy, 2006). The literature has not explored other constituents who may be responsible for student development, such as committee members, directors of graduate studies, or professional associations. The committee is often thought of as a group of individuals who show up for defenses and determine whether students pass benchmarks, but their role needs to be explored. The knowledge and expertise committee members can share with students and their implications for student development are often overlooked.

The role of DGSs is also understudied. Although DGSs were interviewed for this research, the literature does not address their role in student development. One way to think about DGSs is as orchestrators of conversation. Directors of graduate studies indicated that they are in charge of formal orientation and many other activities, such as colloquium or professional development workshops. These are all contexts in which DGSs can examine what conversations students and faculty members should be having and with whom. Important conversations do not necessarily need to be standardized, although some of them probably fit better in a formal setting. Some of the important conversations can take place informally, but DGSs have the challenge of thinking of ways to invite students and faculty members to engage in conversations that will enhance students' professionalism.

Although many conversations will occur informally, there are some aspects of professional development that need to be standardized, such as how to give a job talk and how to write a CV. The co-creation model might be helpful here if it is broadened to the departmental level (Foss & Foss, 2008). Perhaps students and faculty members,

specifically the DGS, could work together to identify areas in which students are underdeveloped and collaborate on new development activities. They could also assess the current system and make changes accordingly (Holaday, Weaver, & Nilson, 2007). It seems that most departments employ the same professional development program each year, despite a unique cohort entering the program. Though DGSs need not reinvent the wheel each fall, they could use student ideas to make development activities the most valuable.

Development activities could also include a focus on public scholarship. Several students indicated that want their research to help a community outside of academia. They pointed to teaching as a way they receive timely feedback about their effort. Although teaching offers a kind of instant gratification that does not always come with the publication process, an emphasis on public and engaged scholarship could show students how research can help the community. The research on public and engaged scholarship is extensive and shows how academic work is connected to the community (Barge, Jones, Kensler, Polok, Rianoshek, Simpson, & Shockley-Zalabak, 2008; Barge, Simpson, & Shockley-Zalabak, 2008; Cheney, 2007; Deetz, 2008; Harter, Norander, & Quinlan, 2007; Krone & Harter, 2007; Papa & Singhal, 2007; Simpson & Seibold, 2008; Waldron, 2007; Weaver, 2007). This literature shows how scholars perform research in a variety of public contexts. One participant noted that she engages in public scholarship because her activism informs her research, but if the idea of this type of scholarship was emphasized more in training and development opportunities, perhaps more students could find a way to extend their research to a larger audience.

Limitations of Study

Although this research drew from three populations, it has a number of

limitations that could be explored in future research. First, this sample is limited to

DGSs, students, and documents. Participants spoke frequently of advisers and faculty

members as constituents in their development. Getting these groups' perspectives could

provide a fuller understanding of professional development. An administration

perspective might also be interesting, as it would give the institutional perspective.

Additionally, the doctoral student sample was limited to students who had completed

their comprehensive examinations. Including doctoral students who are in coursework

and are relatively "new" students could provide data for comparison with post

comprehensive exam students.

In addition to difference sources of data, the research methodology could also be

adjusted to collect different kinds of data. This study used interview methodology and

document analysis. Interviews yielded rich, thick data for the analysis, but captured

participant views at one point in time. Other qualitative methods, such as shadowing and

observation, could give layers to this research.

Choosing a different study design would facilitate these methods. This project

used a cross-sectional design and does not examine how issues develop over time. Using

a longitudinal design could show how any of the aforementioned groups develop and

cope with challenges over time. For example, a longitudinal study could track a cohort

of students throughout their degree and track their challenges, successes, and how the

change over time. It would also be interesting to follow a DGS during his or her tenure

in the position to explore how they organize and adjust development opportunities based on the needs of the student population.

Summary

This dissertation aims to understand how professionalism is communicatively constructed among DGSs, students, and documents. My findings show that DGSs, doctoral students, and documents are in agreement that a communication professional is someone who pursues a career at an RI institution. DGSs and students adhered to this idea, although DGSs recognized that few of their students are actually placed at RIs and most students communicated that they would like to find a career at a non-RI university. Despite agreeing that communication professionals are RI researchers, DGSs and students have differing perceptions about how to achieve professionalism. Evaluation processes measure some of the characteristics of communication professionals, such as research, teaching, and service, but do not track development of other less tangible components of professionalism such as collegiality, good behavior, and work-life balance.

REFERENCES

A classification of institutions of higher education. (1994). Princeton, NJ: The

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

A classification of institutions of higher education. (2005). Princeton, NJ: The

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Abbott, A. (1988). The system of professions: An essay on the division of

expert labor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Aitchison, C. (2009). Writing groups for doctoral education. *Studies in Higher*

Education, 34, 905-916.

Albert, S., Ashforth, B. E., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Organizational identity and

identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy*

of Management Review, 25, 13-17.

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In B. M. Staw & L. L.

Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 7, pp. 263-295).

Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Allen, D. G. (2006). Do organizational socialization tactics influence newcomer

embeddedness and turnover? *Journal of Management, 32*, 237-256.

American academic: The state of the higher education workforce 1997-2007. (2009).

Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

American Council for Graduate Medical Education. (2011). *Duty hours: ACGME*

Standards. Retrieved from

http://www.acgme.org/acwebsite/dutyhours/dh_index.asp.

Ashcraft, K. L. (2005). Resistance through consent? Occupational identity, organizational form, and the maintenance of masculinity among commercial airline pilots. *Management Communication Quarterly, 19*, 67-90.

Ashford, S. J. (1986). Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*, 465-487.

Ashford, S. J., & Black. J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 199-214.

Ashforth, B. E., & Johnson, S. A. (2001). Which hat to wear? The relative salience of multiple identities in organizational contexts. In M. A. Hogg, & D. J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts* (pp. 31-48). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Ashforth, B. E. (2001). *Role transitions in organizational life: An identity-based perspective.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20-39.

Aspland, T., Edwards, H., O'Leary, J., & Ryan, Y. (1999). Tracking new directions in the evaluation of postgraduate supervision. *Innovative Higher Education, 24*, 127-147.

Atwell, R. H. (1996). Doctoral education must match the nation's needs and the realities of the marketplace. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 43(14)*, B4-B5.

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as

socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*, 94-122.

Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Preparing for the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 397-486). New York: Agathon Press.

Baker, V. L., & Lattuca, L. R. (2010). Developmental networks and learning: Toward an interdisciplinary perspective on identity development during doctoral study. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*, 807-827.

Barber, B. (1965). Some problems in the sociology of the professions. In K. S. Lynn (Ed.), *The professions in America* (pp. 15-34). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Barnes, N. J., & Austin, A. E. (2009). The role of doctoral advisors: A look at advising from the advisor's perspective. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*, 297-316.

Basken, P. (2010, June 22). New grilling of for-profits could turn up the heat for all of higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 587-595.

Barge, J. K., Jones, J. E., Kensler, M., Polok, N., Rianoshek, R., Simpson, J. L., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2008). A practitioner view toward engaged scholarship. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 245-250.

Barge, J. K., Simpson, J. L., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2008). Introduction: Toward

purposeful and practical models of engaged scholarship. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 243-244.

Bell-Ellison, B. A., & Dedrick, R. F. (2008). What do doctoral students value in their ideal mentor? *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 555-567.

Bennett, Z., & Graham, E. (2008). The professional doctorate in practical theology: Developing the researching professional in practical theology in higher education. *The Journal of Adult Theological Education, 5*, 33-51.

Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some exploration in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*, 99-112.

Berkelaar, B. L., Buzzanell, P. M., Kisselburgh, L. G., Tan, W., & Shen, Y. (2012). "First, it's dirty. Second, it's dangerous. Third, it's insulting": Urban Chinese children talk about dirty work. *Communication Monographs, 79*, 93-114.

Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 3*, 27-52.

Blair, C., Brown, J. R., & Baxter, L. A. (1994). Disciplining the feminine. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 80*, 383-409.

Blum, L. D. (2010). The 'all but dissertation' student and the psychology of the doctoral dissertation. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 24*, 74-85.

Boud, D., & Lee, A. (2009). *Changing practices of doctoral education*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L. (1992). *In pursuit of the PhD*. Princeton, NJ:

Princeton University Press.

Brew, A., & Boud, D. (1995). Teaching and research: Establishing the vital link with learning. *Higher Education, 29*, 261-273.

Brim, O. G. Jr., & Wheeler, S. (1966). *Socialization after childhood: Two essays.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, D., & Ferrell, M. J. (2009). The taxonomy of professionalism: Reframing the academic pursuit of professional development. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 73*, 1-10.

Bullis, C., & Bach, B. W. (1989). Socialization turning points: An examination of change in organizational identification. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 53*, 273-293.

Cable, D. M., & Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 1-23.

Cameron, R. J., Frederickson, N., Lunt, I., & Lang, J. (2008) Changing professional views of continuing professional development in educational psychology. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 24*, 251-267.

Carpenter, A. and Bach, C. (Forthcoming). Administrative and academic structures: for profit and not-for-profit. In *The Strategic Management of Higher Education.* H. Kazeroony, (Ed.), Addison, TX: Business Express Press.

Carr, D. (1999). Professional education and professional ethics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 16*, 33-46.

Carr-Saunders, A. M. (1966). Professionalization in the historical perspective. In H.

M. Vollmer & D. L. Mills (Eds.), *Professionalization* (pp. 2-9). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Charmaz, K. (1995). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith, R. Harre (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 27-49). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2001). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. F. Gubrium and H. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research* (pp. 675-694). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheney, G. (2007). Organizational communication comes out. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 80-91.

Cheney, G., & Ashcraft, K. L. (2007). Considering "the professional" in communication studies: Implications for theory and research within and beyond the boundaries of organizational communication. *Communication Theory, 17*, 146-175.

Church, S. E. (2009). Facing reality: What are doctoral students' chances for success? *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36*, 307-316.

Clair, R. P. (1996). The political nature of the colloquialism, "A real job": Implications for organizational socialization. *Communication Monographs, 63*, 249-267.

Colbeck, C. L. (2008). Professional identity development theory and doctoral education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 113*, 9-16.

Cohen, J. L. (2008). 'That's not treating you as a professional': Teachers constructing

complex professional identities through talk. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 14*(2): 79-93.

Comer, D. R. (1991). Organizational newcomers' acquisition of information from peers. *Management Communication Quarterly, 5*, 64-89.

Cooper-Thomas, H., & Anderson, N. (2002). Newcomer adjustment: The relationship between organizational socialization tactics, information acquisition and attitudes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*, 423-437.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cowan, R. L., & Bochantin, J. E. (2011). Blue-collar employees' work/life metaphors: Tough similarities, imbalance, separation, and opposition. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 12*, 19-26.

Craig, K. M. (1996). Are all newcomers judged similarly? Distinctiveness and time of entry in task-oriented groups. *Small Group Research, 27*, 383-397.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory, 9*, 119-161.

Creighton, L., Creighton, T., & Parks, D. (2010). Mentoring to degree completion: Expanding the horizons of doctoral protégés. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 18*, 39-52.

Creswell, J. W. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2010). *The mixed methods reader.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronon, W. (2006). Getting ready to do history. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education* (pp. 327-350). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crossouard, B. (2008). Developing alternative models of doctoral supervision with online formative assessment. *Studies in Continuing Education, 30*, 51-67.

David, O., & Bar-Tal, D. A sociopsychological conception of collective identity: The case of national identity as an example. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 13*, 354-379.

Davis, H., Evans, T., Hickey, C. (2006). A knowledge-based economy landscape: Implications for tertiary education and research training in Australia. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 28*, 231-244.

Deetz, S. (2008). Engaging as co-generative theorizing. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 289-297.

Denecke, D. D., Frasier, H. S., & Redd, K. E. (2009). The council of graduate schools' PhD Completion Project. In R. G. Ehrenberg and C. V. Kuh (Eds.), *Doctoral education and the faculty of the future* (pp. 35-52) Ithaca, NY: Cornell

University Press.

Devenish, R., Dyer, S., Jefferson, T., Lord, L., van Leeuwen, S., & Fazakerley, V. (2009). Peer to peer support: The disappearing work in the doctoral student experience. *Higher Education Research and Development, 28*, 59-70.

Dillon, S. (2007, Feb 11). Troubles grow for a university built on profits. *New York Times,* pp. 1.1.

Divaris, K., Polychronopoulou, A., Taofik, K., Katsaros, C., & Eliades, T. (2011). Stress and burnout in postgraduate dental education. *European Journal of Dental Education, 16*, 35-42.

Dukerich, J. M., Golden, B. R., & Shortell, S. M. (2002). Beauty is in the eye of the beholder: The impact of organizational identification, identity, and image on the cooperative behaviors of physicians. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*, 507-533.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 239-263.

Echabe, A. E. (2010). Role identities versus social identities: Masculinity, femininity, instrumentality and communality. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 13*, 30-43.

Ehrenberg, R. G., Zuckerman, H., Groen, J. A., & Brucker, S. M. (2009). Changing the education of scholars: An introduction to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's Graduate Education Initiative. In R. G. Ehrenberg and C. V. Kuh (Eds), *Doctoral education and the faculty of the future* (pp. 15-34). Ithaca, NY: Cornell

University Press.

Eisenberg, E. M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication. *Communication Monographs, 51*, 227-242.

Eisenberg, E. M., & Witten, M. G. (1987). Reconsidering openness in organizational communication. *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 418-426.

Ellingson, L. L. (2008). *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellingson, L. L. (2011). The poetics of professionalism among dialysis technicians. *Health Communication, 26*, 1-12.

Esland, G. (1980). Professions and professionalism. In G. Esland & G. Salaman (Eds) *The politics of work and occupations* (pp. 212-250). Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.

Evans, L. (2008). Professionalism, professionality and the development of education professionals. *British Journal of Education Studies, 56*, 20-38.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Evetts, J. (2003). The sociological analysis of professionalism: Occupational change in the modern world. *International Sociology, 18*, 395–415.

Evetts, J. (2009). The management of professionalism: A contemporary paradox. In S. Gewirtz, P. Mahony, I. Hextall, & A. Cribb (Eds.), *Changing teacher professionalism: International trends, challenges and ways forward* (pp. 19-30). London: Routledge.

Evetts, J. (2011). A new professionalism? Challenges and opportunities. *Current Sociology, 59*, 406-422.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 433-452.

Feldman, D. C. (1977). The role of initiation activities in socialization. *Human Relations, 30*, 977-990.

Feldman, D. C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management Review, 6*, 309-318.

Ferguson, P. (2007). Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36*, 51-62.

Fickey, A., & Pullen, E. (2007). Maintaining sanity in graduate school: A brief commentary on the significant of informal networks. *The Geographical Bulletin, 52*, 64-66.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. (1991). *Social cognition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Foss, K. A., & Foss, S. A. (2008). Accomplishing the mission: Creating a partnership with your advisor. In S. Morreale & P. Arneson (Eds.), *Getting the most from your graduate education in communication: A student's handbook* (pp. 59-70). Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association.

Fournier, V. (1999). The appeal to 'professionalism' as a disciplinary mechanism. *Social Review, 47*, 280–307.

Fox, C. J. (1992). What do we mean when we say "professionalism?" A language usage analysis for public administration. *The American Review of Public*

Administration, 22, 1-17.

Freidson, E. (1986). *Professional powers: A study of the institutionalization of formal knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freidson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn: Theory, prophecy, and policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The third logic*. Cambridge: Polity.

Friedman, A., & Phillips, M. (2004). Continuing professional development: Developing a vision. *Journal of Education and Work, 17*(3), 361-376.

Fullan, M. G., & Hargreaves, A. (1992) Teacher development and educational change. In M. Fullan and A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher Development and Educational Change* (pp. 1-9). London: Falmer.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fulton, J., Kuit, J., Sanders, G., & Smith, P. (2012). The role of the professional doctorate in developing professional practice. *Journal of Nursing Management, 20*, 130-139.

Ganesh, S., & McAllum, K. (2010). Proceedings from National Communication Association 2010: *Volunteering and professionalization: Tensions and trends.*

Gardner, S. K. (2008a). Fitting the mold of graduate school: A qualitative study. *Innovations in Higher Education, 33*, 125-138.

Gardner, S. K. (2008b). 'What's too much and what's too little?': The process of becoming an independent researcher in doctoral education. *The Journal of*

Higher Education, 79, 326-350.

Gardner, S. K. (2009a). Conceptualizing success in doctoral education: Perspectives

of faculty in seven disciplines. *The Review of Higher Education, 32*, 383-406.

Gardner, S. K. (2009b). The development of doctoral students: Phases of challenge

and support. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 34*(6). San Francisco: Wiley.

Gardner, S. K., & Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for

the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 369-387.

Gibson, M. K., & Papa, M. J. (2000). The mud, the blood, and the beer guys:

Organizational osmosis in blue-collar work groups. *Journal of Applied*

Communication Research, 28, 68-88.

Giddings, F. H. (1897). *The theory of socialization.* New York: Macmillan.

Gilbert, L. A., & Rossman, K. M. (1992). Gender and the mentoring process for

women: Implications for professional development. *Professional Psychology:*

Research and Practice, 23, 233-238.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* Chicago: Aldine.

Golde, C. M. (1998). Beginning graduate school: Explaining first-year doctoral

attrition. In M.S. Anderson (Ed.), *The experience of being in graduate school:*

An exploration (pp. 55-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Golde, C. M. (2006). Preparing stewards of the discipline. In C. M. Golde & G. E.

Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education.* San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Goodman, J., Schlossberg, N. K., & Anderson, M. L. (2006). *Counseling adults in*

transition: Linking practice with theory. New York: Springer.

Gruman, J. A., Saks, A. M., & Zweig, D. I. (2006). Organizational socialization tactics and newcomer proactive behaviors: An integrative study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*, 90-104.

Guskey, T. R., & Huberman, M. (1995). *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices*. New York, Teachers College Press.

Hall, L. A., & Burns, L. D. (2009). Identity development and mentoring in doctoral education. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*, 49-70.

Halse, C., & Malfroy, J. (2010). Retheorizing doctoral supervision as professional work. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*, 79-92.

Harter, L. M., Norander, S., & Quinlan, M. M. (2007). Imaginative renderings in the service of renewal and reconstruction. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 105-117.

Harries-Jenkins, G. (1970). Professionals in organizations. In J. A. Jackson (Ed.), *Professions and professionalization.* (pp. 53-107). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Healey, M., Jordan, F., Pell, B., & Short, C. (2010). The research-teaching nexus: A case study of students' awareness, experiences, and perceptions of research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 47*, 235-246.

Helsby, G. (1995). Teachers' construction of professionalism in England in the 1990s. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 21*, 317-332.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*.

Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hogg, M. A., (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 184-200.

Hogg, M. A., & Reid, S. A. (2006). Social identity, self-categorization, and the communication of group norms. *Communication Theory, 16*, 7-30.

Holaday, B., Weaver, K. A., & Nilson, L. B. (2007). Revisioning graduate professional development programs. *College Teaching, 55*(3), 99-103.

Holmer Nadesan, M., & Trethewey, A. (2000). Performing the enterprising subject: Gendered strategies for success (?). *Text and Performance Quarterly, 20*, 223-250.

Hoyle, E., & Wallace, M. (2007). Educational reform: An ironic perspective. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 35*, 9-25.

Jablin, F. M. (1987). Organization entry, assimilation, and exit. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, and L. W. Porter (Eds), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 679-740). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jenkins, A. Blackman, T., Lindsey, R., & Paton-Saltzberg, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Student perspectives and policy implications. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*, 127-141.

Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*. New York: Routledge.

Johnson, T. (1972). *Professions and power*. London: Macmillan.

Johnson, M., Morgeson, F. P., Ilgen, D. R., Meyer, C. J., & Lloyd, J. W. (2006).

Multiple professional identities: Examining differences in identification across work related targets. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 498-506.

Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 29*, 262-279.

Jorgenson, J. (2002). Engineering selves: Negotiating gender and identity in technical work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*, 350-380.

Keep, C. (2009). The last assistant professor: Professionalization and the non academic job market. *English Studies in Canada, 35*(4), 19-22.

Keltikangas, K., & Martinsuo, M. (2009). Professional socialization of electrical engineers in university education. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 34*, 87-95.

Kimball, B. A. (1992). *The 'true professional ideal' in America: A history.* Cambridge & Oxford: Blackwell.

King, N. (2004). Using templates in the thematic analysis of text. In C. Cassell and G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 256-270). London: Sage.

Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, J. E., & Ginder, S. A. (2010). *Employees in postsecondary institutions, Fall 2009, and salaries of full-time instructional staff, 2009-10: First look*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Kot, F. C., & Hendel, D. D. (2011). Emergence and growth of professional doctorates in the United States, United Kingdom, Canada and Australia: A comparative analysis. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*, 345-364.

Krone, K. J., & Harter, L. M. (2007). Forum introduction: Organizational communication scholars as public intellectuals. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 75-79.

Kuhn, T. (2009). Positioning lawyers: Discursive resources, professional ethics and identification. *Organization, 16*, 681-704.

Kuhn, T., & Nelson, N. (2002). Reengineering identity: A case study of the multiplicity and duality in organizational identification. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 5-38.

Kumar, V., & Stracke, E. (2007). An analysis of written feedback on a PhD thesis. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*, 461-470.

Lammers, J. C., & Garcia, M. A. (2009). Exploring the concept of "profession" for organizational communication research: Institutional influences in a veterinary organization. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 357-384.

Larkin, G. (1983). *Occupational monopoly and modern medicine*. London: Tavistock.

Larson, M. L. (1977). *The rise of professionalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lee, A. (2008). How are doctoral students supervised? Concepts of doctoral research supervision. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*, 267-281.

Lee, A. Brennan, M., & Green, B. (2009). Re-imagining doctoral education: Professional doctorates and beyond. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*, 275-287.

Lewin, T. (2010, Nov 9). Scrutiny takes toll on for-profit college company. *New York*

Times, pp. 1-9

Lindlof, T. R. (1995). *Qualitative research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Lowe, J., & Gayle, V. (2010). Towards a new definition of professionalism for college leaders: A Scottish perspective. *Management in Education, 24*, 159-165.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25*, 226-251.

Loxley, A., & Seery, A. (2011). The role of the professional doctorate in Ireland from the student perspective. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*, 3-17.

Lucas, K. (2011). Blue-collar discourses of workplace dignity: Using outgroup comparisons to construct positive identities. *Management Communication Quarterly, 25*, 353-374.

Lucas, K., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2004). Blue-collar work, career, and success: Occupational narrative of *sisu. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32*, 273-292.

Lucas, K., & Steimel, S. J. (2009). Creating and responding to the gen(d)eralized other: Women miners' community-constructed identities. *Women's Studies in Communication, 32*, 320-347.

Lyons, N. (2008). Reflective engagement as professional development in the lives of university teachers. *Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice, 12*(2), 151-168.

McArdle, K., & Coutts, N. (2010). Taking teachers' continuous professional development (CPD) beyond reflection: Adding shared sense-making and collaborative engagement for professional renewal. *Studies in Continuing Education, 32*(3), 201-215.

McCall, G., & Simmons, J. (1978). *Identities and interactions.* New York: Free Press.

McGowen K. R., & Hart, L. E. (1990). Still different after all these years: Gender differences in professional identity formation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 21(2), 118–123.

MacDonald, K. M. (1995). *The sociology of the professions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mahoney, D. F., Mondello, M., Hums, M. A., & Judd, M. R. (2004). Are sports management doctoral programs meeting the needs of the faculty job market? Observations for today and the future. *Journal of Sport Management, 18*, 91-100.

Mana, A., Orr, E., & Mana, Y. (2009). An integrated acculturation model of immigrants' social identity. *Journal of Social Psychology, 149*, 450-473.

Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior, 5*, 16-22.

Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). *The Maslach burnout inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.

Meisenbach, R. J. (2008). Working with tensions: Materiality, discourse, and (dis)empowerment in occupational identity negotiation among higher education fund-raisers. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 258-287.

Meisenbach, R. J. (2010). Stigma management communication: A theory and agenda for applied research on how individuals manage moments of stigmatized identity. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 38*, 268-292.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

Mignerey, J. T., Rubin, R. B., & Gorden, W. I. (1995). Organizational entry: An investigation of newcomer communication behavior and uncertainty. *Communication Research, 22*, 54-85.

Miller, K. (1998). The evolution of professional identity: The case of osteopathic medicine. *Social Science Medicine, 47*, 1739-1748.

Miller, S. E. (2010). A conceptual framework for the professional socialization of social workers. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 20*, 924-938.

Miller, V. (1996). An experimental study of newcomers' information seeking behaviors during organizational entry. *Communication Studies, 47*, 1-24.

Miller, V., & Jablin, F. (1991). Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review, 16*, 92-120.

Moreland, R. L. (1985). Social categorization and the assimilation of 'new' group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 1173-1190.

Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1982). Socialization in small groups: Temporal

changes in individual-group relations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in

experimental social psychology: Vol. 15* (pp. 137–192). New York: Academic

Press.

Morgan, J. M., Reynolds, C. M., Nelson, T. J., Johanningmeier, A. R., Griffin, M., &

Andrade, P. (2004). Tales from the fields: Sources of employee identification in

agribusiness. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*, 360-395.

Morreale, S., & Arneson, P. (2008). *Getting the most from your graduate education in

communication: A student's handbook*. Washington, D. C.: National

Communication Association.

Nerad, M. (2009). Confronting common assumptions: Designing future-oriented

doctoral education. In R. G. Ehrenberg and C. V. Kuh (Eds.), *Doctoral education

and the faculty of the future*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Nettles, M. T., & Millett, C. M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to Ph. D.*

Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Nixon, J. Martin, J. McKeown, P., & Ranson, S. (1997). Towards a learning profession:

Changing codes of occupational practice within the new management of

education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18*, 5-28.

Noordegraaf, M. (2011). Remaking professionals? How associations and

professional education connect professionalism and organizations. *Current

Sociology, 59*, 465-488.

Noordegraaf, M., & Van der Meulen, M. (2008). Professional power play: Organizing

management in health care. *Public Administration, 86*, 1055-1069.

Nyquist, J. D. (2003). The PhD: A tapestry of change for the 21st century. *Change, 34(6)*: 13-20.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1992). Organizational socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 845-874.

Paglis, L. L., Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (2006). Does advisor mentoring add value? A longitudinal study of mentoring and doctoral student outcomes. *Research in Higher Education, 47*, 451-476.

Papa, M. J., & Singhal, A. (2007). Intellectuals searching for publics: Who is out there? *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 126-136.

Parker, R. (2009). A learning community approach to doctoral education in the social sciences. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*, 43-54.

Parsons, T. (1939). The professions and social structure. *Social Forces, 17*, 457–467.

Pathak, V. & Pathak, K. (2010). Reconfiguring the higher education value chain. *Management in Education, 24*, 166-171.

Phinney, J. S. (2008). Bridging identities and disciplines: Advances and challenges in understanding multiple identities. In M. Azmitia, M. Syed, & K. Radmacher (Eds.), *The intersections of personal and social identities: New directions for child and adolescent development* (Vol. 120, pp. 97-109). New York: Wiley.

Piekkarai, R., Welch, C., & Paavilainen, E. (2009). The case study as disciplinary convention: Evidence from business journals. *Organizational Research Methods, 3,* 567-589.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*, 513-563.

Poock, M. (2002). Graduate student orientation: Assessing needs and method of delivery. *Journal of College Student Development, 43*, 231-245.

Potter, W. (2003). Public colleges try to show their value states, but not everyone convinced. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(35), A26.

Pyhalto, K., Stubb, J., & Lonka, K. (2009). Developing scholarly communities as learning environments for doctoral students. *International Journal for Academic Development, 14*(3), 221-232.

Reed, M. I. (1996). Expert power and control in late modernity: An empirical review and theoretical synthesis. *Organization Studies, 17*, 573-597.

Robertson, J., & Blackler, G. (2006). Students' experiences of learning in a research environment. *Higher Education Research and Development, 25*, 215-229.

Russo, T. C. (1998). Organizational and professional identification. *Management Communication Quarterly, 12*, 72-111.

Sambrook, S., Stewart, J., & Roberts, C. (2008). Doctoral supervision ... a view from above, below and the middle! *Journal of Further & Higher Education, 32*, 71-84.

Scarduzio, J. A. (2011). Maintaining order through deviance? The emotional deviance, power, and professional work of municipal court judges. *Management Communication Quarterly, 25*, 283-310.

Schein, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Industrial Management Review, 9*, 1-16.

Schiappa, E. (2009). *Professional development during your doctoral education*. Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association.

Schutte, N., Toppinen, S., Kalimo, R., & Schaufeli, W. (2000). The factorial validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) across occupational groups and nations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 53-66.

Scott, C. R. (2001). Establishing and maintaining customer loyalty and employee identification in the new economy : A communicative response. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 629-636.

Scott, C. R. (2007). Communication and social identity theory: Existing and potential connections in organizational identification research. *Communication Studies, 58*, 123-138.

Scott, W. R. (2008). Lords of the dance: Professionals as institutional agents. *Organization Studies, 29*, 219-238.

Shortland, S. (2010). Feedback within peer observation: Continuing professional development and unexpected consequences. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 47*(3), 295-204.

Silvester, A. (2010). Doing a doc!—The thoughts, experiences and relationships of students undertaking a professional in counseling. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research: Linking Research with Practice, 11*, 179-185.

Simpson, J. L., & Seibold, D. R. (2008). Practical engagements and co-created research. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 266-280.

Slaughter, J. E., & Zickar, M. J. (2006). A new look at the role of insiders in the newcomer socialization process. *Group and Organization Management, 31*, 264-290.

Spronken-Smith, R., & Walker, R. (2010). Can inquiry-based learning strengthen the links between teaching and disciplinary research? *Studies in Higher Education, 35*, 723-740.

Stacy, A. M. (2006). Training future leaders. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education* (pp. 187-206). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Starbuck, W. H. (1992). Learning by knowledge-intensive firms. *Journal of Management Studies, 29*, 713-740.

Stryker, S. (1987). Identity theory: Developments and extensions. In K. Yardley & T.

Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity* (pp. 89-104). New York: Wiley.

Stryker, S., and Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*, 284–297.

Suddaby, R., & Viale, T. (2011). Professionals and field-level change: Institutional work and the professional project. *Current Sociology, 59*, 423-442.

Sweitzer, V. B. (2009). Towards a theory of doctoral student professional identity development: A developmental networks approach. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*(1), 1-33.

Tajfel, H. (1959). Quantitative judgment in social perception. *British Journal of Psychology, 50*, 16-29.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*(2), 96-102.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tajfel, H., Nemeth, C., Jahoda, G., Campbell, J. D., & Johnson, N. B. (1970). The development of children's preferences for their own country: A cross-national study. *International Journal of Psychology, 5*, 245-253.

The Council of Graduate Schools (2005). *Assessment and review of graduate programs: A policy statement.* Washington, D.C.: The Council of Graduate Schools.

Thoits, P. A., & Virshup, L. V. (1997). Me's and we's: Forms and functions of social identities. In R. Ashmore, & L. Jussim (Eds.), *Self and identity: Fundamental issues* (pp. 106-133). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce: Emotional labor, self subordination, and discursive construction of identity in a total institution. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 90-128.

Tracy, S. J., & Scott, C. (2006). Sexuality, masculinity, and taint management among fire- fighters and correctional officers: Getting down and dirty with "America's heroes" and the "scum of law enforcement." *Management Communication Quarterly, 20*, 6-38.

Tracy, S. J., & Trethewey, A. (2005). Fracturing the real-self<->fake-self dichotomy: Moving toward "crystallized" organizational discourses and identities. *Communication Theory, 15*, 168-195.

Trower, C. (1999). The trouble with tenure. *Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 79*, 24-29.

Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes:*

Theory and research (pp. 77-122). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Turner, C., & Hodge, M. N. (1970). Occupations and professions. In J. A. Jackson (Ed.)
Professions and professionalization (pp. 19-50). Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987).
Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford, England:
Blackwell.

Van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and correlates of
organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational
Psychology, 73*, 137-147.

Van Maanen, J. (1975). Breaking in: A consideration of organizational socialization.
In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of work, organization, and society* (pp. 67-130).
Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Towards a theory of organizational
socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavior*, *1*, 209-
264. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Van Note Chism, N. (1998). Preparing graduate students to teach: Past, present, and
future. In M. Marincovich, J. Prostko, & F. Stout (Eds.), *The professional
development of graduate teaching assistants*, (pp. 1-18). Boston: Anker.

Visser-Wijnveen, G. J., van Driel, J. H., van der Rijst, R. M., Visser, A., & Verloop, N.
(2012). Relating academics' ways of integrating research and teaching to
their students' perceptions. *Studies in Higher Education, 37*, 219-234.

Waldron, V. R. (2007). Public scholarship, relational practice: A reflection on

"virtuous" partnerships. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 118-125.

Walker, G. (2008). Doctoral education in the United States of America. *Higher*

Education in Europe, 33, 35-43.

Wanberg, C. R., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of

proactivity in the socialization process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*,

373-385.

Wanous, J. P, Reichers, A. E., & Malik, S. D. (1984). Organizational socialization and

group development: Toward an integrative perspective. *Academy of*

Management Review, 9, 670–683.

Watts, J. H. (2009). Points of departure: From professional to PhD student:

Challenges of status transition. *Teaching in Higher Education, 14*(6), 687-691.

Weaver, C. K. (2007). Reinventing the public intellectual through communication

dialogue civic capacity building. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*,

92-104.

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*.

Berkeley: University of California Press.

Webster, D. S. (1985). Does research productivity enhance teaching? *Educational*

Record, 60, 60-63.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems.

Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Wegner, G. R. (2008). *Partnerships for public purposes: Engaging higher education in*

societal challenges of the 21ˢᵗ Century. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

West, C. P., Shanafelt, T. D., & Cook, D. A. (2010). Lack of association between resident doctors' well-being and medical knowledge. *Medical Education, 44,* 1224-1231.

Williams, J. J. (2012, Feb. 19). Deconstructing academe: The birth of critical university studies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Wilson, R. (2010, July 4). Tenure, RIP: What the vanishing status means for the future of education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

APPENDIX A

DIRECTOR OF GRADUATE STUDIES INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What kinds of professions are you trying to develop doctoral students for?

    1a. What kind of professions do you emphasize in your doctoral program?

    1b. Academic vs. non-academic?

2. How does your program develop students for these kinds of professions?

    2a. Academic vs. non-academic?

    3a. What types of skill sets do you help students develop?

3. What does it mean to behave professionally in an academic career?

    3a. In a non-academic career?

    3b. Are there characteristics that cross over both contexts?

4. What does it mean for a doctoral student to behave professionally?

    4a. If a graduate student is behaving professionally as he/she performs his/her

    responsibilities, what is he/she doing?

    4b. What should he/she be doing?

    4c. What are your expectations for what it means for doctoral students to

    behave professionally?

    4d. Are there ways of behaving professionally in preparing for academic vs.

    non-academic careers?

5. Where does professional development get talked about in your department?

    5a. With whom?

5b. About what?

6. Does your department have a formal orientation for incoming and returning doctoral students students?

    6a. How is that formal orientation structured?

    6b. What do you cover?

    6c. Why?

    6d. How does that initial orientation help prepare doctoral students for future careers?

7. What activities do you feel your department does particularly well in developing doctoral students?

    7a. Which of these activities has had the most impact on the development of graduate students' professionalism?

    7b. Least?

    7c. Why?

8. How do you know if your students are developing professionally?

    8a. What are they showing you?

9. How do you track and evaluate graduate students' professional development?

APPENDIX B

DOCTORAL STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What kind of career do you want to pursue when you graduate with your doctorate?

   1a. What led you to choose that path?

2. What does it mean to behave professionally in that kind of career context?

   2a. If you are behaving professionally in that career context, what are you doing?

   2b. What should you be doing?

   2c. What are the norms that are associated with professional conduct in that career context?

3. How has your doctoral program prepared you for your chosen profession?

4. What departmental activities have helped you develop your professionalism?

   4a. What activities have helped your ability to behave professionally?

   4b. Does your department have a formal orientation for new and returning students?

5. What does it mean to behave professionally as a communication doctoral student?

   5a. If you are behaving professionally in your activities as a graduate student, what are you doing?

   5b. What should you be doing?

5c. If your advisor were here, what would he/she say about how you behave professionally?

6. How do you think what it means to behave professionally as a graduate student is different from what it means to behave professionally in your future career?

7. How do you know if you are developing professionally?

8. How do different people in your department, such as faculty members, your advisor, or director of graduate studies know if you are developing as a communication professional?

8a. What kind of feedback or messages do you receive about your professional development?

8b. From whom?

8c. About what?

9. Who do you talk to about what it means to become a professional?

VITA

Rachel Lynne Rashe received her Bachelor of Arts degree in English and journalism from the University of Arkansas in 2006, her Master of Arts degree in communication from the University of Arkansas in 2008, and her Doctor of Philosophy in communication from Texas A&M University in 2012. Her research interests include professional socialization and development, organizational identity, and organizational socialization in higher education contexts. Dr. Rashe may be reached at rachel.reed11@gmail.com.