2010

I want to be my own person: the meaning-making and psychosocial processes of legacy students at Bucknell University

Jarrett B. Warshaw
Bucknell University

Permission to Copy

I, Jarrett B. Warshaw, do grant permission for my thesis to be copied.

“I WANT TO BE MY OWN PERSON”: THE MEANING-MAKING AND PSYCHOSOCIAL PROCESSES OF LEGACY STUDENTS AT BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY

by

Jarrett B. Warshaw

(A Thesis)

Presented to the Faculty of
Bucknell University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Education

Approved: ______________________________
Adviser

____
Department Chairperson

October 2010

Acknowledgements

I offer my deepest thanks to Professors Joe Murray and Richard Henne, for their teachings, advisement, and mentorship. The spirit of our collaborative, collegial relationship, and, of course, too, their editorial feedback, is embedded in each word of this thesis. I am grateful as well to the following Bucknell University faculty, staff, and community members, who have supported both directly and indirectly the research and writing process: Lynn Hoffman, Sue Ellen Henry, Diane Goodling, Rosaria Gabriele, Serena Fujita, Abe Feuerstein and the IRB committee, Emily and the Singleton family, and Lana, Jeb, and Alex Bird. To the extraordinary women who have participated in the study — your generous, open, and steadfast contributions to the project inspires hope for the next generation and for the people into whom you are blooming. I am indebted to you, especially. It has been an honor — a gift — to include Karen Arnold in the review and defense of the study, a scholar and colleague of the highest order. My family, a source of joy, sustenance, meaning, strength, is felt here on every page, and I write and live according to the rhythm, to the enduring presence, of our love.

Table of Contents

Abstract

This study examined the meaning-making and psychosocial processes of five female legacy students at Bucknell University, each of whom having had at least one parent graduate from the institution. With a research philosophy, design, and methodology rooted in qualitative inquiry and phenomenology, inductive data analysis led to three primary categories that underscored legacy identity development. The first, *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, revealed through six themes nuanced experiences of separation-individuation. Second, *Teaching and Learning*, comprised of five themes, illuminated the impact of family — and of Bucknell parent alumni in particular — on their children's internal working models. Lastly, *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* and the five themes grouped therein highlighted the contributions of University community members, and of the campus culture and climate itself, to the co-construction of psychosocial formation. A tentative outline of grounded theory was offered, which explored categorical relationships; *Paradox of Influence and Identity* emerged as the dominant phenomenon, informing and being reinforced by the data of *Teaching and Learning* and *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*. Provisional intervention strategies for student affairs practice, in the contexts of academics, residential life, and career development, were discussed. Further, triangulated research is needed to substantiate and evolve the findings and theoretical model of this thesis.

Chapter 1

Introduction

To provide an overview of the current investigation, and to frame the reading and evaluation of this thesis, I structure the introductory chapter into the following sections: (1) a summary of the research purpose and questions, as well as the guiding theoretical framework in which I have situated my work; (2) a personal reflection on both my interest in the topic and my professional background in student affairs and at Bucknell University; (3) a snapshot of the subsequent chapters included in this report and how they contribute to our understanding of legacy students; (4) an initial presentation of the research findings, of the three primary data categories and their respective themes, and of grounded theory; (5) a biographical sketch of each research participant; and (6) a concluding discussion on the observations, insights, and questions at which I myself have arrived as the researcher per the completion of the study.

Purpose, Research Questions, and Phenomenology

I have undertaken this qualitative, phenomenological inquiry to examine the meaning-making and psychosocial processes of five legacy students at Bucknell University. Narrowing the definition of "legacies" to refer to students who have had at least one parent graduate from the institution, I have approached the thesis with two main, driving purposes. First, I have sought to uncover the essence of what being legacies at Bucknell University has meant to the students themselves. Second, I have aimed to learn how legacies construct, and co-construct, their identities amid the richness and complexity of undergraduate life. With these goals in mind, the following open-ended questions have led toward deepened, empathic understandings of this distinct campus subpopulation:

- What do the inner “life-worlds” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 395) of legacies, as understood through qualitative inquiry, reveal about the meanings that alumni children ascribe to their undergraduate experiences?
- How do legacies explore and express — via language, metaphor, narrative — identity development needs within or beyond college student psychosocial domains of academics, residential life, and vocational awareness and aspiration?
- How do legacies co-construct their lives on campus, identifying and negotiating the potentially competing voices of self, family, peers, and institution?
- How do the self-narratives of legacies suggest singularity of experiences for each individual participant or echo commonalities across participants — and what are, in turn, the implications for grounded theory or deductive interpretive frameworks to make sense of legacy ego formation?
- How should our evolving understanding of the meanings of legacy identity development impact responsive student affairs practice and therefore enrichment of the lives of legacies present and future?

In following the principles of the post-positivist research tradition (Creswell, 1998; Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, Manning; 1992; 1999; 2000), an explicit statement of hypotheses has not informed this study. Rather, I have subscribed to inductive and participant-centered methods, allowing for the self-narratives of participants to establish the direction of data analysis and the provisional development of grounded theory (Creswell, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Holliday, 2002; Johnson &

Christensen, 2008; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000). Legacies are therefore recognized in this thesis as the creators of knowledge and personal meanings, and phenomenology — in orientating philosophy, methodology, and lens and spirit of the investigation — has permitted access to the multiple, overlapping realities and truths of being alumni children.

Why Legacies: Reflections on the Research Topic and Experience in Student Affairs

I remember her. A prospective student at the time, she and her father had entered the Office of Admissions late one Friday afternoon and approached the front desk in the lobby, behind which I stood. They introduced themselves to me, a young and still somewhat new Assistant Director of Admissions. With an immediate and effusive expression of frenzied reverence for Bucknell University, the pair right away mentioned a longstanding connection between their family and the institution. Both the student's mother and father had graduated from the school, and they not only started dating while in college, but had also been married on campus in the chapel a few years after finishing their undergraduate degrees.

According to the father, when he himself had been in high school and first visited Bucknell, he knew the second he stepped out of the car and into the parking lot that he was home. Coincidentally, his daughter — as a potential applicant to the University — had only seconds ago encountered an identical experience. As soon as they had driven through the main gates and entered our plush, richly verdant four hundred-acre campus in Central Pennsylvania, she had fallen in love. In speaking together further, all before they took the official tour of the school, the student had said something else, something that caught my attention and had remained with me over the three to four years since then.

Recognizing the seeming irony yet unsurprising resonance between her and her father's initial impressions of Bucknell, she had offered a vision of the future: would it not be funny, she said to me and to her father, if she, too, met her spouse-to-be at the University and had their wedding in the chapel?

I am not sure what happened to her, or whether she ever did fulfill her educational and nuptial goals, but the brief yet charged exchange between us had awakened, in part, the idea for this study. At around the same time that I had met this student and her alumnus father, I had begun reviewing the work of Marcia (1966), a scholar in whom I had taken great interest that semester during my very first class as part of the College Student Personnel graduate program. Contemplating the connections between the incident with the Bucknell-affiliated family and Marcia's seminal research, a series of questions overtook me: What about legacy students? How did their familial links to the school impact identity development? In which ways would legacies perhaps be more susceptible to what Marcia (1966) had termed Identity Foreclosure — reiterating through life choices the unquestioned values and influences of parents? How could we, as admissions and student affairs professionals, ensure that alumni children would attempt to shape their lives in college according to their individualities and singular voices?

Nevertheless, as I continued to immerse myself in the literature on psychosocial development, and as I explored the relatively thin research pertaining to legacies, I had confirmed a thesis topic. More importantly, though, I had begun to map the foundation for an inquiry that would (1) bridge the extant scholarship on undergraduate identity formation and legacy students, (2) address the primary gap of understanding from the interior, student-perspective the meaning-making and developmental processes that underscore legacy experiences, and (3) offer a preliminary framework to practitioners to best meet the potentially distinct needs of alumni children. In addition, I had conceived of and initiated a study that presented a natural, compelling overlap between my intellectual curiosities and my own professional responsibilities.

As an Assistant Director of Admissions at Bucknell since August 2006, I had come across many legacy students, if not in person then through evaluating their applications to the institution. There had always seemed a special aura surrounding alumni children, especially within the context of the campus community. By no means an automatic "in" into the school, which has been selective per the low acceptance rate, a different level of sensitivity nonetheless appeared to underscore attention toward this particular population.[1] From my administrator's angle, being a legacy carried meaning, significance, weight — it heralded a celebrated umbilical link to our history and tradition, to our heart. Within a total student population of 3,400 undergraduates, who explore a combination of the liberal arts and pre-professional programs such as Management, Engineering, Education, and Music, legacies seemed to reflect only a small percentage yet had a commanding presence.[2] Or so it had seemed to me, at least.

I am not the child of Bucknell alumni nor have I been an undergraduate at the institution, but through the combination of academic and professional engagement, I have sustained a researcher-practitioner's curiosity about and empathy for legacies and their families. Given my staff member status, however, I have had to set and adhere to

---

[1] According to the Bucknell University Admissions website (2010), the institution received 7,178 applications for the Class of 2014, with 31.4% of candidates receiving offers of admittance. The middle fifty-percent range of SAT scores, for the math and verbal sections combined, for accepted students was a 1260 to 1450.

[2] Bucknell University does not provide information publicly about the number of legacy students who are enrolled on campus.

specific ethical boundaries throughout the research process. Having professional connections with each of the five participants in this study, I have made sure that (1) I have not been involved in the decisions to admit them to the University, (2) I have not, and will not in the future, serve in direct supervisory capacities as part of their jobs on campus, and (3) their decisions to withdraw themselves entirely from, or rescind portions of the data that they contribute to, the study would not carry retributive consequences for them or for other family members who may consider applying to Bucknell. A thorough, informed consent process has reinforced the protection of the legacies in this study, as well as the soundness of the research.

Toward an Understanding of Legacies: The Thesis Chapters

In Chapter 2, I begin to establish the rationale for a qualitative, phenomenological study on legacy students. Addressing the relevant literature on psychosocial development and the identity status model (Erikson, 1968; Josselson, 1987; Marcia, 1966; Waterman & Goldman, 1976; Waterman & Waterman, 1971), I also discuss the principal scholarship pertaining to alumni children (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Howell & Turner, 2004; Martin & Spenner, 2009; Massey & Mooney, 2007). Persistent methodological and ideological gaps have called for an investigation that explores the meanings of identity formation as seen through the "life-worlds" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 395) of legacy participants. As I elaborate on the thesis design and methodology in Chapter 3, alignment of the project within the post-positivist framework (Creswell, 1998; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000) has aimed to reveal the interiority of how legacies construct and co-construct, amid the barrage of voices from parents, professors, peers, and institution, their lives as undergraduates. With rich, descriptive data organized into categories and themes in Chapter 4, the findings are intended to inform responsive student affairs practice (Arnold & King, 1997; Manning, 1992; 1999). Analysis and concluding remarks follow in Chapter 5. There, I examine the categories and themes of this study in relation to theories of human development, particularly those focused on the formation of identity (Adams, Berzonsky, & Keating, 2006; Adams, Ryan, & Keating, 2000; Bowlby, 1969; Josselson, 1987; 1996; Lightfoot, Cole, & Cole, 2009) and propose a tentative outline of grounded theory. Additionally, I offer suggestions for intervention strategies, highlight both the limitations of the current investigation and recommendations for future research, and summarize the main contributions of the thesis to the nascent field of scholarship on legacy students.

The Research Findings and Implications for Grounded Theory

As reported in Chapter 4, inductive data analysis — based primarily on interviews and on member-checking feedback — has led to three main categories of research findings under which corresponding themes have then been grouped. The first, *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, has underscored a process of separation-individuation by which students seek to affirm their own identities yet continue to maintain connections to and rely on support from family, professors, and peers. Themes here consist of: (1) *"But he didn't really influence me at all": Applying to and Enrolling at Bucknell*, (2) *"Just a student — or an alumni child student": The Language and Terminology of Being "Legacies,"* (3) *"But in a lot of ways I have followed her": Family Impact on Academic Majors and Career Plans*, and (4) *Exploratory Behaviors: Finding Their Way in College* (further comprised of *"Hearing from their experiences, it's cool": The Influence of Peers on the Lives of Legacies*, *"Yes, I do need guidance": Receptivity to Guidance, Support,* *and Mentoring*, and *"I am not having his college career": Recreating yet Separating from Family Experiences at Bucknell*). *Teaching and Learning*, the second category, has revealed how parents, the teachers, have influenced their children, the learners, as demonstrated in (1) *"Brain-frequency": Expressions of Family-based Cognitive Processes*, (2) *"We all became really close": Family Dynamics in the Socialization Patterns of Legacies*, (3) *"I feel like Bucknell has and has not changed very much": Keepers of Institutional and Family History and Memory*, and (4) *Generativity: Giving Back to the Next Generation* (encompassing *"I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is": Legacy Emulation of Parenting Styles across Contexts*, and *"I would want to give my kids the same": Having Families of Their Own*). Lastly, *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* has highlighted the institutional impact on the co-construction of legacy identity development through (1) *"There's your stereotypical Bucknell legacy": The Reputations of Legacies on Campus*, (2) *Triggers of Legacy Identity Awareness*, (3) *"I absolutely love it": The Bucknell Culture and Climate*, (4) *"I'm friends with his friends' kids": Legacies as Cross-Generational Connectors*, and (5) *"It just all fit together": Integration of Self and Undergraduate Experience*.

According to the tentative outline of grounded theory that I have proposed in Chapter 5, *Paradox of Influence and Identity* has surfaced as the dominant, most resonant thematic category. Even as the participants in this study expressed their internalization of and dependence on family influences (see *Teaching and Learning*) and ascribed meanings to the campus climate and cultural forces at work within their lives (see *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*), the constant tension with which legacies wrestled, of striving to assert distinct identities while also clinging to the comfort and safety of family, remained salient. Interacting together to reinforce the themes of *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, *Teaching and Learning* not only revealed the depth of parents' influence on their children, but also underscored a relationship to, and the importance of, *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*. It seemed that the University, through its constituents and its own institutional voice, triggered a heightened awareness of family impact, which then made more pronounced for legacies the issues of separation-individuation. Future research, as discussed in Chapter 5, has the potential to substantiate or evolve further the categories and themes of this study, as well as to refine the initial conceptualization of grounded theory.

The Research Participants

I have worked closely, through a collaborative research process, with five primary study participants. All undergraduate female legacy students, each has met with me for individual interviews, and to the extent that they have wanted to, the subjects have provided feedback, per member-checking as part of the methodology of this thesis, on the interpretation and articulation of their respective data. Throughout the inquiry, the legacies could have withdrawn themselves entirely or rescinded portions of their data from the study. None did. Two of the participants consented to have me contact their alumni parents, to invite their involvement as well. The family members, as secondary participants, had the opportunity to submit, with their daughters' consent, excerpts or full copies of text or e-mail messages between them and their daughters. Such documents may have lent insight into the co-construction of identity development. Nonetheless, neither of the parents responded. When I began to solicit interest in contributing to this study, I contacted several male legacy students, yet only heard from one; he declined participation. I address in Chapter 5 the potential questions that may be raised about the research by having all female participants. In addition, other core commonalities among the legacies may have shaped the current investigation, the data, and the concluding analysis. These characteristics include a commitment, openness, and willingness to (1) discuss aspects of their personal lives, (2) acknowledge and explore the significance of family and how parents in particular have influenced their identities, and (3) examine the meanings of private experiences in college.

The following biographical sketches of the participants are intended to provide context for reading the thesis report. To protect the confidentiality of the research participants, I have used pseudonyms for them, for their parents, and for anyone else in their narratives who may be linked to their real identities. Nonetheless, and as I have explained to the legacy students, there still exists a possibility — a risk — that someone could identify them based on the descriptive nature of the data. I address this limitation both in Chapter 3 and again in Chapter 5.

Margaret

Margaret, a sophomore at the time of our interview together, has one parent, her father, who graduated from Bucknell. Her sister, who is not referred to specifically by name in this study, is part of the incoming first-year class at the University, and Margaret will be a junior when her sister begins her undergraduate experience. Initially planning to study the sciences and apply to medical schools, Margaret had switched her academic path amid her first year in college to include Education, History, and Theatre. An important faculty mentor in Margaret's life, to whom she referred in one of her interview responses, is Professor Cindy Heatley (a pseudonym). Margaret belongs to one of the sororities on campus and has been involved in residential activities through her housing and living arrangements. Currently, Margaret sees herself becoming a school teacher after she graduates from college.

Haley

Finishing her sophomore year at the time of our interview session, Haley has had two other family members attend and graduate from Bucknell: her father and her older sister. Haley has a younger sister, a high school student, who is considering applying to the University. In one passage that I quoted from Haley's interview transcript, she referred to her family name — to which I ascribed the alias "James." In addition to studying Psychology as her major and Philosophy as her minor, Haley has been involved with a range of activities on campus, from joining club sport teams to participating in a sorority, from working as an admissions tour guide to volunteering with community service-oriented student groups. One of Haley's faculty mentors, to whom she referred specifically in an excerpt from her narrative that I included in Chapter 4, has been Professor Freidel (a pseudonym). In the future, Haley sees herself working with children through either practicing clinically or conducting research on childhood development.

Kate

When Kate and I met for our interview together, she was approaching the end of her first year of study at Bucknell. Her father, a surgeon, had graduated from the University. Since Kate referred to her father by name in the data that I incorporated into Chapter 4, I gave him the pseudonym "John." A Neuroscience major who is also pursuing a pre-medical path of study as well as contributing to a Psychology research project with a faculty member, Kate wants to become a doctor. During the academic year, she works part-time in the Office of Admissions. Although Kate has yet to join student clubs and organizations beyond her job, she intends to rush for a sorority at the beginning of her sophomore year, the time at which Bucknell students become eligible to join the Greek system.

Taylor

Taylor and I met together for our interview session right as she was completing her first year at Bucknell. Her mother, maternal grandmother, and maternal uncle had all graduated from the institution. In addition to studying Political Science as her major, Taylor has been involved with several activities on campus and in the community, including volunteer work and participation in one of the student-led performing arts associations. As Taylor begins her sophomore year, she plans to rush for a sorority. Currently Taylor is considering a career in government.

Natalie

Natalie, a second semester senior at the time of our interview session, has had two family members graduate from Bucknell: her father and her paternal uncle. Completing a major in Civil and Environmental Engineering, Natalie had already accepted, prior to her graduation, a job offer with an environmental consulting firm. In addition to involvement in a sorority on campus and student employment in the Office of Admissions, Natalie had also studied abroad during her junior year. She and her family have been close friends with several other Bucknell alumni and legacies, people with whom she intends to remain connected throughout her life.

Summary and Conclusion: Framing Thoughts, Observations, and Questions

In this chapter, I have outlined the core foundational elements of the thesis. I have addressed the purpose, research questions, and qualitative, phenomenological framework of the investigation. Providing self-disclosure about my relationship to the topic, and discussing my own professional background at Bucknell, I have met an important tenet of qualitative scholarship (Creswell, 1998; Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000; Peshkin, 1991) and have personalized the context for undertaking this study. In addition to summarizing the subsequent chapters of the current investigation, I have presented, in abbreviated format, the main research findings and grounded theory, as well as introduced the research participants.

However, I wish to offer three concluding thoughts, along with observations and questions, to continue to inform and frame the reading of my work. First, images of ventriloquism surface in the research. I have asked myself, for instance, how have legacies revealed themselves as the communicators for, and the channels through which speak, the influences and people in their lives? How much of what they have shared is reflective of their own distinct voices, expressed with full personal freedom and autonomy? How much of their narratives — of their identities — is comprised of inflected articulations of the deeply embedded messages that they have received from others? Second, and as a closely related strand to the question of whose voices belong to whom, are issues of control, authority, and agency. How have legacies in this study, negotiating the push-and-pull of self in relationship to the familial, educational, and social worlds, exercised and demonstrated free-will? In which ways have they been restrained by the magnitude and contexts of their formative experiences? In which ways through separation-individuation have they liberated their authentic, genuine selves, as they become open to psychosocial transformations? How, if at all, may we separate one's own voice from that which influences it? Though perhaps a difficult task to attempt, ascribing the origins of authorship and meaning to legacy identities holds the potential for powerful insights into psychosocial formation and how families and college environments compound the search for, and the emergence of, self.

Lastly, in aiming to connect theory to practice, the notion of eminence (Arnold, Noble, & Subotnik, 1996) has underscored my reflections throughout the research process. For instance, how may intervention strategies, based on the findings of this thesis and on future triangulated scholarship, give rise to eminent individuals, people who "transform fields and institutions, setting new directions and altering practices and perceptions" (Arnold, Noble et al., 1996, p. 6)? With the intended outcome of maintaining personal freedom over their own courses of psychosocial development, how may legacies integrate "giftedness, personal motivation and tenacity, the support of allies, and resilience" to reach "fulfillment of talent" (Noble, Subotnik, & Arnold, 1996, p. 428)? How might these newly formulated understandings, of the complexity of self in context, "illuminate new possibilities for all" (Arnold, Noble, et al., 1996, p. 4) and thus inspire similar trajectories of empowerment for other alumni children? Further research on the topic, which substantiates or evolves grounded theory as I have outlined it here, has the potential to maximize opportunities for learning and growth, as well as for eminence. At the same time, the results of the research are intended to create innovations in higher education environments, to realize across campus dimensions the potentialities — the realities — for the next generation of legacy students.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

In this chapter I write with three purposes: (1) to address the primary scholarship on psychosocial development and the identity status model; (2) to present the relevant research that has already been conducted on legacy students; and (3) to begin to establish the rationale, in light of gaps in scholarship, for the current study. Building the case for a qualitative inquiry on legacies — students who have had a parent or both parents graduate from the undergraduate institution at which they are enrolled — I save, however, a more detailed discussion on the research design and methodology for the next chapter. Nonetheless, to set the initial foundation for my own investigation, I give careful attention here, per the length and depth of the literature review, to confirming: (1) what we already know within the field of identity development and within the subfield of examining the lives of children of alumni; (2) what we have yet to uncover about the ego formation of legacies; and (3) why we need to reveal that which has been overlooked, marginalized, or pushed toward the scholastic periphery as it pertains to this campus subpopulation.

I address the extant research as part of this review in two sections. In the first half of the chapter, which establishes the theoretical framework for the thesis, I discuss major contributors to and theories on psychosocial development. I draw upon the seminal work of Erikson (1968), who introduces both the importance of identity crisis and resolution in relation to implications for growth trajectories across the life-cycle, as well as the relevance of family context in spurring progressive or regressive negotiation of psychosocial conflicts. In addition, I trace the lineage of work that builds upon the

Eriksonian model, invoking key descendents such as Marcia (1966), Waterman and Waterman (1971), Waterman and Goldman (1976), and Josselson (1987).[3] Their distinct contributions have a commonality: validation of the identity status construct and the psychosocial contexts in which ego formation occurs (ie. vocational choices, religious beliefs, political ideology, etc.). Categorizing undergraduates according to the ways in which they do, or do not, experience identity crises and firm personal commitments, the psychosocial scholars affirm four possibilities — Identity Achievement (crises are experienced and firm commitments made, reflecting the students' own terms and values), Identity Diffusion (no crises, or firm commitments, are experienced), Identity Moratorium (crises are experienced but no firm commitments are made), and Identity Foreclosure (firm commitments are made but without the presence of crises). Although I adhere to the qualitative principles of grounded theory for the current study, drawing upon an inductive process of discovery, meaning-making, and understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Creswell, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000), elements of the identity status framework prove helpful, when aligned with the data, to structure, analyze, and articulate the narratives of legacy subjects.

Within the second half of the review, I focus on scholarship pertaining to legacies, something that until now has been divorced from identity development research. Bowen and Bok (1998), for instance, (1) initiate scholastic awareness of legacies, (2) define the group as an affirmative action cohort, and (3) suggest possible challenges to development

[3] Notably absent from the review are Chickering and Reisser (1993). Although the researchers made profound contributions to our understanding of identity formation of college students, especially in regard to what identity development looks like across specific vectors, I focus instead in this chapter on the psychosocial discourse that surrounds the grouping of undergraduates into identity statuses.

in college for alumni children. Recently, however, the focus on preferential admissions policies, race- and class-based affirmative action, and the academic achievement of legacies (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Howell & Turner, 2004; Massey & Mooney, 2007) has evolved into an emphasis on loosely connected psychosocial dimensions of development, such as vocational aspirations (Martin & Spenner, 2009). Nonetheless, quantitative assessment and study of legacies — the paradigmatic methodology of choice among scholars thus far — seems disconnected from deepening our understanding of alumni children and the meaning of their undergraduate experiences. I address the methodological research gap on legacies as part of this review, with a further discussion included in Chapter 3.

Here, in the conclusion of the second section of this chapter, by connecting the psychosocial research and the literature on legacies, I reach toward an initial statement of points of inquiry for the thesis. Specifically, I propose the following questions: (1) How does qualitative inquiry help us best glimpse the inner "life-worlds" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 395) of legacies, which have been previously ignored? (2) How do the distinct developmental needs of legacies surface within academic, social, and vocational contexts of campus life? (3) How does having legacies inform the competing voices of self, family, institution, and peers possess the power to reveal the process of co-construction of undergraduate experiences? (4) What patterns exist across individual cases in terms of the singularity or commonality of legacy ego formation? and (5) How does the current body of research, and the information collected for this study, on identity development and legacies impact the mechanisms for effective, responsive student affairs practice?

Introduction to the Literature on Psychosocial Development

According to Erikson (1968), adolescent identity formation is defined in terms of crisis and commitment.[4] Erikson favored a bipolarized approach to investigating ego development, meaning the process through which youth respond to the multitude of ways in which they might live their lives, per the personal, familial, societal, and educational forces — the epigenetic pressures — that they experience. Either they navigate the conflict successfully, making firm, unwavering decisions that establish fidelity (an acceptance and congruence of who they are and will continue to be), or role confusion ensues, which propels psychopathology and thereby offsets a healthy life trajectory within the cycle of growth and development. College students are particularly prone to preoccupation with what Erikson terms, as part of his theory on life cycle stages, "identity vs. role confusion" (p. 290); the undergraduate collegiate environment prevents students from taking on adult responsibilities as well as sustains the institutional moratorium on movement through stages of the life cycle itself.

Follow-up research not only validates the Eriksonian ego development construct, but expands upon Erikson's findings as well. Principal investigators such as Marcia (1966), Waterman and Waterman (1971), Waterman and Goldman (1976), and Josselson (1987) uncovered the statuses in between achieved identity (ego commitment/fidelity) and diffusion (role confusion): moratorium (experience of crisis without commitment to identity) and foreclosure (identity commitment without experience of crisis). In the following review of psychosocial literature, I address the major findings within the field, identify gaps and limitations, and set the beginnings of the framework and rationale for

[4] Scholars today refer to "crisis" as "exploration" (Waterman, 1999, p. 591), a term used to better encapsulate with less dramatic, amplified stridency, the identity formation experience of college students.

the current study. In the second section of this chapter, where I discuss research pertaining to legacy students, I further build upon this foundation.

Research on Psychosocial Development

Writing from a clinical psychoanalytic background, Erikson (1968) formulated his life cycle theory on qualitative case studies and life histories. An often unacknowledged limitation, which his supporters usually failed to mention, his findings reflected the experiences of one segment of the population — namely those who demonstrated, or had the strong propensity for, psychopathology. Additionally, the number of individuals on which he theorized was not always stated clearly in his many publications, something that had the potential to skew results, restrict generalizability, and lead us to approach his work with caution. Despite limitations in his approach to sample selection and methodology, Erikson's developmental construct continues to receive validation, and it remains relevant, poignant, and influential today, over 40 years after its initial formulation, especially within the context of examining the dimensions of growth of college students (Waterman, 1999).

Central to Erikson's stage theory is epigenesis. As individuals develop and grow, multiple pressures, both internal and external, spur a confrontation with opposing dichotomized forces. How the crisis, "a turning point, a crucial period of increased vulnerability and heightened potential…the ontogenetic source of generational strength and maladjustment" (p. 286), is resolved leads to two recourses: (1) attainment of healthy psychological functioning and ongoing positive development along the cycle's continuum; or (2) regression toward psychopathological attitudes and behaviors. Whereas individuals will still move through subsequent stages regardless of how they resolve, or do not resolve fully, each crisis, the regressive path tends to incite a life trajectory mired in sustained psychopathology.

The eight life stages that Erikson identified, the outcomes of navigating the respective crises successfully, and the approximate ages at which the dichotomies were faced, consisted of the following, outlined here in chronological order: Infancy: basic trust vs. mistrust — hope; Early Childhood: autonomy vs. shame and doubt — will power; Play age: initiative vs. guilt — purpose; School age: industry vs. inferiority — competence; Adolescence: identity vs. role confusion — fidelity; Young Adulthood: intimacy vs. isolation — love; Maturity: generativity vs. stagnation — care; and Old age: integrity vs. despair — wisdom. To clarify further the importance of resolving dichotomies, the way in which a progressive or regressive trend relies upon the negotiation of crises and the particular significance of Stage 5 in determining adult trajectories, identity vs. role confusion becomes a telling example. Though originally conceived as applying to adolescents, the crisis of identity vs. role confusion applies directly to traditional aged college students as well, because of their postponement of adult responsibilities while in school. Those who achieve identity attain fidelity and progress toward psychosocial resources of love, care, and wisdom. As they ultimately face the end of their lives in old age, identity achievers feel fulfilled, having established a firmly rooted, congruent sense of self, maintained close, intimate relationships, and contributed to generativity (instilling within the next, younger generation a set of values to lead them toward a progressive life cycle trajectory). Diffusers, on the other hand, remain confused about who they are and their direction in life, and they find themselves, at the end of their lives, isolated, stagnant, and in despair.

Erkison's fifth life cycle stage — identity development — not only provided the spark for the research subsequently addressed in this review, but also contributed two salient elements that inform follow-up studies on the topic. First, embedded within the epigenetic process that underlies the psychosocial crisis are occupational and life style choices — two variables featured in the quantitative and qualitative study designs of Eriksonian scholars such as Marcia (1966), Waterman and Waterman (1971), and Waterman and Goldman (1976) and in more recent research on female subjects (Josselson, 1987). Explaining the significance of these two sources of conflict, Erikson observed that adolescents strived to connect their "rudimentary gifts and skills to the occupational prototypes of culture" (p. 290), in other words, finding congruence between one's abilities and the possibilities within prescribed career path options. Life style choices, often defined in terms of religious and political ideology (Marcia, 1966), presented similar challenges to establishing fidelity.[5] Second, Erikson set the groundwork for grouping identities into statuses, as achieved and diffused. Whereas Marcia (1966) expanded upon the two initial categories, accounting more specifically than Erikson for variation in ego formation, the broad themes that Erikson acknowledged both served as the impetus for further theoretical analyses and provided the seminal lens through which identity issues in college students should be addressed: as psychosocial commitments and crises.

Building on Erikson's identity theory, Marcia (1966) conducted a combined qualitative and quantitative study on 86 males, who were enrolled in psychology, religion, and history courses at Hiram College, to assess prevalence of the various

[5] Erikson (1968) operationally defined fidelity as the fulfillment of seeking "inner coherence and a durable set of values" (p. 290).

identity statuses within the group.[6] Although the sample size was small and reflected extreme gender imbalance, thereby limiting generalizability of the findings, the study redefined the psychosocial development categories to include four distinct areas, a significant contribution to and recurrent theme in the studies that follow. An “identity achievement subject” (p. 551), as Marcia operationally defined him, experienced a crisis and was committed to an occupational choice and to religious and political ideologies. “Identity diffusion” (p. 552) indicated subjects who did not experience a crisis and whose “hallmark [was] lack of commitment” (p. 552); they were unconcerned with occupational or ideological questions and did not make decisions to establish a clear, congruent identity.[7] The two additional statuses Marcia found were labeled “moratorium” and “foreclosure.” He found both statuses to serve as intermediates of achievement and diffusion in how subjects exhibited awareness of crises and initiated, or failed to initiate, commitments. A “moratorium subject” (p. 552) experienced a crisis but had yet to make a commitment, and the “foreclosure subject” did not experience a crisis, though he had already made a commitment reflective of family values and wishes and, in broader terms, conformed to the pressures of authority figures.

In order to group subjects into statuses, Marcia had a team of 10 experimenters, seven men and three women, administer 15 to 30 minute semi-structured interviews. The experimenters were students enrolled in Marcia’s class in psychological testing and had

[6] Although the Erikson article cited in this review dates from 1968, two years after the publication date of Marcia’s article in 1966, Marcia is considered a descendent of Erikson. The instigator of identity studies, Erikson had been publishing his theories throughout the 1950’s and 1960’s, well before Marcia completed his own dissertation in the mid-to-late 1960’s. I chose the 1968 Erikson article because it provided a clear, comprehensive explanation of the Life Cycle theory and its implication for identity development.

[7] Marcia (1966) used the Eriksonian definition of crisis to refer to the “adolescent’s period of engagement in choosing among meaningful alternatives” (p. 551). The term “commitment,” according to Marcia but again based on Erikson’s theory, referred to the “degree of personal investment the individual exhibits” (p. 551).

each taken three or more courses in psychology. Beyond the connection between experimenters and the author, a condition that raises questions of researcher bias, the team tape recorded the interviews but then categorized subjects into identity statuses by using a manual that Marcia himself had provided. To reduce bias, the taped interviews were heard at least twice for judging, sometimes three and four times; the agreement percentage, the "interjudge reliability" (p. 553), among the two to three evaluators per recording was .75. Adding a second method of ascertaining identity statuses, Marcia employed the *Ego Identity Incomplete Sentence Blank (EI-ISB)*, which revealed the level of crisis and commitment within subjects related to matters of (1) occupation and (2) religion and politics (which constituted the ideology rating). A third measure — administration of the *Concept Attainment Task (CAT)* — created a quantitative component to the study and was used to investigate subject responses to anxiety (apprehension) and pressure (oversolicitousness), the results of which reflected the strength of their self-definition and internal locus of control.[8]

The study supported a model that featured clear delineations between identity achievement and diffusion and with intermediary results for the moratorium and foreclosure subjects. Identity achievers, as expected, scored highest on ego identity measures and performed the best on the CAT under stressful conditions. More often than not, they did not fall sway to authoritarian pressures and, given their tendency toward an internal locus of control and solid self-esteem, they were also less vulnerable to negative

[8] During the CAT, experimenters made deliberate comments to subjects to gauge responses to anxiety and stress-inducement. As the subjects worked on tasks, an experimenter would say, for example: "By the way, I thought you might be interested to know that this test is related to tests of intelligence and that it's been found to be one of the best single predictors of success in college. So of course you'll want to do your very best" (p. 554). Though an effective way of soliciting subject reactions, which further gave evidence of the identity statuses into which they fell, the method raised issues of ethical treatment of human subjects. Nonetheless, subjects were debriefed, via a postcard, after the experiment had ended.

comments from experimenters. Moratorium subjects had the greatest variability on CAT scores, but manifested aspects of achievement, particularly in terms of their awareness of having confronted crises. Foreclosure subjects exhibited distinct reactions under the stressful conditions of the CAT, "endorsing authoritarian values such as obedience, strong leadership, and respect for authority" (p. 557); self-esteem, as predicted, was susceptible to negative information, and their performance on the concept attainment tasks was poorer than the results of the achievement group. Contradictory to one of Marcia's hypotheses, however, was the performance of identity diffusion subjects on the CAT — for the group scored lower than the achievement subjects but not the lowest of all statuses. Though diffuse subjects did score the lowest on the EI-ISB, confirming Erikson's initial theory of bipolar opposites, foreclosure subjects performed the worst on concept attainment tasks.

Limitations, biases, and gender gap aside, Marcia (1968) tested and validated the construct of the four identity statuses, and he provided a starting point for aspiring researchers in the field who later embarked upon equally important studies (Waterman & Waterman 1971; Waterman & Goldman, 1976; Josselson, 1987). The key findings not only specified characteristics of the psychosocial categories of college students, particularly in relation to their responses to stress and anxiety, but also contributed to the combined use of qualitative and quantitative approaches to measuring identity formation, which influenced the next generation of identity theorists as well as created a design that came closer than Erikson's case study and life history method to establishing reliability and credibility. Follow-up studies by Waterman and Waterman (1971) and Waterman and Goldman (1976) continued to implement the semi-structured interview process, used as well in the work of Josselson (1987), yet also introduced the importance of longitudinal studies and the need for empirical data to validate further the developmental construct.

Waterman and Waterman (1971) supported Marcia's theory of the four identity statuses, but focused their study on the psychosocial movement of college freshmen from one status to another throughout the first year. A small sample of 92 males of whom 90 were Caucasian and two were Asian, limited the generalizability of the research. Although additional limitations included the homogeneity of major (all were majoring in engineering), and socioeconomic status (students were "mainly from lower-middle-socioeconomic class backgrounds" [p. 169]), the method, procedure, and findings are important. Interested in assessing the pattern of changes in ego identity statuses, the volatility of each status (ie. from which status are students most likely to change and into which ones are they likely to move?), and antecedents to identity statuses prior to entrance into college, the authors predicted the following: (1) factoring into the study variables of Family Independence and Cultural Sophistication, identity achievers would score strongly on both measures as well as demonstrate firm commitments occupationally and ideologically;[9] (2) diffusers would reveal the opposite of identity achievers (with moratoriums and foreclosures in between the bipolarized outcomes); (3) moratorium subjects would show the greatest movement, over the course of one year, from their initial status into others; and (4) a progressive trend of subjects changing into identity

---

[9] Waterman and Waterman (1971) defined Family Independence as the "student's degree of closeness with his parental family and the importance that parental expectations have for him" (p. 169). Cultural Sophistication referred to the student's "degree of interest in the various areas of the humanities, including literature, poetry, music, and philosophy" (p. 169). These two variables presented a glimpse into identity status antecedents, for they hinted at that which subjects brought into the college environment psychosocially. Current research, according to Waterman's (1999) definitive commentary on trends within the field, explored more fully precursors to identity status development, echoing Erikson's (1968) trust vs. mistrust theory.

achievement would result occupationally and ideologically, regardless of whether the students started the first semester in moratorium, foreclosure, or diffusion.

The researchers used the identical semi-structured interview process to assess subject identity status as Marcia did in his 1966 study. Similar to their predecessor, Waterman and Waterman (1971) determined that the interview questions adequately elicited "information concerning the presence or absence of a crisis in [occupational and ideological belief systems] and to permit a determination of the subject's degree of commitment to his ideas" (p. 169). Interviews, which lasted 15 to 30 minutes, were taped, and although the judges were not identified, the average rate of interjudge agreement, in terms of categorizing subjects into statuses, was .72. Biases, in adopting Marcia's instrument and in grouping the students themselves, made for a cautious approach in reading into the researchers' findings. However, to strengthen the study and to minimize biases, the authors administered the *College Student Questionnaire—Part I* to subjects during the first week of the fall semester; the instrument measured the variables of Family Independence and Cultural Sophistication.

In the fall semester of the year in which the study began, there were 11 identity achievements, 11 moratoriums, 23 foreclosures, and 32 diffusions for the occupational category.[10] For ideology, there were 20 identity achievements, 8 moratoriums, 38 foreclosures, and 14 diffusions. By the Spring, "approximately 44% of the students changed status for occupation and just over 51% did so for ideology" (p. 170), leaving, for ideology, 14 identity achievements, 8 moratoriums, 31 foreclosures, and 27 diffusions, and, for occupation, 12 identity achievements, 22 moratoriums, 22

[10] The researchers did not indicate the year in which the study commenced, but per the publication date of the article (1971), I inferred that research began in the late 1960's.

foreclosures, and 21 diffusions. The Family Independence and Cultural Sophistication variables illuminated personality qualities of subjects within the statuses. As anticipated, identity achievers who remained within the identity achievement status in terms of ideology (n=7) scored more strongly on Family Independence and Cultural Sophistication than those who changed out of the same status (n=13). Another finding, which supported one of the original hypotheses, pertained to foreclosures: those who left the status (n=8) scored higher in Family Independence than those who remained in foreclosure (n=15), since foreclosed identity subjects tended to maintain a psychological connectedness to and embodiment of family values, wishes, and authority.

A finding that countered one of the researchers' hypotheses, however, concerned the anticipated positive trend movement of subjects into the achieved status for occupational and ideological commitments. Whereas occupational identity achievement increased, the identity diffusion status, and not achievement, experienced the largest growth for ideology. Waterman and Waterman (1971) acknowledged one possible explanation for the regressive trend in ideology: the already determined major of study of the subjects, engineering, may explain why the number of diffusion subjects increased more in regard to ideology (n=27) than occupation (n=21). A commitment to engineering seemed to propel thoughts and crises about vocation rather than about political and religious beliefs. Nonetheless, Waterman and Waterman (1971) posed a question about variable relationships for future research, especially given that 75% of the subjects changed statuses: To which extent does inherent instability within subjects during the first year of college react with apparent environmental factors that promote significant psychosocial upheaval?

Even after the Waterman and Waterman (1971) investigation, a longitudinal study over the four years of college was needed, not only to confirm the stability and validity of the identity statuses, but also to assess — and control for — external, environmental influences on ego formation.[11] Waterman and Goldman (1976), therefore, undertook a new study to better understand identity development during a lengthier period of time than in the previous research; their goal was to ascertain whether identity achievement increased, as expected, by the end of senior year of college.

Selecting a sample of male freshmen (n=134) at Hartwick College, Waterman and Goldman (1976) employed the same methodological approach as Waterman and Waterman (1971). The semi-structured interview to assess occupational and ideological identity statuses of subjects was conducted at the beginning of the students' first year of college. At least two judges listened to each tape recording; the average interjudge agreement was .72. Again, the judges themselves were not identified, which called into question their connection with the researchers and whether or not biases tainted the classification of subjects into ego statuses, an important consideration given the quantitative paradigm in which the study was conducted. Administration of the *College Student Questionnaire—Part I* was intended to yield insight into five dimensions of personality development: Family Independence, Peer Independence, Liberalism, Social Conscience, and Cultural Sophistication.[12] These procedures were repeated at the end of

---

[11] If the first year of college presents unprecedented psychosocial upheaval for students, longitudinal research that measures their identity statuses during their first year of college, and again during their senior year, should control for extraneous variables specific to the first year.

[12] Waterman and Goldman (1976) used the *College Student Questionnaire—Part I* to measure antecedents of identity statuses. Looking at psychological connection to family (Family Interdependence) and knowledge of the arts (Cultural Sophistication), they investigated correlations between these variables and identity statuses. The relative stability of statuses was an important finding, as was how the arts seemed to propel crises yet lead subjects toward creative self-resolutions. Identity achievers scored the strongest on Cultural Sophistication measures and reported the most firm occupational and ideological commitments.

senior year; however, attrition — due to those who withdrew from college, transferred to another institution, or did not want to participate as seniors — reduced the sample size to 59 research participants. With the small sample size, gender imbalance and homogeneous socioeconomic background of the students (who were predominantly from upper-middle class backgrounds), generalizability was limited. Nevertheless, the research sample reflected a multitude of liberal arts majors, and not just engineering students, which lent credibility and balance to the study.

As hypothesized, an overall increase in the number of identity achievers for occupation and ideology during the college years occurred. For occupation, there were five identity achievers during the first year of college, and for ideology (religious and political beliefs), there were 26. By the end of senior year, 22 occupational identity achievers emerged, as did 31 ideological identity achievers. Moratoriums for occupation decreased over time, suggesting that as graduation neared, subjects not only experienced a crisis in working through various career paths and potential professional identities, but also initiated resolutions and made firm, sustained commitments. Diffusers, who were hypothesized to be the most likely to change statuses over time, performed as expected — becoming the most unstable group in terms of movement beyond the initial category. Participants who entered college in a state of foreclosure or achievement in regard to occupation and ideology were found to be most likely to maintain their firm commitments within these initial statuses. Overall, the semi-structured interviews yielded 79 identity crises; in 68% of these situations, subjects became achievers, 18% became diffused, and 14% continued to confront crises within the moratorium status.

Progressive upward trends of subjects moving into the achieved category over time, one of the most resonant findings of the Waterman and Goldman (1976) study, provided evidence to support Erikson's (1968) theory on positive change throughout the course of the life cycle. However, two gaps in the literature, and in the study itself, persisted. Whereas the authors attempted to control for the limitations of only studying subjects during the first year of college, a method Waterman and Waterman (1971) had employed for the RPI research, Waterman and Goldman (1976) did not collect data on research participants during the intermediate years between their first year of college and their senior year. A question thus arises about the identity statuses, and the psychosocial shifts of participants, during their sophomore and junior years. A lack of data for the cohort here limits the ability to design intervention strategies that target their specific developmental needs. Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, something else was absent from the study itself, as well as from the previously considered body of psychosocial literature: the experiences — and the voices — of women.

Josselson (1987) conducted the first phase of her qualitative longitudinal study in 1971, focusing exclusively on female participants. She obtained class lists of seniors who were enrolled at three different institutions — (1) a large co-educational, private university; (2) a large, co-educational state university; and (3) a small, selective private college whose population was primarily comprised of women. The author selected 48 participants, drawn at random, who because they came from three different types of institutions, reflected a variety of life-styles and thus would not narrow the results of the study. Based on initial rounds of interviews, preliminary conversations that echoed the Marcia (1966) model, Josselson grouped the participants so that there were 12 women in each of the four identity statuses. After the initial screening, follow-up interviews were conducted for one and a half to two hours per participant, allowing the women to "speak associatively and introspectively" (p. 195) about their lives. Taping the interviews, Josselson had two graduate student advisees judge the recordings, with the understanding that they would come to agreement together on which participants should be placed into each of the identity statuses. Although the judges could have been biased, given their close connection with the researcher, Josselson reported a .90 interrater reliability rating on the categorization process. Nonetheless, it was not until 10 years later, in 1981, that Josselson decided to contact the subjects again. She sought to collect additional data on how the participants grew and developed, relative to their previously reported identity statuses, over time.[13]

As she organized and analyzed the results, Josselson (1987) renamed the four identity statuses, though the widely accepted principal characteristics that define the categories remained consistent. Identity achievers, to whom Josselson referred as "Pavers of the Way," had "separated themselves from their childhood ties and formed individuated, distinct identities," demonstrating resilience, openness to experience, a strong, grounded sense of self, and independence of "external sources of self-esteem" (p. 70). "Daughters of Crisis," the moratoriums, asserted independence as well — but they felt shameful. Josselson (1987) wrote: "In this group [were] the women who left their churches, marched in antiwar protests, became feminists, criticized their parents, experimented with sex — and felt guilty" (p. 106). The moratoriums were self-aware, recognizing crises and available choices to bring resolution to their lives; however, they

[13] The women received a letter and were advised that a follow-up questionnaire would be sent. Participants audio-recorded their responses, gave them by telephone, or returned the completed questionnaire. There was attrition of 14 subjects, including, in one case of identity diffusion, someone who committed suicide.

were not able to translate grandiose dreams and plans — particularly of helping other women — into "realistic occupational choice" (p. 106). Foreclosures, "Purveyors of the Heritage," had yet to question their childhood beliefs and practices. Their unawareness of questioning or rethinking characterized the group well, as many of them eventually pursued traditional career paths for women (secretary, stay-at-home mother, teacher, etc.) and gravitated toward life styles that reinforced "psychological needs for security and constancy" (p. 43). "Lost and Sometimes Found," the identity diffusion participants, were low in ego development, experienced the highest levels of anxiety, tended to suffer from psychopathology (including borderline personality disorder), and carried "scars of early severe psychological trauma that continued to plague them into late adolescence" (p. 141). One of the women from the diffusion group committed suicide soon after she graduated from college; another diffuse subject, "adrift and lost" (p. 140), never took hold of a life plan.

In addition to realigning the psychosocial research paradigm to include the vibrancy, spirit, and richness of the lives of women, Josselson (1987) further identified key themes that emerged for female subjects as they established identities. The process of "Separation-Individuation," an often unsettling, painful period of growth in which the identity achievers moved away, both physically and psychologically, from their families, struck Josselson as pronounced for women. "Anchoring," a second key component of female identity development according to Josselson, underscored ways in which subjects rooted and instilled meaning in their lives. Identity achievers, for instance, were most likely to anchor themselves in careers that they chose for themselves and at which they arrived on their own terms; diffusers, the polar opposite, appeared to ground themselves, paradoxically, in their instability — turning to drugs, alcohol, and destructive (and often promiscuous) behaviors as pathological forms of connectedness. A third and seminal finding, with implications for the field of gender studies, revealed the value of interpersonal relationships, which Josselson termed "The Web of Relatedness." Foreclosures, for instance, sought nurturance and support through ongoing relations with their parents. Although identity achievers were most likely to establish careers first before starting families, they reported that relationships with colleagues were more meaningful to them than the work tasks themselves.[14]

Despite the contributions of Josselson (1987), the study did not explore the experiences of undergraduates across the class years.[15] Further, while the qualitative, longitudinal method provided a powerful approach to relaying the complex stories and multiple realities of the participants, a lack of triangulation — even within the qualitative context — caused skepticism toward the results. How closely would interview responses correspond with document analysis, for example, had journal entries of subjects been maintained? How would the categorization of women into identity statuses have been altered if member-checking or observation of women during the course of their daily lives had been employed? These questions remain unanswered, but suggest a primary limitation in Josselson's research. At the same time, Josselson's micromanagement style, which included tabulating and interpreting the follow-up questionnaires from the 1980's

[14] In her contemporary studies of high school valedictorians in college, Arnold (1994, 1995) found that academically elite women participants tended to emphasize the importance of family in making career decisions, to underreport their intelligence in order to maintain relational sensitivities to others, to keep vague vocational aspirations to accommodate for having families in the future, and to plan to interrupt their careers to raise and care for children. These results support Josselson's (1987) observations and present a vivid impact of gender on college student development and on vocational identity in particular.

[15] Josselson (1996) later collected data on the same subjects from her 1987 study, women who were by then in midlife stages of development. Whereas the work traced the transitional patterns of women from college to midlife, further evolving the identity status model, insight into psychosocial growth across undergraduate class years remained absent.

by herself, for instance, revealed, too, the potential for researcher bias, which was unaddressed through the lens of qualitative researcher-as-instrument (Creswell, 1998; Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning; 1992; 1999; 2000) and the power of subjectivity (Peshkin, 1991). Nonetheless, the emphasis Josselson placed, and found among the narratives of her subjects, on the importance of family in identity development illuminated three important elements: (1) it provided support for Erikson's (1968) seminal research, which explored developmental patterns across the life-span, as initiated within the family and care-giver context; (2) it brought forward compelling evidence for future studies on antecedents of psychosocial formation for college students; and (3) it demonstrated the need for follow-up studies on different subpopulations of undergraduates who had been previously ignored.

Introduction to the Literature on Legacies

With the review of psychosocial literature providing an intellectual framework for the study, I strive to illuminate in the following section the research that four teams of principal investigators have conducted on legacies, either directly or peripherally. Bowen and Bok (1998), for instance, (1) established the foundation of interest in relationships between legacy populations and admissions policies, (2) hinted at the experiences of legacies on college campuses, and (3) initiated the research strand from which the work of Howell and Turner (2004), Massey and Mooney (2007), and Martin and Spenner (2009) subsequently evolved. Nonetheless, three salient gaps in scholarship persist. These limitations, which I outline below as part of this introduction, underscore both the core of the ensuing continuation of the literature review and the rationale for my own study, something I address further in the next chapter on Research Design and Methodology.

I identify three main gaps in the primary research on legacies. First, the current body of empirical research on legacies is thin.[16] Second, identity development processes as understood through the distinct voices and perspectives of legacies themselves — the ways in which they make meaning of and construct their experiences according to their own language and interior emotional logic — are absent. Third, an imbalance exists in methodology. Within the emerging research on children of alumni, the scholars whom I invoke here have favored quantitative measures of assessment to examine: (1) how legacies are given preferential treatment in admittance to elite institutions (Bowen & Bok, 1998); (2) how the composition of legacy applicants and enrollees has been historically white and middle-class but is expected to undergo a demographic, multicultural shift (Howell & Turner, 2004); (3) how retention and grade point average (GPA) for legacies is juxtaposed with academic markers of success for other campus subpopulations (Massey & Mooney, 2007); and (4) how the academic performance, vocational drive, and human capital that some children of alumni demonstrate compares with that of other affirmative action cohorts (Martin & Spenner, 2009).[17] However, by many accounts, it would appear that the qualitative paradigm — as I argue in the chapter

[16] The topic of legacy students has gained traction in the popular press, as featured most notably in the work of Golden (2006), but relatively little of this investigative journalistic work is grounded in scholarly research.

[17] Whereas Martin and Spenner (2009) operationally defined social capital of legacies as "alumni ties and an acknowledged status group membership, facilitating a material advantage [of] admission into an elite institution" (p. 625), they distinguished human capital differently. As the authors described it, dimensions of human capital, as observed in academic performance, included "1) academic and intellectual skills; 2) self-esteem, academic self-confidence, and identity; and 3) academic effort" (p. 626). Social capital suggested networking, via alumni connections, to reinforce status privileges and power relations; however, human capital insinuated cognitive abilities and academic self-esteem and self-efficacy factors that may lead to material reward of achievement, success, and, ultimately, vocational advancement.

on Research Design and Methodology — is better positioned than the quantitative, positivist framework to capture the richness, complexity, and understanding of research participants (Creswell, 1998; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000; Peshkin, 1991). In turn, qualitative insights that capture and expand on the multiple realities at work within a given phenomenon may thus inform the theoretical underpinnings of meaningful, responsive student affairs practice (Arnold & King, 1997; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000). Incisive research on the topic of legacies will ultimately lead to effective educational interventions in behalf of this unique student population.

Prior to presenting and critiquing the work of the four teams of investigators, I will reiterate, first, the pressing needs that establish the rationale for the current study. In summary, this study responds to the call for: (1) immersion in the inner-worlds of legacies; (2) alignment of research within a qualitative, post-positivist model; and (3) advancement of knowledge in the discipline.[18]

Research on Legacies

Bowen and Bok (1998) both initiated scholarship on legacies — the children of alumni — and legitimized the campus subpopulation as one of three affirmative action cohorts that also included minority students and athletes. Utilizing the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation's *College and Beyond* database, the authors had access to the records of 80,000 undergraduates from a total of 28 academically selective colleges and universities (institutions at which less than half of the applicants were accepted). Data included information on each student's race, gender, standardized test scores, rank in high school class, and family background, as well as academic records from college such

[18] According to Creswell (1998), the most compelling case for new inquiry is the advancement of disciplinary knowledge within the context of established research gaps in prior studies.

as transcripts, list of activities in which the students participated, and files submitted for admission. With the sample coming from students who enrolled in college in 1951, 1976, and 1989, the response rates, as only calculated for 1976 and 1989, were over 80%. Out of the sample of 28 elite institutions, a range of type and setting — from small, private, residential liberal arts schools to large, research universities — was represented. However, as the authors looked at admission preferences for the comparison of legacies to minority students and athletes, they only considered data from three of the 28 institutions. Thus, within the quantitative framework, not only were there limits on generalizability, but the reported findings may also have suffered from over-amplification.

Nonetheless, the results commanded attention, especially amid the buzz and controversy surrounding affirmative action discourse and practice. As Bowen and Bok (1998) revealed, racial- and ethnic-minority students received the strongest boost in admission as compared to legacies, athletes, and all other white candidates. In examining the connection between *Student Aptitude Test* (SAT) scores on the 1600 point scale and admittance to elite schools, the authors found that in the 1100 to 1199 range, typically the lower echelon for selective colleges and universities but not for less-selective institutions, "22 percent of all legacies were accepted, as compared with 18 percent of all other white candidates (and roughly 40 percent of all black candidates)" (p. 28). The biggest discrepancy, though, between legacies and all other white candidates was shown toward the upper end of the SAT range, among those students with scores of 1300 and over; 60% of legacies in this test score bracket were admitted, compared to "24 percent of non-legacies and 70 percent of black candidates" (p. 28). Bowen and Bok (1998) reached the following conclusion, albeit within a limited institutional sample, which confirmed the partiality of the admissions process toward the children of alumni: “The overall admission rate for legacies was almost twice that for all other candidates and roughly the same as the overall rate for black candidates” (p. 28).

Whereas the Bowen and Bok (1998) study focused primarily on admissions policies for minority students and the success of underrepresented student populations over time in and beyond college, the brief discussion on legacies sparked subsequent attention toward the often less-recognized affirmative action subpopulation of alumni children. Although the authors relied on quantitative methodology to the exclusion of in-person interviews, document analysis, and member-checking — core dimensions of qualitative, post-positivist inquiry (Creswell, 1998; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000) — they introduced four traces of thought that would re-circulate later in bold, identifiable themes regarding research on legacies. First, the authors brought attention to the fact that many selective institutions give legacies “some advantage in the admissions process” (Bowen & Bok, 1998, p. 24). Second, they advanced the notion that legacies serve as important links to “long term institutional loyalties and traditions” (p. 24). Third, they drew attention to the potential psychological impact of the legacy privilege on its beneficiaries. Less visible in affirmative action status than, say, minority students, legacies could still potentially suffer, as has been reported of black students, a “degree of discomfort from being beneficiaries of the admissions process” (p. 265). Finally, the authors argued that the treatment of legacies in the admissions process should not be used to justify policies for minorities or athletes, for the children of alumni support an institutional goal that the other two cohorts do not always — that is, legacy enrollment fosters alumni loyalty. Though seminal in their acknowledgement of the dimensions of admissions, affirmative action, and the symbolic connection of legacies to history, tradition, and alumni pride, Bowen and Bok (1998), nevertheless, failed to register the voices of legacies themselves, which was, after all, beyond the scope of their thesis. Even so, the authors created the nascent impetus that informed, to an extent, subsequent research on the topic, including the current study. Building upon this work, other researchers have sought to deepen our understanding of legacies, focusing not just on how or why they are admitted but also on how they grow, learn, and develop in college.[19]

Howell and Turner (2004) expanded on the strands of thought on legacies, race, and admission. Using the University of Virginia (UVA) alumni-base statistics and institutional *Common Data Set*, the authors made predictions about the extent to which shifting college student demographics would impact the composition of future alumni children cohorts. With most legacies classified as white and middle-class, the authors addressed the question of legacy preference in admissions and the perpetuated reinforcement of racial and socioeconomic privilege. "For this reason," Howell and Turner (2004) wrote, "legacy preferences potentially decrease racial diversity" (p. 326), something at odds with institutional missions of enhancing multiculturalism. For instance, the authors found that the "share of legacies enrolled is far from trivial and often exceeds the percentage of black students within the student body" (p. 328). The data

[19] In research on the academically elite of high school valedictorians in college, students whose extraordinary intellectual abilities distinguish them in admissions and in undergraduate experiences, Arnold, Noble, and Subotnik (1996) emphasize the importance of localizing barriers of educational advancement and growth to particular cohorts. To understand specific "psychological needs" may further illuminate for scholars and practitioners alike the "unique issues encountered in [students'] personal and professional lives, and the factors that enhance or inhibit the development of [the cohort's] exceptional ability" (p. 2). I adopt a similar approach in my rationale for studying legacy populations, on which I elaborate in Chapter 3.

supported the claim of minority student displacement at the hands of legacy admissions: 11% of the UVA undergraduate student body (n=5,468) was comprised of legacies (n=601) at the time of the research in 2001, and roughly 8% of the campus community was black (n=437).

In addition to exploring similar admissions-related affirmative action issues as did Bowen and Bok (1998), Howell and Turner (2004) further revealed the disproportionate number of out-of-state legacies being admitted to UVA (50%), a public institution, as compared to out-of-state non-legacies (27%). However, the authors also reiterated — and expanded upon — three key aspects of why legacies mattered to UVA and would to colleges and universities in general: (1) legacies are more likely to enroll than other admitted students, which boosts the yield rate (the percentage of accepted students who matriculate) and therefore institutional prestige; (2) children of alumni "possess a special knowledge of — and a desire to protect — [institutional] traditions," thereby reinforcing a "university's institutional memory" (p. 329); and (3) loyalty as demonstrated to alumni vis-à-vis admittance of their children encourages graduates to donate to their alma mater. Despite its contributions to our current understanding of legacy admissions, the authors' work ignored the interior lives of legacies themselves and assumed an institution-centered perspective. Invoking in analysis and projections that which legacies and alumni provided to UVA in terms of racial distribution, enrollment and yield numbers, and purveyance of history and alumni donations, the investigators omitted emphasis on how legacies undergo identity formation. Upon completion of the study, the following two questions remained unanswered: (1) How do alumni children make sense of who they are in relation to their college environments and within the context of their families? and (2) How does race influence the identity development process of legacies at UVA?

The predictions that Howell and Turner (2004) offered on the changing demographics of college students — and of alumni and their children — carved for the authors a distinct intellectual space within the body of literature on legacies. Mathematically forecasting the growth of potential black undergraduate legacy applicants to and enrollees at UVA, the authors reported that the "share of African Americans in the pool of potential legacy applicants is likely to double in the coming decade…[and] the longstanding images of legacy admissions as disproportionately benefiting white students still hold, but are eroding quickly" (p. 343). With the potential ahead for the subversion of tradition, of realigning racial and socioeconomic privilege, Howell and Turner (2004), however, did not acknowledge the pertinent questions that stem from such a radical paradigmatic overhaul: How does the change in demographics impact the way that legacies make sense of who they are, especially in relation to the handed-down traditions of family and of institution? In which ways will student affairs practitioners have to respond to the new, emerging needs of multicultural legacy populations? To which extent will the racial and socioeconomic shift of legacies impact the meanings and processes of enculturation that alumni children and students in general derive from campus ceremonies and rituals (Manning, 2000)? Whereas the authors, though working within a quantitative model, were unable to achieve generalizability beyond the institution in which their research was conducted, the lack of qualitative insight dulls even further the force and relevance of their predictions and the application of findings to student affairs practice.

Massey and Mooney (2007) carried forward the slow garnering momentum of the scholarship on legacies, looking closer than their predecessors at the academic achievement of legacies as measured through Grade Point Average (GPA) and retention. The authors, in addition, validated the categorization of alumni children as an affirmative action cohort, justifying more directly than Bowen and Bok (1998) the rationale for the grouping and for the attention researchers should devote to studying the subpopulation. Legacies, Massey and Mooney (2007) argued, were labeled as "'affirmative' because they, too, bring non-academic criteria positively to bear in the admissions process" (p. 99). Given admission preferences for legacies, whose credentials sometimes fell below the typical profile for students at elite institutions, two questions guided the authors' study: (1) How do the GPA's of legacies compare to those of the two other affirmative action groups of minorities and athletes? and (2) How well do legacies retain at institutions in comparison to minorities and athletes?

At the heart of Massey and Mooney's (2007) study was reliance on the follow-up data in 2000 and 2001 from the *National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen*, pertaining to a "probability sample of students who entered 28 selective colleges and universities as freshmen in fall of 1999" (p. 105). The response rate, out of 4,573 randomly selected undergraduates, was 80%. Whereas the authors used self-reports from subjects to track cumulative GPA's earned through the sophomore year and to determine whether students had withdrawn from school by the end of junior year in Spring 2002, perhaps recognizing the methodological limitations of the quantitative paradigm, they examined as well how legacies perceived their own academic fit with institutions (especially if they had received an advantage in the admissions process).

In the category of GPA performance, Massey and Mooney (2007) found that legacies appeared "to do best, earning a GPA of 3.26 over the first two years of college, followed by athletes at 3.12 and minorities at 3.05" (p. 109). Legacies, though, were found to have an attrition rate of 7% compared with athletes at 5% and minorities at 11%. Similarly, too, in assessing self-efficacy and self-esteem related to perceived admissions benefits and academic achievement, a concern at which Bowen and Bok (1998) hinted but that they did not study, neither legacies nor minorities were found to experience "disidentification and reduced work effort" (p. 109) as was hypothesized. Even so, in some cases, though the authors did not specify how many, discrepancy between legacies' SAT scores and the institutional average would "raise the odds that individual members [would] decide to leave school" (p. 111) and that they would earn lower grades. Acknowledging a modest effect size, Massey and Mooney (2007) concluded, nonetheless, that while "athletes and legacy students, as well as minorities, may be granted a bonus in the admissions process, the worst fears of the critics of affirmative action do not seem to be realized" (p. 114). The authors' findings in regard to academic achievement, as measured in GPA, and retention of legacies simultaneously allayed concerns about maladjustment and provided support for the continuing implementation of affirmative action for minority students and alumni children.

While rich with implications for the cognitive and psychosocial development of legacies, Massey and Mooney's (2007) work only engaged the subjects quantitatively. A qualitative approach may have elicited deeper understandings of why and how children of alumni transition into and achieve well within the academic (and perhaps, too, the social) climate of college campuses. Such an approach would potentially yield important insights to student affairs practitioners in uncovering how legacies, their family members, and institutional constituents such as faculty, staff, and administrators participate together in the co-shaping of expectations and actualities of success. In contrast, the narrow scope of the quantitative methodology as employed in the study left little space for the inclusion of the multiple realities and voices of those who contribute to the developmental experience of legacies. Whereas Bowen and Bok (1998) and Howell and Turner (2004) suggested the implicit symbolism and power of legacies as instruments and keepers of history, tradition, institutional memory, and alumni loyalty, a poignant question thus resounded from the work of Mooney and Massey (2007): How do agents of elite institutions embed within alumni children, and within campus cultures, images and messages to reinforce high standards for academic excellence, intellectual engagement, and cognitive ability? A thoughtful glimpse into that which surrounds legacy retention, including the potential of warm social acceptance, publicized and implicit reverence, and high positive institutional regard for legacies, would add yet another dimension to the discourse on academic achievement and identity formation.

A combination of themes, thoughts, and findings established by Turner and Howell (2004) and Mooney and Massey (2007), which in turn informed the work of Martin and Spenner (2009), concerned legacy academic performance in college and the cultural and human capital with which this particular affirmative action group entered school. In addition, the authors considered as well the vocational aspirations of legacies, which added another dimension of assessment to the developmental trajectory of alumni children and hinted at the psychosocial literature (Erikson, 1968; Josselson, 1987; Marcia, 1966; Waterman & Goldman, 1976; Waterman & Waterman, 1971).

Acknowledging the admissions preferences for legacies at Duke University — the institution on which the scholars focused — and at colleges and universities in general, Martin and Spenner (2009), however, did not belabor the point. Rather, they defined the intent of the study as “constructing a social portrait of legacies across the college years” and comparing legacies with “three meaningful groups of non-legacy martriculants” (p. 624). The comparison groups consisted of: (1) students who had at least one parent with an advanced degree; (2) students who had one parent with at most a college degree; and (3) students with at least one parent who did not graduate from college. Using the *Campus Life and Learning* (CLL) project data, information collected on two recent undergraduate cohorts that had enrolled at Duke (n=6000 undergraduates), Martin and Spenner (2009) undertook an ambitious research agenda to learn about legacies academically, socially, and vocationally.

Their sample consisted of 1,536 students (602 white, 290 Asian, 340 black, 237 Latino, and 67 bi- or multi-racial). Approximately 20.4% were legacies, 31.5% were in the advanced degree parent category, 40.6% were in the college degree parent subset, and 7.6% were students whose parents had not earned a college level degree. The authors relied on survey data, collected prior to college and after the first, second, and fourth years of the respondents’ time as undergraduates. Salient findings proved different from those of Massey and Mooney (2007), for Martin and Spenner (2009) revealed that, at least at Duke, legacies had entered the university with “somewhat lower levels of human capital, especially in comparison to other students with college graduate parents” (p. 636). Substantiating the claim, the authors noted that legacies reported “lower levels of academic self-confidence than students with advanced degree parents,” and that alumni children expected "to earn a lower first year GPA than other students with college graduate parents" (p. 636). In the category of grades during the first semester of study, legacies scored "over two-tenths of a letter-grade lower than other students with advanced degree parents and about one-tenth lower than other students with college degree parents" (p. 638).

The initial results of the study, despite its methodological limitations, were telling. Duke legacies, who were mostly white and Protestant and thus members of dominant racial and religious groups, arrived on campus with a wealth of "economic, cultural, and social capital" (Martin & Spenner, 2009, p. 638), which was expected to propel them toward academic self-agency and achievement. However, their performance during the first semester — and their deflated attitudes about themselves and their academic skills and future potential — struck me, though the authors themselves did not state it, as symptomatic of possible identity diffusion (Marcia, 1966) rather than of advanced levels of psychosocial development. Whereas the grades and human capital of legacies became comparable over time to those of subjects in the comparison groups, another key distinction that surfaced by graduation, something with potent psychosocial implications, was a discrepancy in vocational aspirations. Legacies, for instance, were "less than half as likely to plan on being a medical doctor compared to students with advanced degree and no degree parents, and about one-fourth as likely to plan on being an engineer compared to students with college degree and no degree parents" (Martin & Spenner, 2009, p. 643). Reflective not only of the possibility of diffusion, the delayed career decision-making that legacies demonstrated further hinted to me of another regressive phase of ego formation, the identity moratorium (Marcia, 1966).[20] Even with the limitations on the study's ability to produce generalizable knowledge across institutions, which included its narrow institutional context and use of self-report data, Martin and Spenner (2009) nonetheless found evidence of developmental concerns particular to legacies. Most saliently, the findings underscored the potential need for sensitivity to the cognitive and vocational dimensions of legacy student development, but with attention as well to the social well-being of legacies on campus.[21]

Despite the intriguing questions and findings of Martin and Spenner (2009) and of prior researchers in the field (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Howell & Turner, 2004; Massey & Mooney, 2007), major gaps pervade these foundational inquiries. Beyond the absence of voices of legacies and the thinness of research on the topic, the prevailing methodological design represents, perhaps, the greatest limitation in the current body of literature. Adoption of a qualitative method of inquiry is not only well aligned with the complexity and comprehensiveness of the subject matter — the learning, growth, and development of legacies in college — but it bridges as well the scattered thoughts, insights, and conclusions of the most influential investigators, upon which I build the current study. With a deepened understanding of the meanings of legacy undergraduate experiences, especially the active role that alumni children take in their own psychosocial developmental processes, the following five outcomes may ultimately be offered: (1) a deeper understanding of how and in which ways legacies, according to their inner "life-

[20] For instance, Martin and Spenner (2009) found that legacies were "most likely to report plans other than school or work for the fall immediately following graduation, and [were] least likely to report future occupational plans" (p. 644).

[21] In light of Arnold's (1994, 1995) findings on high school valedictorian women in college, who maintained vague career plans in order to plan ahead for having their own families in the future, it is possible that legacies in the Martin and Spenner (2009) study also delayed making specific vocational decisions as a way to accommodate basing their post-graduate lives around the wishes, values, and geographical locations of their families of origin.

worlds" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 395), transition to college academically and socially; (2) identification of what the distinct needs of legacies are within the academic, social, and vocational domains of identity formation; (3) clarification of the extent to which, and the ways in which, legacies negotiate the competing voices of self, family, institution, and peers to co-construct their undergraduate lives; (4) an examination of the applicability of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and/or deductive interpretive frameworks (Erikson, 1968; Josselson, 1987; Marcia, 1966; Waterman, 1999; Waterman & Goldman, 1976; Waterman & Waterman, 1971) to make sense of legacy ego formation; and (5) a statement of implications for student affairs practice that can potentially impact, per the national average of legacy enrollment, at least 10 to 15% of American college students (Golden, 2006).

Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter, I addressed the scholarship that pertains to the topic of investigation for the thesis — identity development and legacy students — structuring the review of literature in two sections. I presented the salient psychosocial development theories (Erikson, 1968; Josselson, 1987; Marcia, 1966; Waterman & Goldman, 1976; Waterman & Waterman, 1971) in the first half of the discussion, and in the second half I drew upon the admittedly thin body of work that has previously been conducted on legacies, either peripherally (Bowen & Bok, 1998) or directly (Howell & Turner, 2004; Martin & Spenner, 2009; Massey & Mooney, 2007). With the purpose of establishing what we already know in the field of identity development, and in the subfield of legacy research, I highlighted as well the main methodological, research, and ideological gaps thus far — which build a foundation and rationale for the current study. As I elaborate on the driving research questions in the next chapter, Research Design and Methodology, I conclude here with a succinct summary of scholastic needs based on the examination of literature. First, there is a need for a qualitative investigation to understand the meanings that legacies ascribe to their undergraduate experiences and how they participate in the construction of their lives in college. Second, we must determine how identity development processes occur for alumni children, per their self-disclosed narratives, based on a grounded theoretical framework. Finally, understanding the unique concerns of legacies must be brought to bear on creative problem solving, so as to ultimately have a positive impact on student affairs practice.

Chapter 3

Research Design and Methodology

To provide the continued rationale for this study, and to outline the foundational core of the research process itself, I address in this chapter the following: (1) the purpose of the study and the open-ended research questions; (2) the phenomenological framework for the qualitative project, with orienting philosophical assumptions about epistemology and ontology, as well as implications for the subsequent design and procedures; (3) the sampling techniques used in the study and how the decision on whom to include in the sample ties into the guiding qualitative, phenomenological paradigm and research model; (4) my approach to data collection, including general principles of interviewing, document analysis, member-checking, researcher-as-instrument and subjectivity, and the participant-researcher relationship; (5) provisions for inductive data analysis and the use of data-driven themes, codes, and categories to support grounded theory; and (6) efforts to maximize goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics to reflect sound scholarship and rigor according to the established norms of qualitative inquiry.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of the study is two-fold: (1) to uncover the essence of what being legacies at Bucknell University means to the students themselves; and (2) to understand how legacies construct, and co-construct, their processes of identity development amid their undergraduate experiences.[22]

Consistent with the qualitative paradigm, on which I elaborate in the next section, open-ended research questions drive this investigation. Whereas hypotheses and

[22] I define legacies as Bucknell University undergraduates who have had at least one parent graduate from the institution.

anticipated findings sometimes accompany a discussion of research questions, I refrain here from the practice. Instead, and as supported by tenets of phenomenological scholarship, I "suspend judgment about what is real" (Creswell, 1998, p. 52) prior to data collection and analysis, to allow the voices — the self-narratives — of subjects to lead to grounded theory (Creswell, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Holliday, 2002; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000) rather than to fit participants into predetermined categories and impose theory on them a priori. To this end, I identify five broad questions that guide my inquiry:

- What do the inner "life-worlds" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 395) of legacies, as understood through qualitative inquiry, reveal about the meanings that alumni children ascribe to their undergraduate experiences?
- In which ways do legacies explore and express — via language, metaphor, narrative — identity development needs within or beyond college student psychosocial domains of academics, residential life, and vocational awareness and aspiration?
- How do legacies co-construct their lives on campus, identifying and negotiating the potentially competing voices of self, family, peers, and institution?
- How do the self-narratives of legacies suggest singularity of experiences for each individual participant or echo commonalities across participants — and what are, in turn, the implications for grounded theory or deductive interpretive frameworks to make sense of legacy ego formation?

- How should our evolving understanding of the meanings of legacy identity development impact responsive student affairs practice and therefore enrichment of the lives of legacies present and future?

Phenomenology and Qualitative Inquiry

Although I embark on this study to advance knowledge in the field of psychosocial development of legacies, my use of the qualitative framework adds a meta-cognitive-like dynamic to the project. Not just about following the purposes of the research and posing answers to the questions of inquiry, qualitative scholarship concerns, too, a commentary on (1) the process of discovery itself and (2) the coherence of epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology, and method (Creswell, 1998; Holliday, 2002; Jones et al., 2006). Before I address the specific methods of sampling, data collection, and data analysis used in this study, as well as implications for goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics as criteria for scholarly assessment, I establish here: (1) the philosophical, paradigmatic context in which I situate my work, and (2) the foundation for a subsequent discussion in this chapter on the internal congruence of the study and how the components of the research design and methodology reinforce one another, a marker of quality and rigor in qualitative inquiry (Creswell, 1998; Holliday, 2002; Jones et al., 2006).

With roots in hermeneutics, constructivism, and phenomenology (Creswell, 1998; Gadamer, 1989; Husserl, 1970; Jones et al., 2006), this study adheres to the assumptions — to the axioms — of the specific philosophy and qualitative research tradition invoked here. In the evaluation of epistemology, constructivists hold that the acquisition of knowledge resides within individuals who construct and make meaning of their own realities (Creswell, 1998; Jones et al., 2006). This strand of thought suggests principles of ontology as well. Rather than advancing one finite, objective, and predictable truth, adherents to the constructivist, phenomenological branch of ontology maintain that multiple truths exist as actively created in the minds and lives of research participants (Creswell, 1998; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000). Constructivism finds resonance in this theoretical perspective (Jones et al., 2006; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000), which encourages researchers to interpret and translate the inner "life-worlds" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 395) of individuals to explain social phenomena (Jones et al., 2006). Whereas the concept and practice of constructivism has already entered into the scholarship of student affairs (Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000), I follow a closely related — and what I view as complementary — orienting philosophical perspective: phenomenology.

An established tradition of qualitative inquiry (Creswell, 1998), phenomenology brings focus to this study. Centering on the "uniqueness of lived experience or [its] *essence,*" the approach positions social phenomena as "always anchored in the lifeworld of the individual and the meaning making associated with being-in-the-world" (Jones et al., 2006, p. 47). It encourages scholars to explore, in other words, the tension between (1) the self-authorship that individuals undergo as they define and understand experience on their own terms and according to their own interior emotional logic and (2) how individuals make sense of their lives, per their interpretations of self, in relation to the social realm. "*Essence*" becomes a key concept, deserving of its italicized emphasis in the work of Jones et al. (2006, p. 47). Taking the notion of researcher-as-interpreter-and-translator further, phenomenology invokes the need for textural and structural descriptions (Creswell, 1998): to assess not only the content of what is being experienced but how individuals think, feel, reflect, and act on that which opens them to transformation (Gallagher, 2008; Holliday, 2002). I strive, as many scholars do within this branch of inquiry, to reach and articulate the core — the deepened, empathic *verstehen* — of the forces that infuse the complex, multiple realities at work within and across subjects.[23]

Whereas phenomenology suggests recognition of the idiosyncrasies and individualities of participants, it implies, too, an acknowledgement of the connections individuals have with each other and in relation to the phenomenon under investigation. Although the intent of qualitative research is not, as with quantitative research, the production of generalizable knowledge, the prediction of future outcomes, and the assessment of cause-and-effect relationships (Creswell, 1998; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000), the discovery of "universal structures" is legitimized as part of the research tradition and qualitative paradigm (Creswell, 1998, p. 54). Immersion in the meanings of participants' experiences reveals through thick-description (Geertz, 1973; Holliday, 2002) patterns and themes about which individuals have an overlapping consciousness.[24] Qualitative, post-positivist inquiry (Hammersley, 2008; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992), with

[23] Citing the work of Lincoln, Manning (1999) uses the German word *verstehen* to refer to the incisive levels of comprehension that constructivist, phenomenological investigators aspire to achieve in understanding profoundly, empathically the spirit and essence that lies behind human experience.

[24] Invoking the seminal work of Geertz, contemporary scholars such as Holliday (2002) explain thick-description as the layering of narratives of research participants and of that which qualitative researchers compose about the study and introduce through their own subjectivities. Thick-description, as Holliday (2002) maintains, (1) shows the "different and complex facets of a particular phenomenon" and (2) goes deeper to analyze "the cultural meaning of the act, to explore whether it's an involuntary [act] or a socially charged [act]" (p. 78). To this end, qualitative investigators may add depth to their projects, foster shared understandings between themselves and their participants and between each other and the study topic, and illuminate the multiple realities of individually and socially co-constructed phenomena. Later in this chapter, I discuss the influence of researcher subjectivity and the researcher-participant relationship on the process of data collection.

reliance on (1) emergent research processes, (2) inductive analyses, (3) time-and-place specificities, and (4) empathic person-centered revelations of meaning-making and understanding, is therefore well positioned to respond to the "complexity, contradiction, and paradox inherent to social living" (Manning, 2000, p. 137). In turn, the registering of the richness, vibrancy, and comprehensiveness of underrepresented voices on college campuses, as represented through theoretical interpretations, may inform student affairs policy-making (Manning, 1992; 1999) and institutional practices (Arnold & King, 1997).

Sampling

Consistent with the literature on sampling strategies in qualitative, phenomenological research (Creswell, 1998; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Jones et al., 2006), I have identified primary subjects according to one criterion: participants are legacy students who have had at least one parent graduate from Bucknell University. With a sample size comprised of five legacies in total, the depth of the contact with participants — as I outline in the section on Data Collection — rather than the sheer number fosters the immersion necessary to reveal participant world-views (Creswell, 1998; Holliday, 2002). To explore the co-construction of legacy identity development, I identify as well secondary participants: the parents of research participants, those who have graduated from Bucknell University. With a salient focus in this study on legacies themselves, parent involvement is helpful to understanding the research topic but is not as extensive as the commitment of alumni children. I elaborate further, as part of the section on Data Collection, on the two levels of participants and their contributions to the thesis.

Situating the sampling decision within the context of phenomenology and qualitative inquiry, I adopt what scholars refer to as non-random, “purposive sampling” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 239). Researchers who use this model specify the “characteristics of a population of interest” and try to “locate individuals who have those characteristics” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 239). As cited in Johnson and Christensen (2008), LeCompte, Preissle, and Tesch describe the intentional form of sampling as *criterion-based selection*, and Patton, as further cited in Johnson and Christensen (2008), refers to the practice as *purposeful sampling*, which means that not everyone within a designated population has an equal, unbiased chance of selection. Rather, specific interests in sub-populations, according to that which propels the qualitative researcher and the study, influences who is included or excluded. Given the purpose and research questions of the current study, I employ sample selection based on legacy and alumni status to align the methodology with the topic of investigation and the framework in which I orient the work.

Whereas I have identified and solicited primary legacy subjects via personal connections with them (the implications of which I address in the section on Data Collection), I have used a snowballing technique as well.[25] I ask participants who volunteer to recommend “one or more additional people who meet certain characteristics and may be willing to participate in the research study” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 239). Since my personal knowledge of who legacies are on campus is limited, and

[25] Jones et al. (2006) write that the researcher-participant relationship is not something from which to shy away, as may be the case with quantitative methods, and that it reflects a hallmark of qualitative inquiry. According to the authors, such a relationship “communicates to one’s participants a genuine regard for them as individuals and a deep commitment to understanding their experiences” (p. 77). An initial connection, provided that sensitivity exists to underlying power dynamics and possibilities of life-impacting benefits or retributive consequences, affirms a deep, supportive, trusting rapport — something to foster insight into, and empathy for, the inner realm of participants.

prospective participants who received invitations to participate in the study were given the opportunity to decline, snowballing proved helpful in securing the requisite number of interviews to solidify the "trustworthiness" (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992, p. 649) and "goodness" (Jones et al., 2006, p. 119) of the project. Using snowballing to garner the involvement of secondary parent participants, I gave legacies the option of recommending their Bucknell University graduate parents to join the study; parent participation raised the potential to reveal the layers of co-construction of legacy identity development, something that ties into one of the five open-ended research questions.

Although some scholars who work within the quantitative model criticize non-random sampling, as they do qualitative research in general, for its lack of rigor, validity, and generalizability (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992; Johnson & Christensen, 2008; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the qualitative nature of the ensuing project aligns the research design and methodology, including sampling strategies, within separate standards of assessment (Hammersley, 2008). For instance, Jones et al. (2006) propose the following criteria for understanding the soundness and "goodness" (p. 119), rather than the validity, reliability, and generalizability, of qualitative studies: credibility (judgments as reflected in scholarship fit the topic and context), plausibility (findings and interpretations are probable), and applicability (results of the study inform new actions that lead to personal empowerment and improved quality of life). Thus the sampling strategy, which resonates with the research topic and the qualitative paradigmatic context, achieves credibility. I devote an extended discussion to goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics as part of the final section of this chapter.

Data Collection

In this study I used the following methods of data collection: (1) interviews; (2) documents; (3) member-checking; (4) researcher-as-instrument; and (5) participant-researcher relationship. Here, I not only discuss what each procedural component entails and how I gathered the particular form of data, but I address as well the ways in which my decisions affirm (1) the research purpose and questions and (2) the overarching research framework and guiding philosophy.

Interviews

I met individually with each of five legacy participants for at least one, two-hour interview session, with the goal of yielding insights into their life-narratives. The length of two hours per session allowed for, after careful transcription, coding, and analysis, a detailed description of "the meaning of a small number of individuals who have experienced the phenomenon" (Creswell, 1998, p. 122) under investigation. Jones et al. (2006) affirmed the effectiveness of incisive, open-ended dialogue between the researcher and a small number of participants, even in one-on-one settings, noting that it encourages "relationship-building and in-depth immersion in a particular area of interest" (p. 49). Since I have focused the study most saliently on the meaning-making and active life-world construction processes of legacies themselves, I chose not to include parent participants in interviews; I limited the contributions of secondary participants to both document submissions and restricted member-checking, which I address in the next two sections of this chapter.

Although I discuss ethical considerations in the final section of this chapter, I am compelled to address here the potential for risk in interviews. Not intended to pose any more harm to participants than what they could expect to experience in their daily lives, interviews always hold the potential, however, to reveal sensitive, personal information. Recognizing what may be at stake, I gave legacy participants the opportunity to determine their levels of involvement in interviews; for instance, participants were free to interview but not have the session audio-recorded. Before I analyzed and articulated the data in this report, I shared with participants the transcripts of their specific sessions, allowing them to excise any information that they did not want included in the research. In addition, subjects had the option of not interviewing at all, thereby limiting their participation to the submission of documents and member-checking. I address the issue of confidentiality, and revisit participant autonomy, at the end of this chapter.

The location of interviews was important and thus intentional, as uneven power dynamics between me and the participants may have surfaced within the context of certain settings (Manning, 1999). Taking place in a relatively neutral site on the Bucknell University campus, I audio-recorded the sessions, for those who gave consent, to ensure accuracy in transcription, analysis, and scholarly reportage (all of which I address in the next section, Data Analysis). With a semi-structured, though largely open-ended, interview procedure (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1999), I guided the conversation minimally and as necessary by posing variations of the research questions to participants, hitting on core identity exploration areas (Marcia, 1966).[26] In order to maintain close emulation of this study's hermeneutic, phenomenological, and qualitative lineage, I approached the interview sessions from a human-centered, Rogerian model (Rogers,

[26] For instance, rather than asking participants how being legacies impacted their identity development, I posed open-ended questions such as: What does your being here at Bucknell mean to you and your family? How do you and your family feel about the major that you have selected, or the activities in which you are involved? How have you chosen Bucknell as the college for you?

1961) of: (1) following the conversational pathways down which the participants themselves lead; (2) demonstrating unconditional positive regard for the subjects and their narratives; (3) embodying acceptance both of who the participants are and for how they make meaning of their lives; and (4) relying on counseling techniques — such as verbal and nonverbal encouragers and mirroring, paraphrasing, summarizing, and reflection of meaning and feeling — to establish trusting relationships and empathic understandings.

Some authors argue against the scholarly merits of interviews, claiming that participants merely respond to the contrived interview situation itself and deliver performance narratives only appropriate for theatre and the stage rather than for academic research (Denzin, 2009; Hammersley, 2008). Denzin (2009), in particular, observed that an interview is not a "mirror of the so-called external world, nor is it a window into the inner life of the person," but is a "simulacrum, a perfectly miniature and coherent world in its own right" (p. 217).

Such criticism notwithstanding, interviews offer the advantage of accommodating ambiguity and hold the potential for information-rich content. As a researcher, I find an exhilarating complexity in interviews with subjects — in what is spoken and unspoken, visibly and invisibly charged. Values rooted in race and ethnicity, social class, and background and life experience in general for interviewers and interviewees alike impact the sessions and settings beyond the surface-level of the conversations (Holliday, 2002; Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000; Peshkin, 1991), creating a sub-textual, subterranean dynamism. Interview data thus becomes an important resource by which I may understand the depth of the phenomenon under investigation, the textural and structural essence (Arnold, 1995; Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1999; 2000), and the convoluted process of discovery itself.[27] In the tradition of hermeneutics and phenomenology (Creswell, 1998; Gadamer, 1989; Husserl, 1970; Jones et al., 2006), which recognizes the psychological construction of multiple realities, the way that participants talk about themselves and react to the researcher and interview setting — the embedded, value-laden implications of the use of language, metaphor, and narrative in the immediacy of the moment — is central to, though not the only method of, our understanding of the meanings behind experiences.

It becomes my responsibility, then, to collaborate both with the five legacies who chose to interview with me and with the additional primary and secondary participants. In employing together thick-description (Geertz, 1973; Holliday, 2002), we were able to unearth the deepened layers of engagement and create the necessary space for our findings to enter into the research and into the write-up of the study. I therefore address later in this part of the chapter (1) researcher-as-instrument and (2) the researcher-participant relationship; the elaborated discussion on these two elements not only echoes the complexity and necessity of interviews, but also illuminates the importance of including and addressing throughout the research my subjectivity and the interpersonal connections between me and the participants.

[27] According to Manning (2000), "interviewing is the most useful data collection tool for understanding the past, present, and future through storytelling, questioning, empathic listening, and reconstruction of events" (p. 143). With an emphasis on "understanding" in constructivist, phenomenological inquiry, interviews thus become a collaborative mechanism for researchers and subjects to piece together that which underscores meaning-making and social phenomena.

Documents

Whereas interviews served as the central method of data collection, I included the submission and analysis of documents in the research process, something consistent within qualitative inquiry (Creswell, 1998; Manning, 1999) and scholarship on similar specialized undergraduate cohorts (Arnold, 1995). To explore legacy identity development from an angle beyond interview self-reports, I asked the primary legacy participants, as well as the secondary parent participants, to submit full copies of or excerpts from (1) e-mail exchanges between legacies and their parents who had graduated from Bucknell University or (2) transcriptions of text message conversations between legacies and their parents who had graduated from Bucknell University. Ensuring ethical practice, on which I elaborate in the final section of this chapter, I used only those quotes and passages from e-mail and text message submissions that both levels of participants agreed together to include in the research.

The scope of the e-mails and text messages, as I explained to subjects in the consent forms, concerned the following dimensions that were intended to deepen the understanding of the research topic: (1) conversations about their lives and experiences as legacies on campus; (2) advice that their Bucknell University family members might have given them about the identity decision-making processes regarding academic majors, student activities, vocational aspirations, and other traditional domains of ego formation such as political orientations, religious beliefs, and dating relationships (Marcia, 1966); (3) commentary on parental experiences at Bucknell University and how that corresponds with or differs from the trajectories of participants in the here-and-now; and (4) general feedback that family members offered to their legacy children, which may impact the co-construction of the life-worlds of the primary subjects.

In addition to supporting the salient codes, themes, and findings from the interview data, documents had the potential to reveal the convolution of voices at work within the lives and experiences of legacies. As noted in the methodological literature, "humans are constant creators of complex and multifaceted meanings," and texts themselves "function at many levels and are the product of a person's entire set of sociocultural, political, and psychological conditions and identities" (Gee, Michaels, & O'Connor, 1992, p. 233). Whereas document collection and analysis may receive similar points of criticism as interviews have (Denzin, 2009; Hammersley, 2008), the research purpose, questions, and philosophical underpinnings of this thesis reinforce the power of words, spoken and written, to "capture thoughts, beliefs, knowledge, and feelings" (Jones et al., 2006, p. 88). Although I address member-checking next, a third form of data collection, the use of documents not only provides insight into the co-construction of the legacy identity development phenomenon, but also contributes to triangulation and thereby the goodness, trustworthiness, and rigor of the work (Creswell, 1998; Eisenhart & Howe, 1992; Jones et al., 2006).

Member-checking

I have solicited feedback from participants throughout and especially toward the completion of the research and in its write-up. Recognizing that research of this nature is "a collaborative science" (Gallagher, 2008, p. 68), I have worked closely with legacies to make sure that (1) only the information that they want included in the research is used and (2) the interpretations and articulation of the data find resonance with the participants themselves — the primary constructors of knowledge and experience.[28] I would have incorporated, too, the feedback of parent participants, though only in relation to the e-mail and text messages that they and their children consented to submit, but none had responded to invitations to join the study.[29] Reflective of qualitative inquiry in higher education (Jones et al., 2006) and in student affairs specifically (Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000), member-checking is essential: "participants, readers, and discipline [colleagues] all are involved in the judgment process [of the research's goodness and worthiness] through dialogue centering on criteria" (Jones et al., 2006, pp. 118-19). Unlike a final assessment at the culmination of the project, the ongoing relationship-building with and inclusion of voices from legacies, as well as from their parents, (1) strengthens the rigor of the research and establishes triangulation (Creswell, 1998; Jones et al., 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000), (2) keeps me aware of how my subjectivity is a fact of consequence in my work (Holliday, 2002; Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Peshkin, 1991), and (3) empowers participants through the conscious acts of ascribing meaning and definition to their lives (Jones et al., 2006; Rogers, 1961).[30]

[28] Despite opportunities to excise their data, none of the research participants retracted information that had been contributed to this study, nor did any of them withdraw themselves from the thesis project.

[29] As an ethical safeguard with having two levels of participants, only the legacy students whom I interviewed provided feedback on their individual transcripts and on the way in which their data was to be interpreted and articulated. Parent participants would not have provided feedback on their children's interview data.

[30] According to Creswell (1998), triangulation is central to producing sound qualitative work, and researcher accuracy in presenting "common features and structural connections" (p. 208) within the data often stems from the alignment of multiple information sources. In my study, I achieve triangulation through (1) interviews, (2) document collection and analysis, and (3) member-checking. In addition, supervision from my thesis advisors not only ensures ethical investigative procedures and practices, but also contributes to the inclusion of another dimension of resonance with and feedback on the research results.

Researcher-as-instrument

As the principal investigator, I permeate — and influence — the research process. In tension with the quantitative model, which calls for researcher objectivity as a means to reveal universal and finite truth and to produce generalizable knowledge, the qualitative paradigm suggests the simultaneous futility of eliminating bias and the need to utilize and give voice to that which underscores, motivates, and moves the researcher (Creswell, 1998; Jones et al., 2006; Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000; Peshkin, 1991). As Holliday (2002) explained, "the dynamics of the researcher's presence in the research setting, how it affects the research, and what [the researcher] learns from it must become another significant part of the study" (p. 154), otherwise the scholarship is disallowed. Something to embrace as data source, researcher-as-instrument "must be capitalized upon" (Holliday, 2002, p. 146) and has been legitimized within the field (Jansen & Peshkin, 1992).

As I recognize my background and experience in the introduction to the thesis, and address next a related axiom of researcher-participant relationships, the strand of subjectivity inherent to the work opens another realm of methodological possibility yet also ambiguity. Registering the thoughts, feelings, and meanings behind the constructed realities of legacies, I am granted the power — the permission — to follow my intuitive senses and scholarly judgments via an emergent research process (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1999). Though I have intended for the interior logic of primary participants and their narratives to direct the inquiry, based, however, on who I am and how I hear, react to, and interpret the lives of legacies, my subjectivity is enmeshed with and complicates the participant-centered approach (Creswell, 1998;

Holliday, 2002; Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1999; Peshkin, 1991).

Even with proper acknowledgement and documentation of subjectivity as part of the qualitative, post-positivist framework (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), other qualitative researchers could very well find different results in working with the same participants. With the expectation, though, of time-and-place-bound findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1992; 1999), I may still achieve, as I discuss toward the end of this chapter, credibility per my ongoing self-disclosure (Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Manning, 2000; Peshkin, 1991) and use of data triangulation (Creswell, 1998). Sustaining the voices of legacies as the focal point of inquiry, yet balancing secondarily the parent perspective while also drawing upon my own presence in the research, (1) mediates the threat of my voice dominating the research and its articulation; (2) generates "powerful insights about the complex issues students face in college," as the students matter most in the project; (3) reinforces the scholarly weight of the thesis; and (4) enriches student affairs policy and practice (Manning, 1999, p. 12).

Participant-researcher relationship

My personal connection to participants permits me empathy, an important undercurrent of successful and authoritative phenomenological, qualitative work. Scholarship supports the establishment of deep interpersonal bonds between researcher and participants (Gallagher, 2008; Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Jones et al., 2006; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000). The researcher-participant relationship fuels an intellectual "passion that later becomes the research question" and heightens the opportunity for researchers to delve deeply and empathically into the participants' world-views (Jones et al., 2006, p.

2). Qualitative inquiry, a "collaborative science" (Gallagher, 2008, p. 68), involves shared meaning-making and thus the validation of participants and their life-worlds; constructivist, phenomenological scholarship in particular entails "talking with people, discovering what is important to them, and working with them to jointly construct interpretations of the events based on their ideas about those events" (Manning, 2000, p. 137). Trust, reciprocity, and communicative transparency provide access to meaning and understanding and establish scholarly soundness.

Jansen and Peshkin (1992) raise the issue, however, of how researcher subjectivity may bias yet enrich a qualitative research project, acknowledging the charged ambiguity of whose authorial voice in the research belongs to whom — the researcher or participants. My emotional responsiveness to participants and their narratives, for instance, has the potential to trigger psychodynamic transference and counter-transference, processes that may interfere with rather than enhance my identification with and articulation of the interior lives of legacies. Nevertheless, scholars (Holliday, 2002; Jansen & Peshkin, 1992; Peshkin, 1991) recognize as well the impossibility of eliminating from the study the "involvement of self" (Jansen & Peshkin, 1992, p. 717). Disclosure of how my presence impacts the study and its participants (1) maintains sound and ethical scholarship and (2) positions me within the charged, liminal space of collaborative co-construction and academic observation, of understanding the meanings of participants' experiences from the inside and mediating the barrage of overlapping voices to interpret and translate the insights onto the page.[31]

---

[31] Peshkin (1991) addresses subjectivity and the researcher-participant relationship: "by monitoring myself, I can create an illuminating, empowering personal statement that attunes me to where self and subject are intertwined" (p. 294). That is, self-awareness opens scholars to empathy and an enriched understanding of themselves, of participants, and of the mutually shaping, transformative connections between them.

Given my staff member status as Assistant Director of Admissions at Bucknell University, which I address in the introduction of the thesis, the potential exists for dual relationships between me and the subjects in the study. Although I may have had ongoing contact with prospective and actual student participants professionally, I did not serve in any supervisory capacity to the legacies nor did I have a direct hand in admitting them to the institution. Through the consent process, I have protected participants from the power differential of dual relationships; the consent form, which each subject signs, reads that participation of subjects is voluntary and that they may (1) withdraw at any time portions of the information that they have given or (2) withdraw at any time themselves and their data from the study entirely. Withdrawal at either level carried no retributive consequences to the lives of participants as students or graduates after college. If parent participants withdrew portions of information or withdrew themselves and their data entirely from the study, they did not face any retributive consequences nor did their children who were currently on campus or who may enroll in the future. As I elaborate in the final section of this chapter on research ethics, I encouraged participants to contact, in addition to me, the chair of the Bucknell University Institutional Review Board as well as my thesis advisors with questions about their treatment and rights.

Data Analysis

I have used an inductive method of data analysis (Johnson & Christensen, 2008), reflective of "moving in analytic circles rather than using a fixed linear approach" (Creswell, 1998, p. 142). Rather than imposing themes, codes, and categorizations on data a priori, I have followed a post-positivist sequence (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Manning, 1999; 2000) of working through the interview transcripts, e-mail and text message documents, and member-checking feedback. I have adopted a procedural model from Johnson and Christensen (2008), which consists of: (1) open-coding, in which I have explored the data for general themes; (2) axial coding, in which I have taken broad concepts and turned them into categories and have highlighted evidence from the data — key words, phrases, metaphors — to support my decisions; (3) selective coding, in which I have established a common narrative thread to the emerging theory, something that resonates with evidence from the data as well as with the results of the open and axial coding; and (4) development of grounded theory, in which I have illuminated the research purpose and questions based on the findings from the data, instead of assuming that the data fits into already established interpretive frameworks such as the identity status construct (Josselson, 1987; Marcia, 1966; Waterman, 1999).[32] Member-checking on inductive processes and on the articulation of findings contributes to the goodness (alignment of philosophy, research tradition, and methodology and method) and trustworthiness of the study in plausibility (the results are probable) and applicability (the results apply to and empower the lives of subjects) (Jones et al., 2006). I revisit member-checking in the *Goodness, Trustworthiness, and Ethics* section of this chapter.

To assist with interview transcription and document analysis, I have used the computer software program, *Transana*. Whereas technology within the field of qualitative inquiry eases the manageability and storing of data, it may, at the same time, limit the "worthiness" of the study, curtailing full and persistent immersion in the data (Jones et al., 2006, pp. 97-98). Although the maintaining of data electronically could

[32] I rely here on segmenting, of "locating meaningful segments of data" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 535) and marking and labeling the sentences, passages, and paragraphs of transcripts and documents with identifiers for the inductive themes, codes, and categories. The process supports both the substantiating of evidence in inductive analysis as well as the later incorporation of quotes from the narratives of participants into the research report.

pose as well a threat to the confidentiality of participants (Jones et al., 2006), I have employed aliases to refer to participants in the transcripts as saved in *Transana*, and only I have had access to the transcripts and audio-recordings via the computer program and through the private network space at Bucknell University, where I have stored back-up data. I address in the next and final section of this chapter confidentiality and ethics and the way that I have aimed to ensure the protection of participants.

Goodness, Trustworthiness, and Ethics

I have interspersed throughout this chapter commentary on goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics, which together form a framework for the assessment of rigor and authenticity in qualitative scholarship (Jones et al., 2006; Manning, 1992). In this section, I define these three elements, as well as reiterate the ways in which I have sought to achieve them in this study. Although scholars such as Eisenhart and Howe (1992), Hammersley (2008), Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Manning (1992, 1999, 2000) have detailed models of evaluation of qualitative inquiry, tracing core paradigmatic assumptions and identifying intricate and interdependent axioms of quality assurance, I have adopted in my study the work of Jones et al. (2006). Not only have they outlined the principles of goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics in relation to the ideas of their colleagues, as well as connect qualitative and phenomenological research to higher education, but Jones et al. (2006) have also offered evaluative criteria that are concise, clear, and manageable.

Goodness

Goodness refers to the internal coherence of the research according to the interdependence of: (1) epistemology and ontology; (2) theoretical perspective; (3) methodology; (4) method; (5) researcher; and (6) “participants as multicultural subjects in the representation of voice, analysis, and presentation, and recommendations for professional practice” (Jones et al., 2006, p. 122). I have discussed each of these dimensions of goodness in the sections of this chapter entitled Phenomenology and Qualitative Inquiry (epistemology, ontology, and theoretical perspective), Sampling (participants), and Data Collection (methodology, method, researcher-as-instrument, and researcher-participant relationships). I will reiterate here an underlying aspiration of the study beyond the driving scholastic need for the advancement of knowledge in the field; not only does each procedural component of the study deepen the understanding of the research topic — the meaning-making and active construction processes of legacies as they navigate identity development in college — but the pieces of the process of discovery align together. Philosophy reinforces research tradition, which reinforces everything from sampling to data collection, from data analysis to the ethics embedded within the study. The interwoven facets of the research affirm goodness, as well as trustworthiness, rigor, and authenticity.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is comprised of three core criteria: (1) credibility; (2) plausibility; and (3) applicability (Jones et al., 2006). Credibility refers to the judgments and decisions that the researcher makes throughout the process of inquiry. A question that we may ask ourselves about qualitative work is whether the judgments and decisions have been reasonable in light of the topic of the study and the context in which it takes place. I address credibility through the detailing of each step of the thesis design and methodology, not only discussing the choices that I have made, but also how the choices fit within the purpose and questions of the project as well as within the theoretical and philosophical framework that I have adopted. The attainment of credibility has implications for the data analysis and articulation of findings, implications that member-checking addresses and to which I return again in the conclusion of the thesis.

Plausibility speaks even more directly than credibility to the results themselves. The second criterion of trustworthiness, it suggests the extent to which the findings and interpretations are probable. Whereas I may draw upon interview and document analysis, my subjectivity, and the shared experience of the researcher-participant relationship to assess plausibility, member-checking further provides assessment of the study's resonance with the lives of participants. Connected to the implications of plausibility, applicability refers to the potential of the study to inform new and evolved thoughts, feelings, and actions. An "empowerment of people and improvement of the quality of life" (Jones et al., 2006, p. 132) distinguishes achievement of the third criterion. I strive to attain applicability per the research benefits, which are aimed to enrich the educational experiences of legacies on campus presently, with the exception of graduating seniors, and of prospective legacy students who may enroll at Bucknell University in the future. Ongoing assessment of the intervention strategies that this thesis generates, which I outline in the conclusion of the report, will determine the level of applicability as well as the extent to which the research impacts the lives of legacies.

Ethics

According to Jones et al. (2006), ethical principles include "confidentiality, anonymity, informed consent, avoidance of deception, respect, privacy, and 'do no harm'" (p. 155). Although the legacy status bestowed on students is often associated with pride, as legacies have been viewed as the purveyors of history and tradition of both family and undergraduate institution (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Golden, 2006; Howell & Turner, 2004; Martin & Spenner, 2009; Massey & Mooney, 2007), I seek to protect the identities of the research participants to the best of my abilities. To ensure confidentiality and privacy, I refer to participants using aliases in interview transcripts and in the thesis report; I keep stored safely in the Bucknell University private network space the documents that link aliases to real names, to which only I have access via a distinct username and confidential password. Transcripts and audio-recordings of interview data are stored safely as well in *Transana*, to which only I have access, again, with a username and confidential password. Since I have asked primary and secondary participants to submit copies of e-mails and transcriptions of text messages, I employ aliases for family members, too, especially as the data may contain personal, sensitive correspondence. I keep safely and securely in the Bucknell University private network space electronic copies of these documents, which feature real names and identities. However, as I have acknowledged in the consent process, there still exists a possibility, even with safeguards in place, that someone may identify the participants based on the rich, descriptive nature of the information that they have shared. By signing the consent forms and thus agreeing to participate in the study, legacies and their parents have acknowledged the risks involved and have contributed to the research to the extent that they themselves have determined.

The consent process itself provides an additional layer of protection for participants, for it establishes the ethical boundaries of the study and sets transparent parameters for respect and autonomy in relation to participation. For instance, primary legacy participants have chosen their levels of commitment by (1) interviewing with me; (2) electing to have, or not to have, the interview audio-recorded; (3) excising any information from interview transcripts that they do not want included in the research; (4) choosing both to interview and submit documents; (5) submitting documents only and opting out of the interview; (6) helping me, if they wish, to identify additional primary and secondary participants; and (7) giving feedback throughout the research process on the data that they have shared. Parent participants have determined as well their own involvement by (1) submitting documents (but only if their legacy children agree on the same content from and extensiveness of the documents to share) and (2) providing as much or as little feedback as they wish on the documents that they submit in coordination with their children. With flexibility at the core of the project, subjects are not pressured to participate in all ways; rather, they have the autonomy to contribute as they wish, and to have full control over the information, in content and breadth, that they want incorporated into the thesis.[33]

At the same time, primary and secondary participants may withdraw whenever they wish pieces of the information that they have given, or withdraw themselves and

[33] As I have addressed earlier in this chapter, the limit on parent feedback concerns the interview data of their children. Only legacies have provided feedback on their own interview data. Parent participants have responded only to the e-mail and text message data that they have submitted in agreement with their children.

their data entirely and at any time, from the project without retributive consequence. I have specified — and the subjects have agreed, by signing the consent form — that the data will be used for research purposes only and will be destroyed within three years after the completion of the project (consistent with the Bucknell University Institutional Review Board protocol). Subjects are encouraged as well to contact not only me with questions about or concerns with their involvement, but also the chair of the Institutional Review Board and either or both of the thesis advisors.

With reciprocity, openness, and trust in the researcher-participant relationship (Jones et al., 2006; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000), I refrain from using deception. My self-disclosure about the study may not only lead to mirrored self-disclosure of participants (Rogers, 1961), but also supports (1) reliance on member-checking as a method to achieve triangulation (participants must know and understand the purpose and direction of the study in order to offer meaningful feedback); (2) the collaborative spirit, and its necessity, in this branch of inquiry (Gallagher, 2008; Manning, 1992; 1999; 2000); and (3) respect for participant autonomy to make informed decisions, knowing in full the risks at stake, about involvement in the project. To reinforce the core values of transparency, collaboration, and participant autonomy, I have included the following steps in the research process, which I will reiterate here: (1) I have shared with legacy participants their interview transcriptions so that they may excise from the documents any information that they do not want included in the research; (2) member-checking on the interpretation and articulation of that which subjects agree to have incorporated into the study has provided a secondary layer of assurance of informed choice; and (3) both levels of participants — the students and parents — must agree on the e-mail and text messages to include in the research. In instances where one level of participants has dissented from using any particular communications, I have not invoked excerpts or passages from those documents in the thesis.

Two limitations on the treatment of participants fall under (1) "'do no harm,'" albeit minimally (Jones et al., 2006, p. 155) and (2) distribution of research benefits. Whereas I have addressed confidentiality and outlined the risks involved for participants, the process by which they shared information — through individual interviews and/or through submission of documents of private conversations — was potentially unsettling emotionally. Nonetheless, the level of harm at stake was not intended to outweigh that which participants may encounter in daily life. Although participation in the study did not inflict physical or purposeful psychological damage, especially given my decision to avoid the use of deception, not all participants had an equal chance of receiving benefits from the research. For instance, graduating senior legacy students who participated in the study may not be the recipients of informed, responsive student affairs practice; yet first-year, sophomore, and junior legacies who participated may experience programs and services informed by the research to best meet their distinct educational needs. Future legacies — the younger children of alumni parent participants — have the potential to benefit as well, which balances the differential distribution of reward.

Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter I highlight the design and methodology of the study. I not only identify the research purpose and questions, which support the advancement of knowledge in the field of psychosocial development of college students, but I also articulate the alignment of the study topic with the hermeneutic, phenomenological, and qualitative axioms on which I based the inquiry. In addition, I comment throughout the chapter — and in relation to the corresponding procedural components of the study — on criteria for assessment, which include the three dimensions of goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics. Although I devote a separate section as well to discussion of the ways in which I aim to meet scholarly rigor and authenticity within the qualitative paradigm, I revisit these elements again when I address the limitations of the study in the conclusion of the thesis.

Chapter 4

Findings

Based on the analysis of transcripts from the one-on-one interviews with each of five legacy students, I address in this chapter the research findings. After I completed the open, axial, and selective coding process, three broad categories surfaced under which I then grouped the multiple themes, as well as organized the segmented data, that underscored the psychosocial meaning-making of legacies: (1) *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, (2) *Teaching and Learning*, and (3) *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*. I describe the three categories here in brief as part of this introduction, discussing them next in further detail throughout the ensuing chapter and incorporating into the thesis subsequently, as evidentiary support, quotations and passages from the interviews. Member-checking feedback from the participants allowed me to refine the three categories collaboratively and to make sure that the themes and data resonated with the lived experiences of the legacies themselves. However, limitations on the findings may still exist, which I highlight at the end of this section. Although I provide a biographical sketch of each legacy participant in Chapter 1, I reiterate here as well general background information on the five primary participants, and I use aliases for them, for their alumni parents, and for anyone else who may be linked to their real identities.

Within the first category, *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, participants expressed ambivalence toward their parents. Whereas the legacies acknowledged, on the one hand, the importance of independence and autonomy in making decisions for themselves, they simultaneously recognized at times, yet also suppressed in other moments, the impact of parents and of influential figures in general on their lives. They asserted their own identities as seen through the themes of (1) *"But he didn't really influence me at all": Applying to and Enrolling at Bucknell*, (2) *"Just a student — or an alumni child student": The Language and Terminology of Being "Legacies,"* (3) *"But in a lot of ways I have followed her": Family Impact on Academic Majors and Career Plans*, and (4) *Exploratory Behaviors: Finding Their Way in College*.[34] However, they continued to rely on the guidance of role models such as family, professors, and peers. The second category, *Teaching and Learning*, refers to the ways in which certain attitudinal and behavioral norms have been passed down from parents, the teachers, to their children, the learners, both directly and indirectly. Legacies revealed the presence of *Teaching and Learning* through the themes of (1) *"Brain-frequency": Expressions of Family-based Cognitive Processes*, (2) *"We all became really close": Family Dynamics in the Socialization Patterns of Legacies*, (3) *"I feel like Bucknell has and has not changed very much": Keepers of Institutional and Family History and Memory*, and (4) *Generativity: Giving Back to the Next Generation*.[35]

Lastly, in *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*, data suggested how the myriad forces and voices that stemmed from the Bucknell University environment itself had contributed to the co-construction of legacy identity development. Participants revealed the presence of this particular phenomenon in: (1) *"There's your stereotypical Bucknell*

[34] The three subthemes that fall under *Exploratory Behaviors: Finding Their Way in College* consist of *"Hearing from their experiences, it's cool": The Influence of Peers on the Lives of Legacies*, *"Yes, I do need guidance": Receptivity to Guidance, Support, and Mentoring*, and *"I am not having his college career": Recreating yet Separating from Family Experiences at Bucknell*. These subthemes further revealed the tension that legacies seemed to encounter as they sought to establish their identities while also looking to family, professors, and peers for support and for a model of how to make life choices.

[35] The two subthemes that constitute *Generativity: Giving Back to the Next Generation* are (1) *"I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is": Legacy Emulation of Parenting Styles across Contexts* and (2) *"I would want to give my kids the same": Having Families of Their Own*. Both underscore the proclivity that legacies appeared to demonstrate for mirroring, albeit in their own ways, the generative values and practices of their families.

legacy": The Reputations of Legacies on Campus, (2) *Triggers of Legacy Identity Awareness*, (3) *"I absolutely love it": The Bucknell Culture and Climate*, (4) *"I'm friends with his friends' kids": Legacies as Cross-Generational Connectors*,[36] and (5) *"It just all fit together": Integration of Self and Undergraduate Experience*.[37]

Although I devote an extended discussion to the limitations of the current study in the next chapter, I outline here aspects of the findings that may require a note of some caution. First, consistent with the observations of other qualitative researchers in education (Manning, 2000; Peshkin, 2001), it is possible that other stories based on the data may exist; however, I do not tell them, whether intentionally or not. Rather, I focus on where the narratives of subjects take me as the researcher. Second, I categorize, group, and segment data per what subjects are both conscious and unconscious of regarding their lives. To balance the leeway that I am permitted in serving as an interpreter and translator, the opportunity to solicit and include feedback from the participants themselves has proved helpful in limiting my biases, protecting the credibility of the thesis, and encouraging subjects, through our collaborative relationship, to foster self-awareness as a result of participation in the study. Lastly, whereas broad categories connect the narratives of legacies, the specific domains (ie. academics, residential life, career/vocational development, etc.) in which the subjects seem to express an overlapping resonance with the phenomenon — being children of alumni — sometimes differ. Despite the apparent fragmentation of contexts in which legacies

---

[36] Whereas this theme — of legacies befriending other legacies that then led to alumni parents rekindling friendships with long-lost classmates of their own — resonated with three of the five subjects, the other two students seemed to share a parallel experience as seen through the cross-generational relationships that they have with their siblings and that, in turn, impact connections with parents. I address this point further elsewhere in the chapter.

[37] As I elaborate further on this theme later in the chapter, legacies seemed to describe something fate-like in how the different facets of their lives on campus academically, socially, and vocationally had begun to cohere and had reinforced the deterministic feeling of their being destined to attend the institution.

demonstrate their identity meaning-making processes, which I note throughout this chapter, a question with which I myself have wrestled may arise in the study: to which extent has the structuring and articulation of data, even with the research safeguards of member-checking and my own disclosure in place, reflected shared, real, and lived experiences?

To situate the legacies within the contexts of their own personal backgrounds, I now provide, similar to the biographical profiles included in Chapter 1, a brief encapsulation of general information about each of the five participants. Ensuring a level of confidentiality to which the students themselves have consented, I employ aliases to refer to them, to their alumni parents, and to other people in their lives, such as professors at Bucknell, who could lead to the discovery of the subjects' real identities. I incorporate into the following outlines the students' pseudonyms, class years at the time of our interview sessions, family members who have attended the institution, siblings or professors to whom they refer in their narratives, academic majors, residential activities on campus, and vocational aspirations. These overviews are meant to support and inform the reading of the ensuing report of research findings.

Margaret

Margaret, a sophomore at the time of our interview together, has one parent, her father, who graduated from Bucknell. Her sister, who is not referred to specifically by name in this study, is part of the incoming first-year class at the University, and Margaret will be a junior when her sister begins her undergraduate experience. Initially planning to study the sciences and apply to medical schools, Margaret had switched her academic path amid her first year in college to include Education, History, and Theatre. An important faculty mentor in Margaret's life, to whom she referred in one of her interview responses, is Professor Cindy Heatley (a pseudonym). Margaret belongs to one of the sororities on campus and has been involved in residential activities through her housing and living arrangements. Currently, Margaret sees herself becoming a school teacher after she graduates from college.

Haley

Finishing her sophomore year at the time of our interview session, Haley has had two other family members attend and graduate from Bucknell: her father and her older sister. Haley has a younger sister, a high school student, who is considering applying to the University. In one passage that I quoted from Haley's interview transcript, she referred to her family name — to which I ascribed the alias "James." In addition to studying Psychology as her major and Philosophy as her minor, Haley has been involved with a range of activities on campus, from joining club sport teams to participating in a sorority, from working as an admissions tour guide to volunteering with community service-oriented student groups. One of Haley's faculty mentors, to whom she referred specifically in an excerpt from her narrative that I included in Chapter 4, has been Professor Freidel (a pseudonym). In the future, Haley sees herself working with children through either practicing clinically or conducting research on childhood development.

Kate

When Kate and I met for our interview together, she was approaching the end of her first year of study at Bucknell. Her father, a surgeon, had graduated from the University. Since Kate referred to her father by name in the data that I incorporated into

Chapter 4, I gave him the pseudonym "John." A Neuroscience major who is also pursuing a pre-medical path of study as well as contributing to a Psychology research project with a faculty member, Kate wants to become a doctor. During the academic year, she works part-time in the Office of Admissions. Although Kate has yet to join student clubs and organizations beyond her job, she intends to rush for a sorority at the beginning of her sophomore year, the time at which Bucknell students become eligible to join the Greek system.

Taylor

Taylor and I met together for our interview session right as she was completing her first year at Bucknell. Her mother, maternal grandmother, and maternal uncle had all graduated from the institution. In addition to studying Political Science as her major, Taylor has been involved with several activities on campus and in the community, including volunteer work and participation in one of the student-led performing arts associations. As Taylor begins her sophomore year, she plans to rush for a sorority. Currently Taylor is considering a career in government.

Natalie

Natalie, a second semester senior at the time of our interview session, has had two family members graduate from Bucknell: her father and her paternal uncle. Completing a major in Civil and Environmental Engineering, Natalie had already accepted, prior to her graduation, a job offer with an environmental consulting firm. In addition to involvement in a sorority on campus and student employment in the Office of Admissions, Natalie had also studied abroad during her junior year. She and her family have been close friends with several other Bucknell alumni and legacies, people with whom she intends to remain connected throughout her life.

Paradox of Influence and Identity

Although the legacy participants in this study have followed the educational path of their parents by enrolling at Bucknell University, the students demonstrate ambivalence toward the connection between themselves and their families. On the one hand, they recognize — and at times appreciate — the ways in which their parents have impacted decisions regarding applying to and attending Bucknell, self-identifying as children of alumni, and choosing and finding meaning in academic majors. On the other hand, they also believed in their own independence and individuality of thought and prized the uniqueness of their own undergraduate experiences. The themes toward which the data has led here are: *"But he didn't really influence me at all": Applying to and Enrolling at Bucknell*, *"Just a student — or an alumni child student": The Language and Terminology of Being "Legacies,"* and *"But in a lot of ways I have followed her": Family Impact on Academic Majors and Career Plans*. In addition to the paradox at work within the psychosocial meaning-making processes of legacies, of recognizing yet minimizing the importance of family influence in their lives and in shaping their identities, a second strand of ambivalence surfaced as well. While continuing to forge their own sense of belonging residentially, socially, and vocationally, the subjects credited, nonetheless, both peers and professors as helpful models of inspiration. Further illuminating the back-and-forth that legacies encountered as they negotiated the need to establish themselves on their own terms, but also sought support from others, are the following themes: *"Hearing from their experiences, it's cool": The Influence of Peers on* *the Lives of Legacies*, *"Yes, I do need guidance": Receptivity to Guidance, Support, and Mentoring*, and *"I am not having his college career": Recreating yet Separating from Family Experiences at Bucknell*, the three corresponding themes to the secondary level of paradox grouped under *Exploratory Behaviors: Finding Their Way in College*.

"But he didn't really influence me at all": Applying to and Enrolling at Bucknell

A consistent theme among the legacy students, as they discussed their college search, application process, and rationale behind enrolling at Bucknell University, concerned the simultaneous influence and non-influence of their parents. Margaret, for instance, spoke about the indirect way in which she had learned about the school through receiving University calendars from her father; she would post them on her wall in her room, yet remained convinced that she would not ultimately attend the same college as her father did. As she described it, "I mean, I knew that my dad went to Bucknell but [I] didn't really think anything of it. I guess I kind of wanted more not to go to Bucknell because he went here, and I kind of wanted my own college experience." However, despite her initial resistance to considering Bucknell as a potential choice for college, Margaret came to visit the school when she was a freshman in high school, a trip her father encouraged them to take together, and she "absolutely loved it." She recalled the beauty of the campus, which moved her, and recognized her father's suggestion of them seeing Bucknell but also maintained that he did not impact her affinity for the institution:

> …And we were actually at Knoebels [an amusement park near Bucknell] my freshman year of high school, and we were in the area, obviously, so he was just, like, "Oh, we'll come up and see Bucknell." And I absolutely loved it…we went through the Route 15 entrance and Rooke Chapel was just beautiful and it was in the summer and it was really sunny and, like, all of the trees were in bloom and it was just so, so pretty. So, I mean, that's kind of how I got to Bucknell. But he didn't really influence me at all....

Whereas Margaret's narrative about discovering Bucknell for herself, yet within the presence of and with encouragement from her father, hinted at a paradox of influence, Haley and Taylor had comparable stories.

When I asked her about how she decided to apply to and eventually enroll at Bucknell, Haley responded that at first she "didn't want to." She did not want to embark on the same experience as her father and her older sister, who graduated from Bucknell in 2008. However, after Haley was admitted, and as she toured campus with her older sister, she was then able to envision herself attending the University: "I didn't want to do the whole family thing — at all. But, yeah, it kind of had all the things I was looking for. It was really just walking around campus [when] I was, like, 'I can picture myself going here.'" The moment of realization in which Haley acknowledged the resonance she felt with the institution was accompanied by continued doubt, which underscored the tension of her wanting an undergraduate life distinct from that of her family members' but also finding her father's and sister's alma mater as an appropriate fit educationally. In fact, Haley had visited other colleges even after she already knew that Bucknell would best suit her, because even though she liked the institution, she was

> …not happy about that. So, I still went down and flew down to see other schools that I was looking at, but kind of wanting to like one more than Bucknell, but I just never really felt at home and felt like I could see myself really going there and enjoying it....I mean, the real thing is that I didn't want to come here because my family came here, but I came here anyways….

Similar to the push-and-pull that Haley had experienced, Taylor's narrative echoed the simultaneous desire to assert individuality but also to have a shared college experience with family. Taylor reflected on the paradox, remarking that "I don't want to follow any one path that someone else has followed. I want to be my own person, but at the same time that connection is very important, I guess." Later in our interview together, Taylor and I revisited the topic of how she had sought to exercise autonomy while, at the same time, she had ultimately decided to attend the school where her mother, uncle, and grandmother had gone:

> Yeah. I guess mainly because [my mom] wanted my experience to be my experience. I know in deciding here, I decided not on the fact that she came here or that my uncle or my grandma came here; it was more, like, "You want to come here because you want to come here." And in deciding it, I never really considered it "Mom's School," I never really thought of it as me following her....

Nonetheless, Taylor found comfort in the fact that her mother, as well as other relatives, had graduated from Bucknell, which made it less "scary or shocking as [compared to] going to a whole other school that none of us had really experienced before."

Although Natalie and Kate were steadfast in their acceptance of Bucknell as the college for them, they, too, recognized yet also minimized the influence of having alumni parents. For instance, Natalie recalled having a warm and spirited celebration at home with her family the day that she had received notification of having been admitted to Bucknell: "It was exciting. My dad had gone here and my uncle also went here, and so in my family they know that it's a great school and that I would enjoy it a lot and everything, so, I think that that was really exciting about it." However, Natalie believed that the connection to the University through her father did not necessarily add another layer of meaning to her now becoming a student at the school; rather, the joy she and her parents experienced together had more to do with her getting into her top choice for college, instead of being about Bucknell specifically:

> …I don't know if it really affected me that my dad had gone here, besides that my family was really excited about it, and I was, too, but I think I would've been excited to go to any school. My number one choice and getting into your number one choice, I don't think it was because I was going to Bucknell that it made a

> huge difference — if I really liked a school and it was a good school, I think my family would be very excited about it, too. I don't know how much it made a difference that it was Bucknell.

Whereas Natalie both valued and questioned the interrelatedness of her interest in and celebration of attending Bucknell and her family ties to the institution, Kate, on the other hand, never doubted her wish to matriculate. It was not until she had started as a first-year student on campus that Kate then began to ruminate on her college choice:

> At first I was kind of questioning...because, you know, I didn't look at any other schools — I really didn't. And I was, like, "I love it here, but should I have maybe looked at other places to reaffirm why I picked Bucknell?" Just to see an actual really, like, balance as opposed to just going in and being, like, "Oh, no, I want Bucknell." I don't know….

Though Kate did not mention her father directly as the inspiration behind her commitment to attend Bucknell, which she had decided for herself in ninth grade, she nonetheless mirrored his undergraduate path — a topic that Kate herself returned to throughout the interview and that I address within ensuing sections of this chapter.

"Just a student — or an alumni child student": The Language and Terminology of Being "Legacies"

A second theme that emerged from the data on the paradoxes of legacy identity development revolved around (1) the manner in which subjects expressed their ambivalence toward being labeled "legacies," and (2) the language that subjects used to refer to themselves in relation to having alumni parents. To begin each interview, I posed an open-ended question, asking what it had been like for the subjects to be students at Bucknell thus far. Without wanting to dictate the direction of the conversation, my approach was aimed to give legacies the opportunity upfront in our dialogue to acknowledge their identity as alumni children or to take us down whichever path they wished to go topically. At the outset, the participants seemed resistant to discussing their lives as "legacies" specifically; rather, they sought to establish their own sense of identities first before they then addressed more consciously the research topic, which typically occurred only within the final third of the interview sessions.

Natalie's response to the opening interview question captured well the mixed feelings, as well as the tone of uncertainty and the type of language that legacies had used, pertaining to their experiences of being legacies:

> JW: I guess, actually, maybe to begin with, the open-ended question that has been driving the research is: what has it been like to be a student at Bucknell?
>
> N: Just a student — or an alumni child student?

Similar to Natalie's use of the words "student" and "alumni child student," instead of her employing the term "legacy" directly to refer to herself, my conversation with Taylor appeared to carry a comparable resonance. When I asked Taylor the same opening question, she responded, "Just a student in general?" Margaret, however, demonstrated more forthrightly resistance to being a legacy by minimizing her distinct identity and saying that her college experience had been typical of any other undergraduate:

> Umm...I mean...in comparison to what it's been like to not be a legacy? — I'm not really sure. My experience has been what I would consider to be relatively normal. I mean, my dad is excited that I'm coming here, but he didn't push me to come here in the first place, so I guess I would compare it to any other college student.

Whereas Kate talked openly about her life at Bucknell and reflected on what it has meant for her to attend the same school as her father, she, too, at times referred to herself with language other than the word "legacy." "…We're both Bucknell alumni," Kate said of her and her father, "I'm an alumni [sic] this semester, we're both Bucknell alums…."[38]

[38] At Bucknell, students are considered alumni after they complete one full academic year on campus.

Nonetheless, Haley, whose response and apprehension about being a legacy paralleled that of the other subjects, articulated the point of contention at work within the lives of the research participants: she wanted her own experience yet had followed, on some level, the paths of family members such as, in her case, the “James’s,” her father and her older sister. This paradox surfaced in the way that Haley (1) discussed her choice to attend Bucknell, (2) recognized her need for continued independence, and (3) substituted her family name, “James,” for the identity marker-term “legacy”:

> I was very independent — and I'm still independent — but I was a very independent high schooler [sic], and I didn't want that whole stigma of just being another “James” or whatever, even though I don't think that [stigma] really is there, but.... And I wanted to kind of just go somewhere and just start my own thing, but I don't know, it's been fine.

“But in a lot of ways I have followed her”: Family Impact on Academic Majors and Career Plans

In a finding at odds with the need for legacies to forge a separate identity from their families, the participants recognized the influence of their parents on the selection of academic majors and, to an extent, vocational plans. Amid completion of her first year at Bucknell, Taylor talked about declaring a major in Political Science — the exact same degree path that her mother had pursued. Again, she acknowledged the similarities between her and her mother’s lives yet also maintained a sense of individuality nevertheless:

> Yeah, I mean, in some ways I feel like it's...I feel like I haven't thought about my mom being here and what she did and trying to copy or anything, but in a lot of ways I have followed her, just the fact that...of the way things worked out. She was a Poli Sci major, and I probably will be, too, just because I love it, not because I'm trying to follow her or anything.

Natalie shared a story that echoed Taylor's experience, reflecting on the summer internship she had had at her father's company, which sells environmentally friendly products. Though Natalie studied Civil and Environmental Engineering, and her father studied Management, both are interested in issues of sustainability academically and professionally:

> …when I did work for his company, I don't think I liked issues of sustainability because he did, but I think it helped to have someone above teaching you everything like that — that was...my dad was helping me to understand these things, and he was always trying to help me to really understand the management part of it because he was kind of the business aspect of it, and then I kind of helped him understand more the engineering...that kind of part of it. I think there are a lot of things that I get from my dad.

Although Margaret discussed a recent change in majors, switching from the sciences and a pre-medical concentration to History and Education, she, too, talked about the impact of working in her father's business, at his dental practice, on her academic interests.

> And that was probably around the time that I was working in my dad's office, and just being able to, like, see what I was looking at in the books and all that I was learning about all the nerves and, like, the salivary glands and muscles and stuff like that and, like, seeing it in real life...it was awesome. It's kind of, like, how you have all of these little puzzle pieces — like, they're really cool as separate, but then, when you put them all together, it's just...there's no other word to describe it...it's just really cool and amazing.... And to this day, I was just talking to my roommate yesterday, and I still wish sometimes that I could go into pre-med. There are certain aspects that I absolutely love about it. I love the working with people, which I guess has driven my educational route a little bit, I love all of the details that go into medicine, like, all of those fine-tuning things that you have to figure out. I know that my dad does a lot of work with models and stuff like that, for dentistry, and I just love working with my hands, and it's just kind of a combination of thought-process problem-solving as opposed to working with your hands and visual problem-solving. So, I guess that's kind of what drove...it was a combination of things, ending in "I want to do pre-med" and then having my dreams crushed by not being able to do science.

Despite withdrawing from the science program, Margaret nonetheless has continued her interest in working with her hands and using a "thought-process problem-solving" technique; she is involved with Theatre Technology and Design classes, focusing on set and scene design and costuming, which emphasize the underlying skill set that the foundational experience with her father has inspired.

Whereas Kate consciously followed her father's pre-medical academic path at Bucknell, literally taking the same exact required courses that he did as an undergraduate, his influence was felt most heavily in her vocational plans. She discussed becoming a surgeon, her father's current occupation and the type of doctor that apparently runs in her family lineage. In addition, her narrative revealed the internal stress associated with seeking her own career options while wanting to carry on a tradition, and her commentary here reflected as well the voice of her father, which she quoted to herself as she relayed the debate within her.

> …See, my dad obviously...my dad is like a [sic] 8th or 7th or 9th generation doctor or surgeon from his family, so he's pretty well versed in it, and I'm the only chance of carrying that on right now. And no one has ever said that there's a lot of pressure there…but it's like...I don't know.... I talk to him about it, and he makes it very clear: "This is your choice. This is your life. I don't want you to go into medicine if you don't want to. I'm not...," he's like, "I'd be happy for you to." He's like, "I think there's a lot of problems with it that I don't really, like, want you to face...." Like, he hates all the paperwork and stuff involved with it. He hates the business-side of medicine. And he's like, "I think there's a lot of stuff that's messed up, and I wouldn't want to put you through it — I wouldn't want to put myself through it again." But he's like, "I'd be really thrilled with your choice." But I kind of feel, like, there is pressure to do it — but he's always been on and on that there isn't, but I still feel like there is. Again, I think I create pressure. I think I create external pressure to put on myself that is imaginary, but I do that with everything…

Haley, on the other hand, saw her older sister as a reference point of comparison more so than she did her father. In fact, Haley mentioned that she was unaware of her father's major: "I don't know that much about my dad when he went here or [about] his experience at all, so...." However, Haley talked about her older sister studying

Psychology, the same discipline that Haley herself had decided to pursue. Nonetheless, she maintained her distinctiveness from her older sister and articulated, again, the crux of the paradoxes that legacies seemed to face. Though she measured herself against her sibling, addressing the commonalities in academic major yet the disparities regarding involvement in clubs on campus and in their overall personalities, Haley's commentary spoke to the relationship between the primary participants in this study, the students, and their alumni parents:

> H: Yeah. Me and my sister, we're kind of similar but we're also very different, so I'm doing different things than her naturally, not because I want to be different from her, but just because naturally that's what happens.
>
> JW: Yeah, so you want to be different.
>
> H: Yes, but that's not why I'm doing things — we're different, so I'm not joining a club because I know she wasn't in it by any means, but we've always had different interests and are different people.

Exploratory Behaviors: Finding Their Way in College

As the legacy students discussed their explorations of campus life, ranging from involvement with academics to trying different clubs and organizations, from considering career paths to establishing social niches, they continued to experience a paradox. Feeling the push-and-pull of family influence in their lives, while also seeking individualities, the participants had transferred their need of parental guidance and mentoring from family to others within the college community. The first subtheme, *"Hearing from their experiences, it's cool": The Influence of Peers on the Lives of Legacies*, reflects the impact of peers on legacies, especially as the research participants navigated transitions into residential life, academic paths, vocational goals, and first-year student orientation. However, the second subtheme, *"Yes, I do need guidance":*

Receptivity to Guidance, Support, and Mentoring, reveals the salience of professors as supportive role models for legacies; here, faculty became symbolic parents to their students, demonstrating a family-member-like commitment to the well-being of alumni children, to caring about their lives in college and after graduation as well. Lastly, the subtheme, *"I am not having his college career": Recreating yet Separating from Family Experiences at Bucknell*, underscores the tension of reconciliation that legacies encountered socially; reliving, and recreating, facets of their parents' social lives at Bucknell, on the one hand, legacies also sought to carve out their own unique space residentially albeit amid negotiating the internalized echoes of their families' pasts.

"Hearing from their experiences, it's cool": The Influence of Peers on the Lives of Legacies

Although Taylor, as previously highlighted in this chapter, recognized and also minimized her parent's influence regarding the choice to major in Political Science like her mother, something that spoke to the paradox of family impact on the lives of legacies, Taylor nonetheless credited her peers with helping her feel comfortable about her nascent intellectual track. When I asked her to elaborate on the process of discovering what she wanted to study, Taylor reflected on the older students with whom she had become friends and how they had presented a model for her as well as a source of encouragement:

> I've found a lot of people who are on, I guess, a future path of what I want to be on; I'm thinking of a Poli Sci major and a Spanish minor, possibly going abroad to Spain, and I've found a lot of people who have done that or will be going to do that, so, I guess talking to them is really cool and, like, influential — it's, like, hearing from their experiences, it's cool.

Later in the conversation, Taylor specified the ways in which "it's cool," looking up to those who have already accomplished what she would like to: "Yeah, it's helpful in the sense that it's doable and people have really enjoyed it as well….” Natalie, similar to Taylor, found validation for her academic interests as well as for her emerging vocational path. She discussed the importance of peers — of colleagues and constituents — with whom she had interacted during an environmental business internship over a summer break:

> …but talking to these people that were really interested in doing the right thing, and really wanted to do the right thing…but ultimately just were, you know, trying to save a couple trees or whatever it was. And so I think it was my conversations with those people, those types of people that summer that really got me interested in sustainability and those types of issues…

In addition to receptivity to peers as sources of support and validation for academic and career trajectories, friends on campus served as inspiration for students to join clubs and activities. Taylor, for instance, talked about participating in “Uptown,” a group that sponsors concerts and other events in a venue in a residence hall, but only after her student Orientation Advisor invited her (“She said, 'Come to Uptown,' and I'm like, 'Okay — I'll go.'”). After hearing about her friends’ experiences doing community service in Nicaragua, Haley decided to learn more about the club, the Bucknell Brigade, and ultimately applied to attend one of the club’s trips:

> …Some of my friends had gone on it — or I knew people who went on it — and so it seemed cool. I went to the [Bucknell Brigade] info session, and I watched their video and slide-show, and I just kind of felt, like, drawn to that — I had never done anything like that per se; I had been to other countries on vacation, but that was it. And I really wanted an experience like that, to actually do service work, especially in a poor, quote-on-quote, Third World country. It just seemed like a really great experience, and I thought it was awesome — what they were doing. And so I applied.

Having seen or at least heard of others’ experiences — whether in academics, a career, or clubs — gave Taylor, Natalie, and Haley confidence in doing similar activities themselves.

At the same time, peers provided comfort to legacies as they faced social transitions into campus life. Margaret, for instance, articulated the way that orientation smoothed the arrival process and instilled in her and her classmates the immediate sense of belonging and of how and where to take care of certain types of needs:

> From never having been on your own to, “You need to get to class; here's where you eat; here's, like, all the buildings; here's the library — just in case you didn't notice that big building right in the middle of the quad, that's what that is.” So I think what was very helpful and what made my transitional experience a lot easier is the fact that Bucknell does do all of those transitioning-period activities and, like, they show you around campus...I mean, like, our [Orientation Advisors] were, like, “Oh, you should do this instead of this.” So, it's, like, stuff that you may have remembered on the tour but you wouldn’t necessarily know because it's like your insider-information, quote-on-quote. So I think the combination of the [residential] college and Bucknell did such a great job with orientation and just transitioning people that I don't think I really had much of an issue, like, it wasn't that big of a shock.

Helping with the adjustment of living at Bucknell, following the lead of peers at times provided necessary companionship. Kate, for instance, had felt included and anchored in the community by staying together with friends almost all of the time. She reflected on accompanying friends to the cafeteria so often for meals that she had found herself having dinner on several occasions in the same day:

> …I feel like at the beginning of the year you have to...I was very, very complacent — and I still am — I'm just more out to give my opinion, which I have, of course. But before I was like, “OK, whatever. We can eat now — that's fine.” Instead of being like, “You know, I'm really not hungry, and I'm not going now.” Or, “I'll go and sit with you but I'm not going to eat, I'm not hungry,” instead of being like, “Yeah, sure.” I'd end up going to the [cafeteria] for dinner five times. I feel like everyone tries to please everyone at the beginning, but then everyone's personalities [sic] start showing, but I'm happy in the way that mine has.

Not only did the story that Kate shared address the following of peers’ examples, such as with meal times, but the commentary further articulated the paradox at work within legacy students of needing approval and guidance yet also “showing” distinct identities, self-agencies, and voices.

“Yes, I do need guidance”: Receptivity to Guidance, Support, and Mentoring

The impact of professors, even as legacies sought to establish their own independence and autonomy apart from adult, parent, and family influence, found resonance among the participants. Natalie, for instance, described the way that personal connections with faculty enhanced her experience of community:

> …I think that also, in looking at the professor relationships that you gain — and even, you know, I saw a professor the other day who I had sophomore year, an electrical engineering professor. I had him once for one semester, and he remembers my name and said, “Hi, Natalie,” and he says “hi” to me every time that I see him, and I didn't even get that close with him when I had him — you know, I didn't go to see him a lot or anything like that — but still the fact that he remembers my name.... And I think that that's similar for a lot of professors around, and I think that that can provide a similar community feel. And I think that that helps a lot, having adults around that aren't students that you build relationships with, because then you have mentors and people you can kind of, you know, talk to…

Reflecting further on the deep mentoring bonds that she had formed with professors, Natalie recalled a reaction that she had had to faculty who gave graduation gifts to her and her fellow classmates at the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department’s senior banquet. Perhaps unconsciously equating faculty to parental figures who wish to protect their children, she said that her professors “knew each of the students very well, and I think that they just really look out for us….” Whereas Natalie seemed to appreciate the closeness to and sense of safety with her mentors, Taylor valued the personal growth that she had encountered in being independent yet in also continuing to rely on guidance from parents, friends, and teachers alike:

> T: I've become more confident, I guess, being able to open up to people more…It's just more of a confidence factor by being independent, doing your own thing, and at the same time hanging out with your friends. Being able to make decisions by yourself.
>
> JW: So, making decisions, and it sounds like you're able to achieve for yourself a balance with what you want to do.
>
> T: And then when it works, you feel so much better. You're like, "Cool. This works, like, I can do it in the future." Yes, I do need guidance, but I do need guidance from my parents and from my professors and from my friends, but at the same time you know you can do it by yourself, so, that gives you the confidence boost as well.

Approval from family, peers, and professors validated the choices that Taylor, as well as the other legacy students, had started to make for themselves since arriving at Bucknell.

Amid her first year of study, Kate worked closely with a Psychology faculty member, collaborating together in the lab on a research project — something that made her feel important:

> …And I just asked him, "Can I help you in anyway, or be a part of your research, or just watch you do anything to get in your lab?" And he's like, "Yeah, sure." And I was able to run the experiments and stuff. And he gave me a lot of responsibility, which I really liked. It was like me being important, I guess, like early on and being a freshman…

Haley, who had referred to herself as an "independent high schooler [sic]," felt a similar resonance with a professor, Professor Freidel, someone from whom she had enjoyed learning so greatly and in whose classes she had felt so empowered that she decided to enroll in all of his courses. By the end of her sophomore year, she had nearly completed a minor in Philosophy as a result: "I'm planning on 'minoring' in philosophy but really 'minoring' in Freidel. So, I'm doing a Freidel minor — I'm taking my third class with him next semester." Margaret, too, seemed to appreciate the approval a faculty mentor in the Theatre Department had given her and her sister, an incoming Bucknell student who had visited with Margaret for a week in the Spring 2010 semester, as the siblings worked together on a project. According to Margaret, Professor Cindy Heatley supported Margaret and her sister becoming involved collaboratively in future assignments, because they had worked so well together:

> …So, I'm really excited to have her [my sister] here next semester, and actually Cindy — do you know Cindy Heatley? — she's already, like, "Yeah, if she wants to work here, that's great because you two clearly have something going on that you'll work well together — so, I mean, I don't have to worry about you guys."

Although the legacies were reluctant to accept the influence of parents in their lives, the approval and role modeling of professors nonetheless fulfilled a need for care, appreciation, and guidance from adults.

"I am not having his college career": Recreating yet Separating from Family Experiences at Bucknell

An area of sensitivity that the legacies had demonstrated concerned an awareness of their parents' social experiences at Bucknell. At times, the research participants recreated elements of the past while also leading different lives separate from the influence of family. Margaret was the most vocal of the research participants in clarifying the distinctions between her and her father:

> …I mean, my dad and I had very different experiences. He was on the cross-country and track team, he was on a D-1 sport, I'm not. He did sciences, I'm doing humanities. He didn't go Greek, I did. I mean, it's very different, so there's really no need to compare… I mean, I'm not trying to ignore [being a legacy] by any means, but I'm not promoting it either. It's great that my dad went here, but I am here for me, I am not here for him, I am not having his college career. He had his own thing, I'm doing my own thing. My sister is going to do her own thing. It's part of who I am in a way, but at the same time, it's not who I will be.

Haley expressed a similar need to establish herself socially, something she described in response to my question about the differences she saw not only between her and her father but between her and her older sister as well:

> I honestly have no idea what my dad did when he was here. No idea. I know he didn't play a sport, he wasn't in a fraternity — that's all I know. I don't know what he actually did do. My sister, I mean, we're similar in some ways, but I'm...I think I'm more well-rounded; I'm involved in more things on campus than she was, not that that means I'm well-rounded, but she's a little more one-track in terms of being really into academics. And we both do well academically — we're comparable there — but I'm a little more easy-going than she is overall.

Kate, Taylor, and Natalie, however, spoke more directly to the ways in which they relived their parents' social histories, especially within the context of the Greek system and the parties that family and alumni children alike had attended during their respective times as students at Bucknell. As Kate reflected on visiting the Sigma Epsilon fraternity house during her first year of school, a fraternity house where her father had lived and served as the chapter president, she recalled a moment of déjà vu: "I can remember staying [with my dad during his reunions] in Sig Ep frat house, and I re-remembered this when I went there for a party, and I was like, 'Oh, my gosh. I've seen this before — I've definitely seen this.' And I was like, 'This is weird...I got to go.'" In the interview with Taylor, the topic of feeling "weird" arose as well, and I asked her to describe this reaction to the cross-generational, intra-family connection that had surfaced for her:

> …It's weird knowing that our parents were here, like, our age, like, interacting at our age, and they were friends, and we weren't even a consideration in their mind. It's weird how, I don't know, you just...in general it's weird thinking of my parents at my age, it's just weird. So, thinking about my mom here, like, doing her own thing, and other peoples' parents — imagining what they were like, because I've met them now, so, it's kind of hard to imagine what they were like when they were younger, but I don't know, it's, like, thinking of them going to parties, going to class, and being friends with each other...it's just weird.

What seemed to trigger Taylor's rumination were moments, similar to Kate's story, of realizing that she was attending a party at a house where her mother had also gone with friends as students at Bucknell:

> Yeah. And I've heard stories, and oh, it's really weird thinking...there's this house — basically all of 6th Street — my mom has all these pictures of her and her friends on the porch of this house, and I looked at them, I was like, "I've been inside that house. I've been in there many times — this is really weird." And, of course, the house hasn't changed, most of the houses downtown are pretty gross-looking, so, they obviously haven't been updated at all. I don't know, so that was really strange, thinking, "Oh, my gosh. This is very strange. Like, take that house and go back thirty years." It's just very strange.[39]

Natalie, on the other hand, not only acknowledged the link in terms of social experiences between her and her father, but also found the shared connection to deepen their relationship:

> …So, I've heard about Bucknell a lot in my life and heard about the [pirate themed] "Shipwrecked Party," you know, and a couple of different things about Bucknell and heard stories and everything through [my dad and his classmates] being together and telling stories about it. So, hearing about it for a long time and then being able to share that experience with him is very special and felt...and not felt accepted but I definitely knew that this was a great school and that they had a great experience, and I wanted to have a similar experience than them…

In the next section, *Teaching and Learning*, I seek to build on the research finding of parental influence, exploring how it seems to be engrained within legacies and acted upon subsequently via cognitive, niche-forming, and generative patterns.

Teaching and Learning

The second category, *Teaching and Learning*, underscores the way that parents have served as teachers to their children, the learners. Four themes surface here, which reflect the depth of family influence across different dimensions of the legacy

[39] I address in greater detail the phenomenon of legacy identity triggers in the section, *Bucknell — the Environmental Context.*

participants' personalities and undergraduate experiences. *"Brain-frequency": Expressions of Family-based Cognitive Processes* captures how alumni children have internalized and draw upon the cognitive, thought processing styles of their parents. *"We all became really close": Family Dynamics in the Socialization Patterns of Legacies* highlights the socialization patterns that the participants demonstrate, niche-forming behaviors that reflect a recreation of family dynamics. *"I feel like Bucknell has and has not changed very much": Keepers of Institutional and Family History and Memory* reveals the passing down of Bucknell institutional knowledge from parents to children, who then become the holders of memory and purveyors of the liminal space between the past and present. Lastly, *Generativity: Giving Back to the Next Generation* is comprised of two subthemes: (1) *"I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is": Legacy Emulation of Parenting Styles across Contexts*, in which legacies emulate parenting styles and values within the contexts of education, community, social relationships, and family, and (2) *"I would want to give my kids the same": Having Families of Their Own*, in which legacies more specifically seek to model generative practices with their own children and families in the future.

"Brain-frequency": Expressions of Family-based Cognitive Processes

Legacy participants reflected directly on the connections that they have experienced between (1) the ways in which they themselves think and (2) the cognitive and problem-solving mechanisms of their parents as passed down to them. Discussing the implicit bond that she shares with her father, Margaret, for instance, emphasized the cohesive element in their relationship: she and her father know exactly what the other one is thinking. As Margaret herself described it, "My dad and I are more on the same frequency — the brain-frequency thing again — and we think exactly alike." In addition to recognizing that which underscores the depth of their familial cohesiveness, Margaret elaborated on how she had adopted a similar cognitive style as her father, something rooted in his teaching her his tenets of parenting:

> …Whenever he did something he would very deliberately say, "This is why I'm doing it." And this goes back to the fact that he and his dad didn't really talk, or he'll say even to this day that, like, "Why did grandpa go do this?" And he'll be like, "Actually, I don't know," or, "I wish I could've asked him so that he would've told me." So he's always, like, "I don't want you to be in a situation where your kids ask me why I did something or you know why I'm doing it," and that sort of thing. He kind of wants me to see his thought process, and it's kind of both a teaching experience as well as just actually being a parent by not only doing what he's doing but explaining what he's doing, so that way I can learn from it in a way. So, no, he was always very deliberate on saying, "I am doing this because...," or, "I am not doing this because...," or whatever.

The "detail-orientedness," to use Margaret's language, of the questions that her father often asks her has further impacted her thinking, and she has seen the influence on her behavior within the contexts of seeking guidance from her academic advisor and planning events for her sorority: "[It] kind of teaches me to ask questions…just the detail-orientedness is, I guess, a big thing." Natalie had a similar experience, especially as she drew upon her father's manner of decision-making in order to gain perspective on weighing choices about summer plans and internship possibilities:

> And I think that it helps that I have a father who's a planner that said, "OK — what if you do *this* this summer, do something in Civil Engineering this summer, and Environmental...." He definitely looked at...helped me look at it that way. But I think that it also had to come within me to want to have a summer internship as opposed to babysit or something else that would be fun in the sun. So, yeah, it was probably a push by my dad, but, I mean, he's a Bucknellian, too, so....

Natalie demonstrated as well her father's propensity for reflection, which influenced her within the academic domain of study abroad and within the social realm of campus life:

> My dad is definitely one that has a sense of energy and youth in him, just wanting to get the most out of life, and he'll always say...he's very reflective also — the e-mails that I get, reflecting about whatever it is he's thinking about, that are pages long, and you know that he has so much work to do, his company is very small, it's only...he's with three other people, so, he's very busy all the time and has lots of things to do, more than he should, but always manages to send us these reflective e-mails. And I found that through my friends here at school sometimes I'll send very reflective e-mails, so, I think that just kind of talking a lot about the future and the past and kind of being very live-in-the-moment type of thing and all of those types of qualities I think I've gotten from my dad…
>
> …When I came back from abroad, he asked a lot of questions about how I would feel, and he really encouraged me to do a blog while I was there, you know, send e-mails home to family and friends. And so he was...I think that he was enjoying my reflections there but also was helping me reflect by sending me long e-mails that would talk about how great of an experience that I was in the middle of and how I have to get the most out of this experience and telling me the types of things to look for and that kind of thing. I mean, it's not that recently — it was a year ago today or something, but just being able to reflect on my semester abroad, it was so unique and most likely you won't have the same opportunity ever to do the same type of thing, so just helping me to get the most of it in terms of thoughts, you know, taking it all in, I guess.

Kate, too, acknowledged the indirect teaching that her father had accomplished with her, instilling a nuanced worldview that not only informs the way that Kate relates to other people socially but also underscores her decision-making regarding plans with peers:

> We're both very level-headed, I guess, as opposed to.... A good example is my friend is trying to plan this trip to Disney World — pretty much we were going to drive down. In four days we were going to drive down, be there for three days, and somehow drive back, for under a [sic] 100 dollars. And I'm like, "This doesn't make any sense, it just does not make any sense." And he's trying to plan it out, and I'm just like, "This is not realistic at all." And, like, "You're no fun — we can make it work." And I'm, like, "No, we can't. You can't sleep in a car, for one, in half of these states that you're trying to go to — that's illegal." And he's like, "No, it's fine." "No, it's not." And just, like, things like that. Yeah, I don't make unrealistic or lofty plans or whatever. Whereas I can be seen as sucking the fun out of stuff, I think it's just realistic. Like my dad doesn't get really excited — and I kind of hate that about him — but he's realistic about stuff. He always says this: he's like, "I tell people that they have cancer and that they're going to die. My perspective of what is good is much different than...or what is exciting is different." And where he's kind of sarcastic, he's not really — he definitely means that. He has a different view point on what's a good day as opposed to a bad day. I think that keeps him grounded, but in the same sense it keeps him from getting

> childish excitement about anything except the Mets, who lose all the time. Rare, rare excitement.

Whereas Margaret, Natalie, and Kate articulated the thought-processing styles that they themselves use and have learned from their parents, Haley and Taylor, on the other hand, reveal indirectly a resonance between their and their parents' cognitive patterns. Haley, for instance, talked about the conversations she has had with her father about Bucknell sport teams, an object-oriented dialogue and way of thinking that she then replicated within an academic context. During our interview session, Haley recalled one of the recent exchanges between her and her father, in which he had focused on concrete, factual details:

> H: …He knows a lot about Bucknell sports, so, I get to hear all about that.
>
> JW: So, he gives you updates on what's happening?
>
> H: Yes. But updates as in their coaching style and the recruiting class they have coming in and their subbing pattern during a particular game — and he can go on and on and on.

Although both Haley and I were unaware of the connection at the time of our interview, data analysis suggested that a particular professor's teaching style, which she has enjoyed and to which she has been most receptive, may match the object-orientation and concreteness of her father's thought process:

> Well, I really responded well to his teaching style. It was all...especially with Logic, but he wrote everything up on the board — and I learn by taking notes — so that was really good for me. But he knows what he's teaching so well that the method he's designed the order that he teaches in, it just makes so much sense. And he really understands it, so he's able to impart that knowledge onto other people. And I know people who have taken Logic with other professors, and I'm sure that's great, too, but they do it in a different order that to me doesn't seem as logical, if you will, so I just really liked how he taught, and then he makes class really fun as well because he's really funny and very quirky, but he's so smart.

Taylor, though she, too, did not necessarily report a direct link between her and her mother's way of thinking, nonetheless found inspiration in utilizing her cognitive skills within the academic context; her manner of problem-solving echoed the way in which her mother had encouraged her to approach choosing a college to attend, with an emphasis on working through options on her own, weighing different factors, and after wrestling with ambiguity, building a structured approach toward resolution. As Taylor described her experience with writing an intensive research paper:

> You're presented with this ten-to-twelve page paper about election reforms and voting reforms and campaign reforms and America — what can you do to make it better, so you can improve voter turnout. We've gone through a whole class talking about it, but sitting down doing a paper on it and condensing it and doing research on it, you're just, like, "Okay. What do I do first?" And when you start working on it, it kind of falls into place. Like today, that's why I'm in a good mood; I was working really hard, but I feel like my paper's going in the right direction. So, yeah, it's rewarding, I guess.

"We all became really close": Family Dynamics in the Socialization Patterns of Legacies

In addition to learning and utilizing a cognitive framework that their parents have taught them, legacies have internalized, and then adopted, models of socialization from their families as well. Participants discussed, for instance, the belief that they have made life-long friends at Bucknell, sibling-like relationships that they will sustain forever into the future. Natalie reflected on having learned from her father that friendships established with classmates at Bucknell are lasting connections, something she herself expected to find in her own undergraduate experience and that she felt she had accomplished:

> …And he made those great friendships that had lasted so long — and I think that that's something that...you know, Bucknell friendships do last a life-time, and I'm sure that other college friendships would be the exact same at similar schools, but just knowing that you're making friends that will last hopefully for your whole life

> — I think that that's a really neat part about Bucknell. You know, talking about the community feel, I can just picture which of my friends now that I'll be in touch with forever, and I think that that's really cool…
>
> …And I think that that also made me really look at my college friends in a different way and really picture who I would end up seeing myself keeping in touch with until I'm...for thirty years or something like that. I think it kind of morphed with the kind of friendships that I made while at Bucknell, not as much the surface the relationships that are on the surface, but having deeper relationships with friends and stuff.

Natalie further referenced the niche she had formed within her sorority as something reflective of continuing to perpetuate a family-like dynamic socially: "[We are] just enjoying spending time together, liking to do similar things and being friends for a long time, have a lot of memories and sharing those memories with them." Although Taylor had yet to finish her first year on campus at the time of our interview, she nonetheless described her friendships apropos to the narrative that Natalie had shared. Taylor had "made my three best friends, like, ever, so, we do everything together — they're the kind of people that you know you're going to be friends with for the rest of your life." Similar to the ways in which her mother had encouraged Taylor's individuality, yet also her ongoing affiliation with family, Taylor recreated a parallel experience with her friends. She discussed not only how she and her friends "mix well" despite their inherent, personal differences, but also their plans to remain together in the future:

> …We mix very well, and we're each very, very different, but we're all very similar, and we mesh very well, which, you know, is very hard to find — and yes, you have friends that are good friends in your life, but you just know...I just know that they'll be there for me. And we talk about when we're older, we'll live in a cul-de-sac and all of our families will be in the cul-de-sac; we're just going to have morning walks with coffee and our dogs…

Kate, too, echoed the importance of sustaining friendships from Bucknell throughout a lifetime, which she had learned from her father, who still reconnects with classmates:

> …and, like, it's normal here, too, to stay in touch, to stay best friends with your friends from here. And I like that...definitely...I definitely like that aspect of the whole thing…

> …Yeah. The longevity of...long-lasting relationships, I guess. I definitely got that from my dad. Every one of his friends that isn't a doctor is from college. So for that twenty-some-odd years later and to be in all different states, and to still meet up, and they act like, they act like frat brothers, which is weird.... But when they meet up it's like they've never left each other — and I think that's neat.

Although Taylor and Kate were ineligible to join the Greek system as first-year students, under the rules and regulations of Bucknell's delayed-rush system, both planned to vie for sorority bids at the beginning of their sophomore year. When I asked Taylor why she would want to join a sorority, her reply seemed to express well the theme of seeking deep, familial relationships with peers: "…because of the friends you make, a very close connection, I guess…."

The salience of Greek life, and how behavioral patterns within sororities reflect family values, surfaced in the interview with Margaret as well. She directly acknowledged the way that her father had taught her certain social skills, which she then demonstrated within the context of her peer relationships via involvement in her sorority:

> …I notice it a lot during [executive meetings] for our sorority where, I mean, obviously everyone is going to have a different opinion, and just being respectful of everyone...ways of wording things...to get a point across. I guess that point is difficult to explain, but I always, in [these meetings], like, when someone's talking and if there are people that are opposing, I can be, like, like it kind of just snaps into my head, "Oh, I got that from dad"…

At the same time, Margaret further expressed the pattern of negotiating relationships that she had learned from her father. Margaret became aware of his influence in regard to how she sees herself interacting with her sister, who will be entering Bucknell as a first-year student:

> And this is more parenting than actual...well, I guess it's a combination of both...but with my sister — earlier in the year I called my dad and was, like, "You know, what am I going to do if my sister gets in, like how am I going to let her have her own experience." As I was talking to him, after I finished talking to him, he laughed at me and goes, "Well, you just learned three important rules of parenting." And a lot of it is their parenting style, and particularly I think my dad's parenting style more...at least more visibly is rubbing off on me. When I look at my sister, because there are certain where, like, I have to let her do her own...I guess this kind of goes back to the whole how-did-you-choose-Bucknell-thing, like letting her do her own thing, like letting me do my own thing. I want to let her have her own experience, and I don't want what I did to influence what she does.
>
> …I think that's really a big thing that transferred from my dad to me and then from me to my sister — and again from my dad to my sister.

Whereas Haley, on the other hand, did not necessarily discuss the need for sibling-type, long-term friends, or the direct influence of her father on social relationships, she nevertheless found a comparable family-like cohesiveness with peers based upon a shared co-curricular experience. As she reflected during our interview together on the community service work that she and her classmates conducted in Nicaragua, Haley commented on the group of volunteers' nightly discussions. Through these conversations, the students developed a meaningful, distinct bond: "…And to just kind of process it together — yeah, so we all became really close through going through the same experiences."

"I feel like Bucknell has and has not changed very much": Keepers of Institutional and Family History and Memory

Not only learning from the deeply embedded cognitive and social teachings of their parents and families, legacies further revealed the access that they have been granted, by virtue of being children of alumni, to institutional knowledge about Bucknell. Each student participated in the maintaining of historical information and of their parents' memories, thereby occupying a liminal psychological space in which the past has merged with the present day. Although Haley, for instance, had not talked much with her father about his undergraduate experience, she still recalled knowing, before she arrived at Bucknell, the names and locations of certain buildings that date back to her father's time at the school: "I know general facts. I know the 'mods' [sophomore housing developments] were put up right around when he was leaving, I guess. He's mentioned Vedder [an undergraduate residence hall] before, but, I mean, we don't talk too much." Natalie, however, had learned about traditions and Greek life events on campus, and she realized that her father never discussed the academic side of being a student and only shared, it appeared, stories about social aspects of life on campus:

> …I think there were a few traditions that I would hear about, not necessarily [the pirate costume-themed] "Shipwrecked Parties" or anything, but traditions that aren't here anymore, and hearing about some of those traditions and.... I remember one thing that comes to mind is an intramural sports competition between fraternities and sororities, and every fraternity had to participate in every intramural sport, and it was like a whole competition, and there would be a winner at the end of the year who was the best at all of them…
>
> …He didn't talk about the school part of it as much. It didn't seem like school was as much of a thing in his life.

Whereas Haley remembered physical locations and Natalie recalled social traditions, Margaret held onto knowledge about people. Her father, a runner on the varsity cross-country team, had one of the most famous coaches in Bucknell athletic history, someone in whose image a bronze statue on campus has been cast and dedicated in memoriam. "If it ever happens," Margaret said of being reminded of her legacy connection, "it's [a] very random moment where someone's like, 'Oh, there was this track coach that used to be here… And it's like, 'Oh, Coach Gulden?' Because he was my dad's cross-country coach. 'Well, how do you know that?' 'Well, he was my dad's coach.'"

Taylor expressed an experience of time merging together, of recalling what she had learned about the Bucknell community from her mother and of being enmeshed within it herself. As she discussed the vibrancy of the atmosphere on campus, Taylor remarked that:

> I feel like Bucknell has and has not changed very much, I mean, there's still that Bucknell spirit that still exists — my mom would always talk about the Bucknell spirit, and I would just be like, “OK, I don't really know what you're talking about,” but I get it now…

However, the liminality of balancing the past and present struck Taylor as “weird,” for it triggers for her visualizations of what her mother was like as a college student on campus over two decades ago:

> …but there are moments where I'm just like, “Wow. Okay, this is weird.” I can't imagine my mom as her younger self, going out with her friends and going to class — it's a weird thought. And, like, she...I live in the “mods” next year, and she lived in the “mods” her senior year, which was the popular thing to do, I guess. But just the fact that we're living...the “mods” haven't changed really, and we're living in the same area, and it's just weird. I don't know how she feels about it, though; she hasn't really elaborated on it much.

Kate not only recalled the name of a former pizza restaurant near the Bucknell campus during her father’s era, a place called *Zaha’s* and a word that her father sometimes attempts to use in their family games of *Scrabble*, but she also reflected on the meaning of being a conduit between history and the present moment.

> …Have you ever heard of the place *Zaha's* here? It's a pizza place. I think it's called *House of Pizza* now, but it used to be called *Zaha's*. OK — he tried to play that as a Scrabble word in Greece — we were in Greece this summer, too — and he tried to play that as a Scrabble word...that fight didn't end until the rest of the vacation, because *Zaha* is not a word, it's a proper noun, which can't be played until now when the rules just changed. And regardless of the fact that it's not an accepted slang for “pizza” anywhere but in Lewisburg, which none of us had lived in until me now — and that was after the game, so...
>
> …and the other thing is that you have the same experiences. At the beginning of the year you have the fall outdoor concert thing and then you have the fall concert

> and you have House Party Weekend and you have Chrysalis, and you have all the special things that we do here. Whereas at a bigger school there's all these random events, and you can have a bagillion [sic] different...all of these different experiences. But here everyone has a lot of stuff in common just with their four years. Like, you have stuff to relate to with everyone, where at a bigger school it's not necessarily true at all. And for some people I'm sure they're super happy with that. But it's like I, and anyone who is put into this situation, we have the same memories — and they just vary slightly. A lot of tradition, and immediately you can relate to an alumni [sic] here and talk about the same stuff, or talk about a building and you know where it is. Chances are you lived in the same dorm at one time or...you just have stuff that you can relate to as opposed to a school like Penn State or Pitt where it's, like, you might not have even heard about something…

Generativity: Giving Back to the Next Generation

Legacies exhibited a heightened sensitivity toward emulating their parents' generative practices, wanting to give back to younger generations and to enrich similarly the lives of those who will come after them. Two subthemes emerged here. In the first, *"I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is": Legacy Emulation of Parenting Styles across Contexts*, legacies demonstrated generativity in the contexts of education with students, community with activities that engage youth, vocation per their emerging career paths and the type of work that they foresee themselves doing, and family in regard to the caring and mentoring relationships established with siblings. The second subtheme, *"I would want to give my kids the same": Having Families of Their Own* reveals how legacies more specifically aspire to fulfill generativity in their lives by having their own families in the future. Participants even discussed sending their children to Bucknell, citing how their parents had done the same with them.

“I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is”: Legacy Emulation of Parenting Styles across Contexts

As Natalie approached her graduation from Bucknell, she discovered a new passion: wanting to help the next generation of students. A theme that resonated across the legacies in general, the drive to practice generativity within an academic context surfaced in the interview with Natalie, and she articulated well that which underlies this research finding. She spoke about wanting to stay in touch with one of her Engineering professors, and

> …maybe coming back to Bucknell and speaking for them in a class or something like that. And especially this year we've had a lot of speakers through our senior design class; it's all speakers — it's just a big speakers' series, a different one every week. At the beginning of the semester I was like, “Who comes back?” You know, who takes time out of their day, they're not paid, they're traveling to Bucknell, and usually this is the only thing that they're doing when they're on campus — it's not like they're here for meetings or something like that. And so at the beginning of the semester I think I would've been less inclined to do that as a graduate. But as you approach graduation and kind of see this legacy that you...and wanting the students who come after you to do well and to learn from these experiences that you did and just wanting to share with them your industry experience or whatever it is, and I could picture myself more likely to be coming back and speaking to a class or something like that.

In addition to visualizing herself imparting knowledge on students, which would, in turn, help them with their studies and possible career paths, Natalie had worked with a faculty member to create a proposal for a new curriculum that would better prepare Bucknell graduates for jobs in the environmental business sector. “[It] made me want to get more involved in what comes out of Bucknell after,” Natalie said, reflecting on her contributions toward revamping the educational foundation of Bucknell Engineering students. However, her emerging career itself — suggesting the presence of generativity vocationally — appears to achieve preserving the well-being of future generations. Pursuing a job in sustainability, Natalie remarked that “these issues that you can save money, you can do good things for your business and also help preserve the natural resources that we have" has inspired her thus far, as has also "bringing more Bucknellians into that field."

Whereas Natalie discussed wanting to return to Bucknell after graduation to work with students, Haley had already found herself in the position of impacting incoming students. Working for the Office of Admissions as a tour guide, Haley has had regular contact with prospective applicants and their families, and often shares with them her story of how she decided to attend the institution. During our interview together, I asked her to describe the way in which her own path to Bucknell surfaced in conversations with admissions constituents:

> Well, I mention it throughout my tour. I'm like, "Yeah, my...," or "I saw certain concerts because my sister went here." Sometimes I mention it, other times I won't until the end [of the campus tour], but then it's kind of just the story of how I came here, and I'll tell it basically the same way I told you but a slightly shorter version. Moms kind of laugh for the most part — I'll get a few chuckles from the parents. I think it's kind of a relatable story for some prospective students, just because not necessarily being a legacy and not knowing where to go, but just not knowing where to go in general. One time I had a girl talk to me for a while afterwards, because she was kind of in the same situation; she had, I think, both her parents went here, so, she kind of didn't want to but liked it so far.

The meaning that Haley encountered through her contact with prospective students and families also informed the rationale behind her wanting to work with children as a developmental or clinical psychologist. As Haley reflected on the depth with which she values connections and helping relationships with people: "But I've just always felt that I could relate to where people are coming from and understand people, which is more on the clinical end of it, like actually working with people to help them." At the same time, within the generative context of community, a similar spark as she has found in the academic domain seemed to inspire Haley — especially as seen through the volunteer work that she had conducted in Nicaragua. "I mean, there's [sic] people everywhere that need help…," she said of her experience in Central America, and "…it felt like what we were doing was making a difference."

Taylor's expressions of generativity overlapped the narratives of Natalie and Haley. In her case, Taylor's academic major of Political Science — and the vocational path down which it could lead her ultimately — hinted at her commitment to improving the lives of citizens. When I asked her in our interview together why she had decided to study Political Science, and what she found compelling about the academic discipline, she responded:

> I'd say just the fact that...I guess of how we can change the government as it is right now. There are a lot of issues with the structure and the set-up of our government, elections and everything like that, so just the fact that there's, that there needs to be change and that the upcoming generation can do it. And our government is always changing and developing and making itself better, so, I guess that just attracts me to it.

However, the theme of generativity in Taylor's narrative became even more salient as she discussed her involvement in on-going community service projects with a local Girl Scout troop. Having developed deep, mentoring relationships with the children, Taylor referred to the connection in familial terms: "But they've become our little sisters in a way." As she continued to reflect on her taking care of younger generations, Taylor realized a defining moment in her life in high school, something that made her self-aware of the impact she is capable of having on youth. The following exchange between Taylor and me seemed to underscore the importance of generativity in her life:

> T: Well, in high school I was in a dance company, and my senior year I kind of became the girl that all the younger girls went to, I guess, like, they would always come to me, and even though there were other, there was one other senior dancer there, I just kind of became "the mom," I guess, of...they'd also be like, "Taylor, Taylor, Taylor. What do I do, what do I do, what do I do?" And it's just like,

> "Calm down." And, you know, you'd give them, like, tips about how to do something better, or to learn how to learn the dances. That's the main thing.
>
> JW: But they felt comfortable coming to you.
>
> T: Mmmhmm. Yeah. I was just approachable, I guess.
>
> JW: So, you're approachable.
>
> T: I think so, yeah. I mean, I was comfortable with myself — I wasn't trying to be...like, I was a senior dancer, and I was getting the main roles, but I wasn't trying to be something, like, someone who is better than everyone else. I was just kind of, like, doing my own thing; I didn't want to be that girl that everyone was scared of, that no one wants to talk to because they're too afraid to ask her a question.

Although Taylor demonstrated generativity in the lives of children, Kate, on the other hand, expressed sensitivity toward helping incoming and current college students. Reflecting on her own transition to being at Bucknell, in light of what her friends at other schools had told her about their experiences, Kate commented on that which she had learned thus far and on the insights and advice that she would want to impart on peers:

> And I've also learned that there's nothing you can do with some things — they're just, like, funny. I should write a book on what to do when you get to college, like, first semester what not to expect that you think that you should expect but don't because you'll be really upset. And there have been so many of my friends from home, or acquaintances from home, that have dropped out of their schools — like, so many people that I know have dropped out or have gone to our community college, and I cannot even imagine. Or the people that are not doing anything, that are just working. Or, my friend is like, "Oh, it's just really hard." And I'm like, "Do you think it's going to get easier in a year when you forget all of this stuff from high school?" I don't understand that. It's like whenever this is really hard, I realize that there's [sic] a lot of people who have it way harder, number one, way worse, and it's also going to get me places, so, whatever — stick with it.

However, consistent with the research findings on the presence of vocational generativity among legacies, Kate not only considered what she could do to help college students and her peers, but also how she could improve lives through becoming a doctor and working in medicine. During our interview she discussed the reasons why she would want to be a doctor, yet why she would also have reservations about it:

> I feel like there's very different types of kids that want to be doctors. There are the kids whose parents were underprivileged and wanted their kid to be some amazing profession, and they're like, "Oh, I'm either going to be a doctor or a lawyer or a politician." And you're like, "Really? Like, you might spend just like 10 more years in school? Maybe if you feel like it?" And then there's [sic] the kids that are just dead-set, like me, that that doesn't matter, that's what I want to do. And then there are the doctors' kids who think that they're supposed to do that. And there are people, again, who fall under the same category, like, "Oh, I think it would be cool." Like, "No." It's a sacrifice, it's a life. And that's one thing that I've learned from my dad is, like...it honestly goes patients, and then the other doctors, and then his family — and that's just the way it is. To do what he does, or to do what most of them do, you have to put them — your patients and stuff — first, because their lives are in your hands, not your family. And it's just the way it is. But then I realized that maybe I don't want that experience. Like, my dad is not there — he's missed Christmases before by being on call — and I realize that my parents could be divorced, and I could see him every other Christmas, but for your job, for a job that you put all of this money into and so much schooling and stuff, you have to sacrifice a lot still. I can understand being a truck driver and being forced to work those hours, but it's, like, doctors do it to themselves. But there's definitely a reason for that — it must be super rewarding, which I think it is because I don't think people would go into [it] otherwise.

Whereas Kate, similar to Natalie, Taylor, and Haley, highlighted the importance of people in her life, and of wanting to work with them in a helping capacity, Margaret's narrative expanded on this theme to include generativity in the context of immediate family members.

Anticipating what it would be like to have her younger sister at Bucknell while she herself is still a student at the University, Margaret emphasized the need for her sibling to have her own, individual experience. In fact, in what constituted one of Margaret's longest passages in the interview session, she elaborated on the ground rules she would set to encourage her sister's independence, something designed to foster healthy personal development:

> And so I'm like, "I will drive you to get books at the bookstore; you are not using my car for anything else." And, actually, for fall break she's taking the bus home, and I think I'm going to visit my roommate in upstate New York. And so then I was like, "And then you can appreciate the fact that I'm driving you home for vacation." Because I want her to...as much as we do share a lot of the experiences, particularly in something like high school and college, I want her to have her own experience. Like, she wants to do a sorority, and right now this is my new big problem is that I want her to have her own experience. And I don't want her to join or not join a sorority because of me. And I think that to some extent it's inevitable just because I'm older...but that's my new big dilemma with regards to that I want to be as uninvolved in her recruitment experience as possible so that way she can make her own decision.
>
> Or for like the Walmart bus on Saturdays, like, I want her to take that instead of having me being able to drive her because I so much more appreciate being able to go to Walmart whenever I want because we used to have to go on Saturday and that was it — if you missed that last bus at, like, 3 o' clock to go to Walmart then you were kind of screwed and you had to either wait a week or go buy it in the bookstore where it's, like, ridiculously more expensive.
>
> So, at this point, it's going to be a very interesting balance of letting her do her own thing and having my input into what she's doing. I mean, of course if she asks for help — or if she asks for a suggestion — then depending on what it is I'll give it to her but for, like, recruitment and for rush and everything like that and about all the different sororities on campus, I haven't said anything to her because that's how I came in. I didn't know anything about all of the sororities, like, I knew the Greek letters but that was about it. And you pick up stereotypes, but I want her to pick up her own stereotypes of them; I don't want to give her my impressions of them because, I mean, impressions change, particularly once you're in the Greek system. My friends that are not Greek — and they have a completely different impression of Greek organizations than I do being in one. Like, we could look at the same sorority or fraternity and have two completely different opinions just based on the fact that I'm Greek and she's not. And, I mean, that's not always the case. But, yeah, I want her to have her own thing.

Not only did Margaret verbalize the connection between how her parents had treated her and how she then would want to interact with her sibling, but her self-awareness here expressed as well the ways in which the generativity of legacies had emulated family values and dynamics: "Yeah...it's kind of, like, in a weird way — and I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is...because the same values are transferring over, I think, at least on letting her do her own thing, sort of." Nevertheless, Margaret's academic and vocational path, of studying History and Education and of wanting to be a teacher, reinforced the generative spark at work within her life. She recalled, for instance, returning to high school recently to observe her former History teacher:

> …and it's really funny because I went back to her class this year, and I'm sitting in her class, and I'm, like, she's teaching and she's having a discussion in class, and I'm thinking while she's talking, "And, oh, well here I would have done this because of this," or, "I would've steered the conversation in this direction." And part of that is just from my education classes — and another part of it is just having been in college and having class discussions and having people bounce ideas off of each other and....I don't know, I'm absolutely happy in the direction that I'm going…

The prospect of giving back to students through a specific teaching style validates Margaret's academic and vocational paths as well as provides an emotional reward, of feeling "absolutely happy."

"I would want to give my kids the same": Having Families of Their Own

Legacy participants discussed plans to have families of their own, a way in which they could continue to practice generativity as well as emulate their parents. Margaret, for instance, envisioned the balance that she would want to seek between sustaining a career and taking care of her children:

> …Because, quite honestly, I can't truly see myself taking a bunch of classes and having a nanny raise my kids or having a babysitter raise my kids. Even if I...I acknowledge that our society is changing and more women are working, so I'm perfectly happy to accept that, I mean, if I'm fortunate enough to be able to stay home with my kids, that's fine, but if not, I wouldn't want a job, 9ish to 5ish, or if I'm teaching, 7:30 to 5ish or 4ish, or whenever the school day ends...and then I wouldn't want to come home, feed my kids dinner really fast, and then run out to a night class for my master's degree or something like that. I guess in the back of my mind I'm trying to be realistic as to what I can actually do versus what I like to do, and I feel like, and if I have kids, I have to put them first because that's what my mom did with me and my sister. My mom was, I think, two-thirds of the way done with her master's at Columbia for nursing and she kind of just dropped that when she had me and she raised my sister and me — and she's been at home for 19 years? So, I would want to give my kids the same — and if I couldn't do that, then a similar opportunity. So, it really depends, but that's the general gist of it.

Although Haley had less vivid ideas about the future as compared to Margaret, she nonetheless considered her academic learning — especially about cross-cultural parenting — in the context of what she would do, or not do, as a parent herself. "There's [sic] still some ones where I don't think I'd do it," Haley remarked, reflecting on her psychology course from the semester in which she and her classmates learned, for example, how some African tribal members smother their infants in dung to protect the newborns from evil spirits.

Kate and Taylor, however, not only both made direct references to having children, but also said that they would want them to attend Bucknell. Although Kate, as she highlighted, has only been the second member of her family to enroll at the University, she believes that there could be a long line of descendents who follow her, her father, and, potentially, too, her future husband: "…And I'm only the second legacy here," Kate said, "but who knows, there could be a ton of us now, especially if I end up marrying someone from here — like, I can't see the kids not going to Bucknell…." Taylor expressed a similar sentiment as Kate. Talking about how she and her friends whom she met at Bucknell would all live together as adults in a cul-de-sac, Taylor said that, "…Of course we all want our kids to come here [to Bucknell], too, so." When I asked Taylor why she would want to send her children to Bucknell, her replies articulated the rationale as well behind Kate's vision of the future. According to Taylor:

> Just related to the legacy thing, coming here I've met a lot of legacy kids, and from talking with them, just the legacy kids who are my friends, we figured out that our parents were friends or in the same sorority or they knew them in certain fraternities, and it's really strange how the connections are made — very, very strange. For example, my friend — his mom was in the same sorority as my mom, and they hadn't talked in years, and I think she is two years older than my mom, and we were on the phone, I think it was during winter break, and then my other friend called him up and was like, "Was your mom in this sorority?" And he was

> like, “Yeah. What's her name?” And they relayed information, and she was like, “Oh, my God — that's so ridiculous.” Just seeing the connections, I guess, I don't know, it's cool. It's been cool.
>
> …When you think of some peoples' parents — like, let's say that their two moms are in the same sorority but their kids are so, so incredibly different, then they'll hear about it and talk about it and talk about their experiences as well. I don't know...it's cool thinking that, like, who knows, maybe, like, kids from certain legacies will marry each other and connect. Like, there's [sic] marriages a lot within the Bucknell community. So, I don't know, it's interesting to think about that because I've heard about it, so.
>
> …I can't believe, like, thinking back, imagining certain kids from my class and from other classes...how those connections are going to be related in the future, because there will be connections obviously, thinking about the possibilities of one of my kids being best friends with someone I don't even know or someone I'm not really acquainted with being best friends with one of their kids, or even someone I'm really good friends with. …Because then I can come back and be like, “Oh, you're so-and-so's kid — that's so cool. I knew him,” or, “I knew her.”

Whereas Taylor had previously down-played the influence of her mother on her college decision, she, nevertheless, was comforted in attending the same school as her parent — and she would want her children to have a similar feeling of safety and connection at Bucknell. Taylor remarked that “there are connections that are deeper, there's [sic] lots of people that you meet that have these connections, it makes it more comfortable, I guess.”

Bucknell — the Environmental Context

The third category, *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*, is comprised of five themes that suggest the impact of the institution itself — its campus culture and constituents — on the identity development of legacies. Data grouped here revealed the co-construction of psychosocial formation, in which the subjects not only negotiated the voices of parents (as seen elsewhere in this chapter, under the headings *Paradox of Influence and Identity* and *Teaching and Learning*), but also the voices that stemmed from the immediacy of the school environment. *“There's your stereotypical Bucknell* *legacy": The Reputations of Legacies on Campus*, the first theme examined here, underscores the discourse surrounding legacies as well as the mix of positive and negative assumptions associated with children of alumni. The second theme, *Triggers of Legacy Identity Awareness*, highlights that which propelled, in academics, social settings, and institutional events, heightened sensitivity of the subjects about being legacies. Third, *"I absolutely love it": The Bucknell Culture and Climate* reveals aspects of the Bucknell campus culture, and the legacies' participation in it, which contributed to identity formation. *"I'm friends with his friends' kids": Legacies as Cross-Generational Connectors*, the fourth theme, positions legacies as cross-generational connectors of family and friends. Lastly, in *"It just all fit together": Integration of Self and Undergraduate Experience*, legacies had undergone an experience of integration, in which the various — and sometimes competing — elements of their lives had fallen into place coherently; the fate-like sensation of the phenomenon further pointed toward something akin to determinism, that the students had always been destined to attend Bucknell.

"There's your stereotypical Bucknell legacy": The Reputations of Legacies on Campus

A common theme among the narratives of legacies was the discourse, as initiated by faculty and peers, concerning alumni children. Participant responses reflected a range and diversity of experiences. Margaret, for instance, expressed concern about self-identifying as a legacy, especially in front of professors; she feared the assumptions that faculty might make when they learn of her family link to Bucknell:

> There's your stereotypical Bucknell legacy. And, I mean, even as students at Bucknell, we all acknowledge that there's this running joke that there are kids that are your very spoiled children, that mommy and daddy will, like, help you out —

> they're very, very babied. And I think people, myself in general, tend to associate that particularly with students who have had a parent who has gone here. Because they think that, "Because mommy and daddy have gone here so therefore it's going to be really easy for me to coast through." And I think that the professors are aware of that, so I think, if anything, I..."negative" isn't the word...but I would almost associate being a legacy, when talking to a professor, in a negative regard. Just because I know that they have certain impressions — and I feel like I personally don't live up to those expectations that they hold… So, if anything, I try not to bring it up [that I'm a legacy] just because I don't want professors thinking, "Oh, it's some spoiled legacy kid." I mean, don't get me wrong, I know that people that are here are here for a reason, but I also know that, just through my own experiences as a student, that you will get your legacy kids — and this is being general — that mommy and daddy do everything for them, and they support them, and they are still paying their bills at college for their ATM card and their credit card bill whatever, and it's like you go into class and you expect to receive a certain grade because, "I got in here...." And I've talked to professors about this, where there's a sense of entitlement that sometimes goes along with that, that I in particular associate with legacies. So I just don't bring it up. Because I don't want to be labeled that way.

Kate shared Margaret's experience of backlash toward being a legacy student. Whereas Kate acknowledged what she and her peers had believed were the affirmative action-oriented policies of Bucknell, by which alumni children had an advantage in the admissions process, she said the application benefit had come with a cost:

> K: In another way, though, being a legacy was awesome until you got here. I didn't realize that...I mean, no, it's good now being here, but the way that you're perceived. Because before at high school, it was like, "Oh, good. You're probably going to get in there then." But then when you get here, we're looked at like athletes — like, "Oh, they only got in because they're a legacy." [Laughs] There's a lot of that. And I'm like, "That isn't true...."
>
> JW: Who says that?
>
> K: A lot of people say that. They're like, "Oh, well unless you're a legacy or an athlete — they must be a legacy or an athlete...." I mean, Bucknell does definitely cater to their alumni, but in the same way, I think, all of us here would want them to, and it's really just a way for the people who aren't legacies to feel, like, better — I mean, people just like putting people down...it's just the way it is…And if you get to know me, you'll realize that I obviously didn't get in just because I'm a legacy. And I haven't honestly met anyone that I'm like, "Oh...." I mean, I've met a person or two whose parents have a building, and then I'm like, "Oh....You guys must really like Bucknell." But other than that, all of the legacies are here for the

> same reason that I am: their parents had a hard and good education. And once you're here your education just doesn't change because you're a legacy. It might up your chances of getting in more, but once you're in...if you rise to it, you obviously were meant to be selected. And everyone is meant to be selected, but you're obviously not here because you're a legacy — you perhaps maybe chose to come here due to legacy influence. But I just thought that was funny.

When I posed the question of stigma to Haley during our interview together, she said that she had not encountered anything negative and that “people don't really know my dad went here — you can't really tell who's a legacy and who's not.” Even as students learn about other students’ family connections to Bucknell, Haley continued, “it’s not really a big deal.”

Although Natalie and Taylor did not necessarily reveal in their interviews the exact words and stereotypes that community members at Bucknell had used in regard to legacies, the two research participants, nonetheless, indicated the positive, affirming associations that professors and peers had reinforced with alumni children. Natalie, for instance, found within the academic context both personal validation for being a legacy as well as inspiration for generativity, as several of the Civil and Environmental Engineering professors had graduated from Bucknell:

> Yeah, and I think that the same goes for going back to professors — a lot of the professors went here. I don't know if it's typical, but a couple of the Civil Engineering professors went here, and kind of hearing their experience in the Civil Engineering Department or something and how they got back to being a professor here and how it made them, again, want to give back and just seeing that. And I think it took me 'til senior year to realize why they would want to come back and be a professor at Bucknell. Not that there's anything wrong with it — a lot of them give up great careers in industry to come back and really give back to the community, and I think that that's a really eye-opening experience: you see what your degree can give you, can offer you later in life.

At the same time, Natalie received encouragement from her peers to see how many of them, within their group of friends, were legacies and, in turn, whether their parents had been friends together.

> …But I think that that's the biggest part is trying to connect with friends here and trying to see if our parents ever connected when they were here, and just being exciting because knowing that our dads knew each other — thirty years ago they split ways, never really talked until we came back and knew each other at Bucknell…

Taylor described a similar occurrence — and reaction — to when she and her friends realize that their alumni parents had known one another at Bucknell. "Just seeing the connections, I guess," Taylor said of being friends with other legacies whose parents were also friends together at school, "I don't know, it's cool. It's been cool."

Triggers of Legacy Identity Awareness

For Margaret, a classroom discussion every once in a while, in addition to conferences with professors, reminded her of being a legacy:

> …My dad went here, great, that's fine, whatever. I am here for my own reasons — and it's a long-winded story as to how I got here, but I didn't go here because of my dad, I went here because of me and because I want to be here and because I want to study here and because I want to work hard. And I want to live up to that Bucknell expectation of having good academics and going out into the world — and that sort of the thing, the whole networking thing. I'm not doing it for my dad, I'm doing it for me. And I think that that's an expectation that professors don't always expect, I guess, particularly from legacies. So, I just don't bring it up [that I'm a legacy]. And I think that's really the only time I think about it is if a professor says to me, or if it slips that, "Oh, my dad did this," or, "Oh, I heard that it didn't used to be like this." "Oh, how did you hear that?" "Oh, well my dad used to go here." "Oh, your dad went here...." The conversation immediately changes, I mean not always in a bad way...by any means, not always in a bad way. But it's always...it's like that you can tell, it's like, "Oh, yeah...."…
>
> …People that know, know because they're my friends or because it's been brought up because of a class discussion — and I think that only happened once, and it was more of like...ah, I don't remember, it was, like, first semester, but it's never come up. I mean, my dad and I had very different experiences. …I mean, it's very

> different, so there's really no need to compare… So it would be a very rare, random moment where if anything it pops up as...I guess there's no other way to describe it but random conversation where it just flows very nicely into it. But I don't feel the need to bring it up, by any means, to say, like, “Oh, my dad went here.” Like, “Pay attention to who I am.”

Whereas the academic environment triggered Margaret’s awareness of — and resistance to — being a legacy student, the social and residential dimensions of campus life offered additional reminders to students about their family connections to the institution.

As a first-year student, Kate noted that at the beginning of the academic term, acknowledgment of her being a legacy surfaced often, especially when she and her peers discussed applying to colleges. However, through her on-campus job of working in the Office of Admissions, Kate had poignant, and sometimes comical, encounters with alumni who are parents of prospective applicants:

> …And certain people I've talked to more — our parents went to school together and gave us something to talk about. That was neat. And what's funny now is that I never really thought about this before when I would ask people, but now I ask parents to their face if they come into Admissions, “Oh, I went here.” “Oh, my dad did, too.” And then I say who it is, and they remember. And this one lady I remember distinctively. She was like, “Oh, John.” She was like, “Oh, he's a funny guy.” And I was like, “Oh, boy. What do you know about my dad? What is your memory of my dad because I know that you just had a flashback?” And I never thought about that until...it's weird. It's weird because you live, you eat, you sleep, you live with, and you go to school with all of these same people instead of having a home life and a school life. This is it — it's the bubble. So, you just don't know someone for being academic, like, what I always thought of, “Oh, yeah. I went to school with John. Cool.” On paper he's, like, a Chemical Engineering-Chemistry double major and went to medical school [and was] president of his frat. But then on the other side he was the president of his crazy frat; I don't know which side of my dad, you know. Which is kind of funny to think about that. I wanted to ask him and be like, “How does this lady know you — and why did she look at me like that?” [Laughs]. I think it's neat, though, because we have something extra to talk about, I guess. At the beginning of the year it was more prevalent when you're just trying to meet people, but.... I haven't met anyone who's been like, “Oh, I hated your dad,” so that's good, that's been good.

Although Haley had come across something similar in her work as a tour guide, meeting alumni and their children, she had also found new student orientation and the social experience on campus as a channel by which to recognize legacy connections among her and her friends:

> I guess I knew people would have parents who went here, but there's people I'm still finding out, like, “Oh, yeah, my dad went here, or my mom, or both of them.” A girl on my freshman hall, we, like...that's just stuff that comes up during orientation, just randomly hearing people mention their parents in the context of Bucknell.
>
> …Yeah, I think it's just kind of like, “Oh yeah, that's cool.” And that's it. Like, a girl on my hall had both her parents and also her grandmother — and she went back multiple generations — and her brother, so.... It's kind of just like, “Oh, that's cool.” And then, move on.

Taylor reported as well the discovery through casual conversations of her and some of her friends having in common alumni links to Bucknell; however, she emphasized the importance of University events, such as a rugby match at homecoming, as reminders of her being a legacy.

> T: Yeah, we were at a, to build on this, at a rugby game — it was homecoming weekend, I think — and my parents had come down to visit, and one of my friends on my hall, his parents were there, too; it turns out his dad was in Kappa Sig [fraternity], I think, and was two years older than mom who was in Tri Delt [sorority], and they had known each other, and they saw each other, and they were like, “Oh, my God,” I know-you-kind-of-thing. “This is so weird, our kids are living on the same hall and they're friends.” It's just very strange. And my mom saw her ex-boyfriend at homecoming as well — it was just like, “Woah.” She didn't come and approach him or anything. It was pretty funny.
>
> JW: Talk about blast from the past.
>
> T: Yeah, she was like, “He hasn't aged very well.” Whoops. But it's pretty funny.
>
> JW: So, she probably feels pretty good about the choices she's made subsequently in her life.
>
> T: She's like, “Thank God I didn't marry him.”

Natalie echoed the relevance of events such as Parents' Weekend to her and her family, something that had served as an opportunity for multiple generations of Bucknell students, past and present, to reconnect and to celebrate together. Nonetheless, during a typical day on campus, Natalie said she did not think much about her father having attended Bucknell: "I don't sit here and think about my dad being here all the time."

"I absolutely love it": The Bucknell Culture and Climate

One of the common themes that resonated throughout the interviews with legacies was the academic rigor of the Bucknell learning environment. Kate summarized well the intellectual experience, noting both the adjustment that she needed to make to her own expectations for success and the culture of achievement in general:

> Yeah, I joke with my parents that I always thought I was smart, and in college I was reassured that I'm quite average. Because everyone's smart here, at least in my classes, everyone's bright and has always had it pretty much all come naturally to them. And now it's like I'm among a bunch of those people, a bunch of exceptionally bright students, too, so you have to work a lot harder to stick out from being average.
>
> …a good example is when Jeopardy comes on, everyone looks and watches — and then everyone knows the answers. You're not called a "dork" or laughed at...like the TV is not turned off. Everyone's just very inquisitive, I guess, and really wants to engage in intellectual stuff as opposed to laugh at it. It's taken seriously, as is having a social life, too. It's like you don't just have to be one or the other here.

Natalie remembered a conversation she had had with her mother in which she, similar to Kate, mentioned an awareness of the academic caliber of the institution:

> …I was surprised at how much I liked the academic side, and I came home and said that to my mom: "Mom, I really like the academic side of Bucknell," and she said, "Yeah, that's what you're at college, you know, for the academic part of it." And she was surprised, and I'm surprised that it hadn't really occurred to me before, but I think that that's the part that I'd convey the most [to younger students]. I mean, I think that all the parts of Bucknell I'd like others to experience

> the same thing, but how impressed I was with the academics is just really something that stuck to me.

In addition to the shared commitment to learning among her friends, Natalie found that enjoying spending time together socially was an important core element of her undergraduate experience:

> I mean, I think it's the type of thing that connects you with anyone in life. You know, I mean, what makes you like someone versus not like someone — you know, just having a lot of fun together and enjoying...wanting to spend your time in similar ways, you know, enjoying going out and having a couple of beers and that kind of thing but also enjoying watching a movie and just playing board games or going on vacation or whatever it is. So, I guess it's just having things in common with them, similar interests in what you like to do with your time; also being school-oriented and caring about grades and things like that. I think that a lot of my friends have that in common, and a lot of my friends and I like to cook together, and that's been something that we've shared — we like to eat together, too. So, I think it's what attracts me to other people, any other people not just that kind of thing, so.... Yeah, I don't know if it's Bucknell that attracts those kinds of kids or that those kinds of kids exist everywhere, and I've just found them on campus or what the situation is, but I think there's definitely a certain type of person that comes to Bucknell, and I think that if you have more people around you that are like you then you're more likely to find better friends.

Haley herself, however, demonstrated the drive of Bucknell students as well as the enrichment of having contact with peers across a variety of settings residentially; not only has she served as the captain for the club soccer team, but she has also been a part of the Bucknell Student Government, volunteered with the Bucknell Brigade (with which she travels to Nicaragua for community service projects), worked as a tour guide, joined two different religious life clubs, played intramural sports, and, most recently, attended meetings for another service-oriented organization, Bicycles Against Poverty.

Taylor and Margaret both discussed the impact of the environment — the academic rigor, friendships with peers, and overall culture — on their morale. Margaret, for instance, has enjoyed her experience so much that sometimes she wishes she could be a student at Bucknell forever:

> I absolutely love it — and I am so happy that I'm here. And I think I chose it for all the right reasons, and I don't think that I can necessarily change any of my reasoning for liking the school four years ago and possibly six years ago. I think my reasoning has stayed relatively consistent, and I can still stand by the logic as to why I came here — just in regards to the professors, and I love the students, everyone's pretty nice to each other...I mean, you obviously get your random "black sheep" but...the resources and the classrooms even and the library, just like all the little nooks and crannies around Bucknell that are really, really homey and that I'm still discovering, the campus is beautiful...like, I love everything about Bucknell, and I love being a student here. And I just wish that I can be a student here for the rest of my life, but that's a little overkill.

Taylor described an affinity for Bucknell on par with Margaret's response, describing the school as her new "home." As she reflected on the movement, psychological and physical, from home with her family to home with her friends at school, Taylor said of the shift:

> I would've never expect...school I had always considered to be school, like, you go to school, you come home, and you have fun — you don't have fun when you're at school. But that's totally different here. I know I'm really going to miss it over the summer, and I thought winter break was a long time and summer's even longer, so. And I guess just appreciating it, too, that's part of it — appreciating it while I'm here. Everyone wants to go home, like, one of my friends left today, but there's this same feeling that you don't want to leave. Like, we all need a break, I think, just because it's been a whole year, and we're tired — we need a break — but at the same time we don't want to go home.
>
> JW: Because in some ways you are at home.
>
> T: Exactly. Like, when we're going...I'll call up my friends, or we're in the library or something, and they're like, "Oh, where are you now?" I'll be like, "I'm going home," like, meaning back to our room, back to our dorm, like, "OK — we'll see you there." And that's what we say. Cleaning out my room is just going to be really sad, and I can't imagine not living there because it's my little space and my little home. I'm going to have to when it happens, though.

What Taylor saw as separating her and her friends from students at other schools, something that speaks to the morale at Bucknell and to the way that legacies seem to feel about the institution, was the ongoing discussion about how much they love being at the University:

> …It was actually really funny, one of my friends was saying to me the other day last weekend we were walking around campus and it was, like, Saturday or something, and she was like, “You know, the difference between us and my friends who go to other schools is that we always talk about how much we love Bucknell so much even when we're here.” You know, sometimes people don't really say it; they always complain about the school or work or the drama that goes on with their friends, and then they go home and they say, “I miss it so much.” We constantly talk about it while we're in school, and we always talk about legacy connections, and we always talk about everything that goes into our experience all the time and how much it's so great, so, I guess that's the difference between Bucknell and other colleges. I do know it's interesting because even my other friends have had some trouble adjusting to college, and they haven't exactly liked their colleges very much, or maybe at first they didn't like it, but now they're warming up to it, so, it's interesting to see the difference — and they don't really get where I'm coming from sometimes.

“I'm friends with his friends' kids”: Legacies as Cross-Generational Connectors

Legacy participants experienced something else in common within the context of being students specifically at Bucknell: whether through friendships with classmates on campus or through the relationships with siblings, legacies were cross-generational connectors. Bringing closer together friends and family members, the legacies themselves occupied a liminal social sphere that transcended time and history. Natalie, for instance, remembered how special one particular Parents’ Weekend was for her and her family; she and her parents celebrated with another alumni family, long-time friends of theirs whose son attended Bucknell with Natalie.

> One of the families that we vacationed with for a long time, one of their children went here, and he was two years older and just being able to share that experience with him I think was really special and kind of being able to share with him and his parents when they would come back for Parents' Weekend or something — it just felt so natural that everybody was at the same place and just being able to share that experience between generations was really neat.

The friendship itself between Natalie and another legacy student took on, for her, a different kind of tone, especially in light of the bonds between their respective parents. “It was different than friends — they weren't the same as my freshman hall friends or anything like that,” Natalie said, “It was more different, it was more of family...I looked at them like a brother or something than a friend on campus or something like that, so.” Kate had a similar awareness as Natalie and also responded with an affirmation of the cross-generational bonds among her and her friends, her father and his classmates, and Bucknell itself: “…I liked the fact that my dad kept in touch with all his friends from here, and I'm friends with his friends' kids — and I think that's neat.”

Taylor expressed her experience of cross-generational relationships in regard to her plans for the future. Similar to what she herself had encountered in relation to her mother, Taylor envisioned her own children attending Bucknell and through her children’s friendships on campus then allowing alumni parents to discover and reconnect with one another:

> … I can't believe, like, thinking back, imagining certain kids from my class and from other classes...how those connections are going to be related in the future, because there will be connections obviously, thinking about the possibilities of one of my kids being best friends with someone I don't even know or someone I'm not really acquainted with being best friends with one of their kids, or even someone I'm really good friends with.

While Margaret and Haley also demonstrated cross-generational connections per their future-oriented thoughts, they focused their attention on siblings. Haley, for instance, talked about how her younger sister may want to attend Bucknell, with Haley then becoming an intermediary between her two siblings and her father. For Margaret, reenacting her family’s parenting style toward her sister fostered resonance across generations as well:

> …And a lot of it is their parenting style, and particularly I think my dad's parenting style more...at least more visibly is rubbing off on me. When I look at my sister, because there are certain where, like, I have to let her do her own...I guess this kind of goes back to the whole how-did-you-choose-Bucknell-thing, like, letting her do her own thing, like, letting me do my own thing. I want to let her have her own experience, and I don’t want what I did to influence what she does.
>
> …I think that's really a big thing that transferred from my dad to me and then from me to my sister — and again from my dad to my sister…

“It just all fit together”: Integration of Self and Undergraduate Experience

Although the legacy participants demonstrated this research finding in different dimensions of their lives, from academics to residential experiences, a commonality among them was an experience of integration. Haley, for instance, discussed the intensity of her daily schedule on campus and how she had sought a balance among the overlapping demands on her time. When I asked her what the transition to college had been like, especially given the sheer number of activities in which she was involved at Bucknell, she responded that “I think for the most part, I've kind of always been like that. I was a big soccer player my whole life, so between that and school, everything else had to kind of fit in. And I've always been involved in other things besides soccer, so it just all fit together, I guess.” At the same time, she described a similar feeling of synthesis — of choices she had made “just all [fitting] together” — in relation to joining a sorority. Haley recalled the Greek system rush process that she had undergone earlier in the academic year:

> …Things just worked out in the way that I was fine with, and I never really had any choices to make — or any, like, difficult choices to make [between sororities]. …Like I said, it just all kind of fell into place. I never really thought much throughout the whole thing, but, I mean, I like all the girls — they're really nice.

Whereas Haley experienced how life “fell into place” residentially with clubs and the Greek system, Taylor also expressed a parallel insight about the way she had established friendships with classmates. According to Taylor

> …you just wonder sometimes how weird it is because my best friends, one of them is my roommate and then the two others live on our hall — to find them and we're all on the same hall is just crazy, but just the fact that it worked out is amazing. ...Yeah — that it would all work out the way it's supposed to, I guess.

However, Taylor had noticed as well the interconnectedness, the fitting together, of academics and residential and social dimensions of being an undergraduate at Bucknell.

Responding to the opening question of our interview together, in which I asked what it had been like for her thus far to be a first-year student on campus, Taylor addressed the comprehensiveness, yet also the overarching sense of cohesion, of attending the University.

> T: …So, I guess just coming here and going to classes and hanging out with my friends, it just...it all kind of fits, I guess. There's, like, no real separation, I guess, between the different aspects…
>
> JW: So, you said it all fits together.
>
> T: Yeah. I don't really know how, but you go to class and you take notes and you learn stuff, but then you also, like, last semester especially, the topics fit into my other classes as well, and you can talk about it with kids outside of class, like, in the [dining hall] and stuff. And you establish a relationship, I guess, maybe with your students in class but, like, outside of class as well.

Although Taylor valued the merging together of academics and socialization with peers, inside and beyond the classroom, Margaret, on the other hand, demonstrated more saliently intellectual integration. As she spoke about engaging in cognitive problem-solving activities, which she had encountered per her science coursework and through a medical internship with her father, Margaret recalled that

> …just being able to, like, see what I was looking at in the books and all that I was learning about all the nerves and like the salivary glands and muscles and stuff like that and, like, seeing it in real life...it was awesome. It's kind of, like, how you have all of these little puzzle pieces — like, they're really cool as separate, but then, when you put them all together, it's just...there's no other word to describe it...it's just really cool and amazing...I know that my dad does a lot of work with models and stuff like that, for dentistry, and I just love working with my hands, and it's just kind of a combination of thought-process problem-solving as opposed to working with your hands and visual problem-solving.

Kate, too, had emphasized a need for her academic processes — and for her educational and career paths — to "click." As a first-year student, Kate acknowledged that the intellectual and vocational coherence for which she had worked did not necessarily arrive yet, but was something toward which she would continue to strive: "I'm figuring it out eventually. It'll all come together junior year maybe. It'll, like, click. I realize now it's totally fine to not be...not perfect, because I never thought I was — perfect is just not an expectation I ever had — but it's really okay to suck at some stuff…."

Natalie, who by the time of our interview together was approaching graduation, had reached a synergistic state in which the different facets of her life academically and vocationally had become aligned. As she described her job interviewing process, which ultimately resulted in her being hired to work for an environmental business firm, Natalie recalled how everything from the contact with her soon-to-be employer to her own self-discoveries along the way "fell at the right times":

> …You know, if I had found this passion ten years ago — I think it would've been harder to find this passion ten years ago because of the way that the movement towards energy efficiency and different forms of energy and things like that, renewable energy and... the world is more interested in those issues now than they were ten years ago, and I think that it's just fallen into place for me.
>
> …If I would have had an offer in the fall I would've taken it, even though it might not have been what I necessarily wanted to do, but because it would have been a job with a good company in a bad job market, and I probably would've ended up taking a job that wouldn't have been as perfect of a fit as the one I ended up doing.

> …and so, it kind of took me that whole... the whole year, and they fell at the right times that got me to where I am now.

Natalie further articulated why the sense of integration, within the context of being at Bucknell, had been important for her, and perhaps, too, for the legacy subjects in general, to achieve. Describing the impact, more specifically, of life as a legacy student — as someone who has brought together classmates, friends, and parents across generations of alumni and who has subsequently felt an inner, personal resonance — Natalie suggested something fate-like about the "reassurance" of being meant to attend Bucknell. She said of the experience:

> N: …And it just feels like you were meant to be friends with that person. Or it just feels...it just gives you a sense of...I don't know what I'm thinking of...of reassurance, I guess, that you're in the right place.
>
> JW: Yeah, I mean, in some ways it's almost like fate that your dad was friends with these people…but then you're able to connect with the children of your dad's friends and in a way almost that this was all meant to come together...
>
> N: Mmmhmm. Definitely. It just feels right…

Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented the research findings, which I base primarily on analyses of transcripts from interviews with each of the five legacy participants. Three broad categories provide an overarching structure under which I have then grouped the data, organizing further the meanings of legacy identity development.

The first category, *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, underscores the process by which alumni children experience separation-individuation. Here we see how the subjects have negotiated, consciously and unconsciously, the conflicting needs to establish distinct identities while at the same time continuing to rely on family members, as well as peers and other adults, for guidance and support. Themes that have surfaced here consist of: (1) *"But he didn't really influence me at all": Applying to and Enrolling at Bucknell*, (2) *"Just a student — or an alumni child student": The Language and Terminology of Being "Legacies,"* (3) *"But in a lot of ways I have followed her": Family Impact on Academic Majors and Career Plans* and (4) *Exploratory Behaviors: Finding Their Way in College* (further comprised of the subthemes *"Hearing from their experiences, it's cool": The Influence of Peers on the Lives of Legacies*, *"Yes, I do need guidance": Receptivity to Guidance, Support, and Mentoring*, and *"I am not having his college career": Recreating yet Separating from Family Experiences at Bucknell*).

Teaching and Learning, the second category, provides insight into that which parents, the teachers, have passed down both directly and indirectly to their children, the learners; themes that have resonated here are (1) *"Brain-frequency": Expressions of Family-based Cognitive Processes*, (2) *"We all became really close": Family Dynamics in the Socialization Patterns of Legacies*, (3) *"I feel like Bucknell has and has not changed very much": Keepers of Institutional and Family History and Memory*, and (4) *Generativity: Giving Back to the Next Generation* (as seen in the two subthemes of *"I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is": Legacy Emulation of Parenting Styles across Contexts* and *"I would want to give my kids the same": Having Families of Their Own*).

Lastly, the category of *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* highlights the influence of the institution and its constituents on the co-construction of legacy ego formation. *"There's your stereotypical Bucknell legacy": The Reputations of Legacies on Campus*, *Triggers of Legacy Identity Awareness*, *"I absolutely love it": The Bucknell*

Culture and Climate, *“I'm friends with his friends' kids”: Legacies as Cross-Generational Connectors*, and *“It just all fit together”: Integration of Self and Undergraduate Experience* constitute the third categorical grouping.

As part of the next and final chapter of the thesis, I address the implications of the research findings for student affairs practice as well as discuss limitations of the study. Taking into account these limitations, I then offer a series of recommendations for further research on identity formation in legacy students.

Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusion

I write here, in the final chapter of this report, with five objectives: (1) to explore how the research findings align with, yet challenge and evolve, theories of human development in general and identity development in particular, (2) to propose general intervention strategies for student affairs practice within the contexts of academics, residential life, and career development, (3) to underscore the limitations of the study, (4) to offer recommendations for future research in light of the gaps in this investigation, and (5) to summarize key contributions of the thesis toward advancing the field of scholarship on legacy students.

In the first section, I discuss the three broad categories that have surfaced during data analysis, *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, *Teaching and Learning*, and *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*, and situate them, and their themes, within corresponding theoretical perspectives. Scholarship on separation-individuation (Josselson, 1987; 1996), the internal working model (Bowlby, 1969; Lightfoot, Cole, & Cole, 2009), and family relationships, higher education environmental dynamics, and undergraduate psychosocial outcomes (Adams, Berzonsky, & Keating, 2006; Adams, Ryan, & Keating, 2000) offers the most compelling frameworks to make sense of the research findings. I draw upon peripherally the identity status model (Marcia, 1966) and prior research on legacies (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Howell & Turner, 2004; Martin & Spenner, 2009; Massey & Mooney, 2007), but also highlight the apparently unique facets of the legacy students in this study and begin to establish grounded theory (Creswell, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Second, I address possible intervention strategies for student affairs practice within the contexts of academics, residential life, and career development. In addition to citing data from this study, I reference the works of several different teams of researchers to support my recommendations. Waterman, Kohutis, and Pulone (1977) and Waterman and Archer (1979) found, for instance, that poetry-writing was linked to attaining identity achievement. Adams, Ryan et al. (2000) and Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006) revealed the impact of faculty, and the intellectual demands of their classes, on the identity development trajectories of undergraduates. Pertaining to campus life, I focus attention on new student orientation and Greek life and invoke Chickering and Reisser (1993) to inform the discussion on meeting student needs such as proving social competencies, receiving approval, and fostering interdependence. Cohen, Chartrand, and Jowdy (1995) conceptualized patterns of students' vocational growth within the core, Eriksonian dimensions of trust, autonomy, and industry, and the scholars presented ideas on how best to counsel students. Because future research is needed per the gaps in this thesis, I keep the suggestions for practice brief and general, leaving a detailed proposal for programs and policies for another investigation.

Third, I address what I see as the primary limitations of the study, commenting on (1) questions of triangulation, including the lack of document submissions from participants and the low response rate for member-checking feedback, (2) the gender of participants, who were all female, and the potential influence on the research, and (3) how this thesis relates to principles of goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006). I then offer, in the fourth section, recommendations for future research. Studies, for instance, that compare legacies from different types of institutions

— and perhaps, too, research on the ways in which colleges and universities seem to function as "parents" to alumni and, in turn, to their legacy children — may deepen our understanding of this campus subpopulation and inform effective, responsive student affairs practice.[40] Including male participants in subsequent inquiries has the potential to yield additional data on which practitioners may rely as they work with alumni children. Nonetheless, to conclude the chapter, I summarize the main scholarly contributions of the thesis, with the hope that this study has also (1) enriched, through a collaborative process of inquiry, the lives of the research participants, (2) empowered the legacies to continue to affirm their own distinct identities, voices, and paths, and (3) generated the credibility, attention, and momentum necessary to inspire further qualitative work in student affairs and on legacy identity development.

Evolving Theory: The Research Findings and Interpretive Frameworks

To reiterate the research findings of this thesis, inductive data analysis has led to three categories that underscore the meaning-making, psychosocial processes of legacy students. The first, *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, has illuminated the tension — and constant negotiation — at work within the lives of legacies, as the students seek autonomy yet continue to rely on supportive relationships with family, professors, and peers. I have grouped here the themes: (1) *"But he didn't really influence me at all": Applying to and Enrolling at Bucknell*, (2) *"Just a student — or an alumni child*

---

[40] In assessing how institutions "parent" alumni, which then impacts the family and educational experiences of legacy students, the following questions arise: What are the core values that colleges and universities embed within their graduates? How has the undergraduate environment, and student meaning-making undertaken therein, shaped the identities of parents who have then influenced their children's development? In which ways are cultural elements — as rooted in the permeation of campus life psychosocially and in the inflected messages received about self, community, education — transmitted from one generation to the next? How do legacies unconsciously recreate yet subvert family and institutional histories, norms, and traditions? I return to these and other related questions when I discuss recommendations for future research toward the end of the chapter.

student": The Language and Terminology of Being "Legacies," (3) *"But in a lot of ways I have followed her": Family Impact on Academic Majors and Career Plans*, and (4) *Exploratory Behaviors: Finding Their Way in College*, further comprised of *"Hearing from their experiences, it's cool": The Influence of Peers on the Lives of Legacies*, *"Yes, I do need guidance": Receptivity to Guidance, Support, and Mentoring*, and *"I am not having his college career": Recreating yet Separating from Family Experiences at Bucknell*. *Teaching and Learning*, the second category, has addressed more directly the impact of parents, the teachers, on their children, the learners, as demonstrated in (1) *"Brain-frequency": Expressions of Family-based Cognitive Processes*, (2) *"We all became really close": Family Dynamics in the Socialization Patterns of Legacies*, (3) *"I feel like Bucknell has and has not changed very much": Keepers of Institutional and Family History and Memory*, and (4) *Generativity: Giving Back to the Next Generation* (*"I don't want to say that it's parenting — but it kind of is": Legacy Emulation of Parenting Styles across Contexts*, and *"I would want to give my kids the same": Having Families of Their Own*). Lastly, *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* has revealed the institutional influence on the co-construction of legacy identity development through (1) *"There's your stereotypical Bucknell legacy": The Reputations of Legacies on Campus*, (2) *Triggers of Legacy Identity Awareness*, (3) *"I absolutely love it": The Bucknell Culture and Climate*, (4) *"I'm friends with his friends' kids": Legacies as Cross-Generational Connectors*, and (5) *"It just all fit together": Integration of Self and Undergraduate Experience*.

In order to make sense of these findings, and to understand how they apply to and advance psychosocial interpretive frameworks, I draw upon the works of Josselson

(1987; 1996), Bowlby (1969), Lightfoot et al. (2009), Adams, Ryan et al. (2000), and Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006). Their respective contributions to current understandings of psychosocial development, especially in regard to identity formation, carry greater resonance with the legacy narratives, patterns, and themes in this thesis than with other scholarship on similar topics (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Howell & Turner, 2004; Marcia, 1966; Martin & Spenner, 2009; Massey & Mooney, 2007). The theories toward which I work subsequently to explain legacy meaning-making and psychosocial processes are incomplete; however, as I address later in this chapter, future research has the potential to fill some of these conceptual gaps.

Paradox of Influence and Identity and Separation-Individuation

As the subthemes associated with *Paradox of Influence and Identity* have suggested, legacy students experience heightened sensitivity toward establishing their own identities while at the same time maintaining connections with family. Here, participants expressed the psychosocial push-and-pull effect through (1) how they had decided to apply to and enroll at Bucknell, (2) the circumlocutions in language and terminology, and thereby the psychological distancing from their parents, in which they engaged as they addressed being "legacies," (3) how their parents had influenced their selections of majors and potential career plans, (4) their acceptance of how important professors and peers within the college environment had been for support, guidance, and mentoring, and (5) their simultaneous reliving, yet redefining for themselves in their own ways, of their alumni parents' experiences at the University. Several passages and quotations as reported in Chapter 4 underscored these findings, but none more succinctly than an excerpt from my interview with Taylor, in which she recaptured and summarized one of the main conflicts with which the research participants had wrestled: “I don't want to follow any one path that someone else has followed. I want to be my own person, but at the same time that connection is very important….”

To reframe within a theoretical context the paradoxes by which legacies seek autonomy and preserve attachment to parents, I now turn attention to separation-individuation (Josselson, 1987; 1996). The process of forging individual identities while still clinging to the support of family, according to Josselson (1987), begins as early as infancy: “Babies are most likely to explore their world in optimal proximity to their mothers, needing their mothers near while proving that they do not need their mothers at all” (p. 17). A foundation from which children then “explore their world” for themselves, parents are, even amid the moments of physical and psychological separation, sources of emotional comfort, nurturance, and safety. Josselson (1987) linked the self-assertion of children to their vulnerable, nascent self-awareness, which they must protect from the perceived threat of caregiver omnipotence. “Awareness and experience of self-hood are still new and fragile,” Josselson (1987) wrote, and “must be asserted and guarded from the dangers of becoming again a part of mother” (p. 17). The autonomy that young children seek early in their lives informs adolescent identity development as well. Adolescents want both “to move away from parents and to stay near them to feel safe” (Josselson, 1987, p. 19). Separation from family may manifest itself, then, emotionally and physically, such as when students leave home for college; however, a deep psychological bond has already been internalized and permits the “ongoing relationship to parents” (p. 20).

Having family affiliations with Bucknell, legacy participants had undergone an intensified form of separation-individuation. As Kate, for instance, discussed her vocational aspirations in relation to her father's career in medicine, which she wanted to emulate, the psychological impact of family on identity formation had surfaced. Kate's father did not force her onto the path of becoming a doctor, but she said, "I kind of feel, like, there is pressure to do it — but he's always been on and on that there isn't, but I still feel like there is. Again, I think I create pressure. I think I create external pressure to put on myself that is imaginary, but I do that with everything…." Even with direct encouragement from her parent to establish a distinct vocational identity, Kate nevertheless held onto the connection with her father as expressed in sharing the same career goal. Maintaining the relationship with him in this way perpetuated for Kate a conflict — a dissonance between mirroring family and discovering her own voice and life trajectory.[41]

In cases where adolescents successfully minimize dependency on their parents, the need for continued family support may be transferred onto friends and other adults. As college students in particular construct a "revision of relationships with parents" as part of separation-individuation, Josselson (1987) wrote, "peers and other admired people begin to absorb some of the emotional energy formerly reserved for parents" (p. 19). Haley, for instance, distinguished herself from her father, saying that "I don't know that much about my dad when he went here or [about] his experience at all…." At the same

[41] On the one hand, Kate demonstrated signs of identity foreclosure (Marcia, 1966), as she articulated an unquestioned commitment to following family influence. Nonetheless, in other moments, she seemed to inhabit a moratorium status (Marica, 1966), experiencing self-exploration and scrutiny of identity yet not necessarily making a firm vocational choice. Occupying liminality between two ego formation statuses, separation-individuation has, therefore, emerged here as a potentially more relevant explanation for the findings grouped under *Paradox of Influence and Identity*.

time, Haley was receptive to the influence of friends, who inspired her to travel with a student club to Nicaragua where the group conducted community service work: "…Some of my friends had gone on it — or I knew people who went on it — and so it seemed cool…." For Natalie, the close connections with faculty on campus comforted her, and she said of the experience "that that helps a lot, having adults around that aren't students that you build relationships with, because then you have mentors and people you can kind of, you know, talk to…." Achieving a balance between reliance on others and the assertion of self, Taylor found personal empowerment yet in the context of relationships, and she summarized this finding as it pertained to the legacy participants in this study: "Yes, I do need guidance, but I do need guidance from my parents and from my professors and from my friends, but at the same time you know you can do it by yourself, so, that gives you the confidence boost as well."

Gender further compounds the experience of separation-individuation, impacting women differently than men. Writing about the personal strength and psychosocial validation that women tend to find in relationships, Josselson (1996) observed that

> In seeking meaningful engagement with others, women do not look to depend or submit, but rather to form ever more articulated and multifaceted interconnections that allow for self-expression in a *responsive* exchange where both self and other are contained, recognized, empowered, valued, and enriched. (pp. 209–10)

The dynamism, reciprocity, and cohesion of interpersonal connection not only sustains women emotionally, but also provides "mother" (Josselson, 1987, p. 17), a sense of safety from which to explore and affirm individualities. Amplified for women, relationships become, then, intertwined with expressions of independence, autonomy, and self-agency, whereas a "separate identity or a separate sense of self is not quite the same in women as in men" (Josselson, 1987, pp. 169-70).[42] Margaret, for instance, seemed to reveal the intensity of her feelings toward her father and articulated the complexity of their connection by asserting the uniqueness of her experiences at Bucknell. "It's great that my dad went here," Margaret said, "but I am here for me, I am not here for him, I am not having his college career." Her vehement tone had suggested to me, during our interview together, something defiant — of wanting to protect, with force and urgency, her own identity. Nevertheless, as a legacy, Margaret recognized that her father's presence and influence had shaped her life, but did not necessarily define it: "It's part of who I am in a way, but at the same time, it's not who I will be."

Josselson's (1987; 1996) research resonates with the lives of the legacy students in this study, and her scholarly contributions, when applied to the current investigation, enriches one of the main findings, *Paradox of Influence and Identity*. Nevertheless, a question arises about how the data that I have collected here advances the theory of separation-individuation. I respond, in part, toward the end of this section by proposing a tentative outline of grounded theory, of how the narratives of legacies have suggested a distinct interpretive framework. However, an immediate point of difference concerns the realignment — the redefinition — of "mother" (Josselson, 1987, p. 17). The experiences of those legacies whose fathers graduated from Bucknell subvert the traditional belief that mothers, and the relationships with them, exert a primary influence developmentally. Within the scope of this study, which emphasized the connection between students and

[42] Conducting research on high school valedictorians and their experiences in college, Arnold (1995) also found that women participants demonstrated relational sensitivities more so than men, especially within a vocational context. "At age nineteen, the female valedictorians began talking about careers in light of motherhood" (p. 107) and were "more interested than men in the career values of working with people, helping others through careers, and finding work that allowed combining career and family" (p. 110). Thus Arnold's (1995) research provides a resonant example of how high-achieving female college students tend to intertwine the self with others, to evolve core values of personal growth and ambition yet within relationships.

alumni parents, fathers wielded powerful influences over their children. In addition, peers and faculty served as symbolic "mothers," who offered inspiration, role modeling, and emotional nurturance. As I discuss later in the chapter, in *Recommendations for Future Research*, Bucknell, through its environment, culture, and climate, may also be considered a "parent" to students.[43]

Teaching and Learning and the Internal Working Model

The research finding and themes of *Teaching and Learning* underscore that which parents, the teachers, have passed down to their children, the learners. Legacies emulated, for instance, the cognitive patterns and niche-forming behaviors of their families. At the same time, participants in this study demonstrated historical knowledge about Bucknell and the undergraduate experiences and traditions of their alumni parents.[44] Seeking to fulfill family-oriented generative values, legacies further expressed a commitment to helping others and even envisioned having their own families in the future. Margaret's explanation of how, during a sorority meeting, she had mirrored the thought processing and socialization styles of her father seemed to articulate the core of this particular data category: "I guess that point is difficult to explain, but…it kind of just snaps into my head, 'Oh, I got that from dad'…."

---

[43] Faculty-student relationships were family-like. A safe, acceptable way of deriving ego strength from adults, legacies depended on professors for validation and approval, which they no longer sought from parents. Thus the college environment, for alumni children, became increasingly paradoxical, complex, and therapeutic. The more they separated from family, the more they recreated the dynamics of "home," a sense of the familiar. New, symbolic forms of "family" and of "parents" comforted legacies, fortifying explorations of and giving voice to the aspects of identity that seemed to them unique.

[44] This particular finding is consistent with prior research on legacy students (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Howell & Turner, 2004; Martin & Spenner, 2009; Massey & Mooney, 2007), which emphasized the importance of alumni children as purveyors of institutional customs, culture, and memory. Nevertheless, the data in *Teaching and Learning*, as well as the relationship of this category to other scholarship on human development (Bowlby, 1969; Lightfoot et al., 2009), expands upon the seminal work of my predecessors.

Lightfoot et al. (2009) presented a summary of research on the internal working model (Bowlby, 1969), a developmental framework that substantiates the *Teaching and Learning* category as well as informs our understanding of legacy psychosocial development. An "internal working model," as Lightfoot et al. (2009) explained, stems from the parent-child relationship early in life and is later expressed as the "mental model that children construct as a result of their experiences and that they use to guide their interactions with caregivers and others" (p. 212). Based on the resolution during infancy of issues of trust and mistrust, children form expectations of how others will respond to them and their needs. The impact of parenting — and the resulting level of attachment — becomes a deeply embedded psychological resource that in turn directs, unquestioningly, thoughts, beliefs, and actions. Children reveal the internalized influences of family, and recreate with peers and adults the dynamics of parental relationships, as seen in how they elicit comfort or rejection, emotional availability or indifference toward the communication of feelings (Bowlby, 1969; Lightfoot et al., 2009).

With roots in childhood development, the internal working model, similar to separation-individuation, persists into adolescence and throughout the life cycle. Writing on the closely linked process of "introjection," Josselson (1987) observed that "taking in a part of the parent as part of the self" helps children defend "against the increased feelings of vulnerability" (p. 18). As the legacy students, for instance, began to separate from family and face the unknowns of self and college, they took on the characteristics of their parents — embodying their values, infusing them into their daily lives, and acting upon them accordingly. The degree of commitment — of homage — to their alumni parents became indistinguishable at times from the meanings that legacies ascribed to their own identities, which protected the fragility of ego formation. Taylor's generative plans, for example, illuminated this phenomenon. When I asked her to elaborate on her intentions to have a family in the future, Taylor said of her and her Bucknell friends that "…Of course we all want our kids to come here [to the University], too, so." In addition to mirroring the encouragement to attend Bucknell that Taylor herself had received from her mother, Taylor further explained that she would want her own children to enroll at the school because of the sense of safety, and of trust, that had come from the legacy network and experience: "…there are connections that are deeper, there's [sic] lots of people that you meet that have these connections, it makes it more comfortable, I guess."

Freeing legacies, as has been the case for many adolescents, from "excessive dependence on the parents" (Josselson, 1987, p. 18), utilization of the internal working model helps students achieve developmental equilibrium. Without divorcing themselves entirely from the comfort of family, the research participants nevertheless sought to maintain autonomy through the distanced, indirect way in which they drew upon a different and perhaps less obvious form of parental support. According to Josselson (1987), the integration of self and family creates "individuality, a core of selfhood on which all later identity formation is based" (p. 19). Open to transformation, the legacy students possessed a psychosocial foundation, as rooted within the teaching and learning relationships with parents, which enabled progressive and individualized growth. Haley, for instance, discussed the self-awareness that she had reached from taking a psychology course on cross-cultural parenting styles. Acknowledging the insight that she had gained into her own background, and into the rituals and customs of non-western cultures and traditions, Haley began to form a distinct and firm sense of self and of how she would want to raise her own children: “There's [sic] still some [parenting practices] where I don't think I'd do it.”

When applied to the lives of college students, the internal working model does not necessarily account for other contributors to the co-construction of psychosocial formation. Parent relationships are central to how legacies have established their core selves, yet the voices from the Bucknell environment itself — from peers, faculty, and the overall climate and dynamism of the educational context — require explanation from and alignment with another set of theories (Adams, Berzonsky et al., 2006; Adams, Ryan et al., 2000). By including this additional, tertiary layer of interpretation, we may then be able to move closer toward a comprehensive understanding of how legacies shape, revise, and make meaning of their identities from within themselves while also in constant negotiation with external and relational demands.

Bucknell — the Environmental Context and the Impact of Family and Educational Dynamics on Psychosocial Outcomes

As the data grouped in *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* have revealed, the University culture and climate, as well as its community members, informs the process of legacy psychosocial meaning-making and development. Here, participant narratives engaged (1) the reputations and stigmas associated with, and the discourse surrounding, legacy students, (2) how the academic and social settings, in addition to institutional events, had intensified a poignant awareness of family connections to the University, (3) the dynamics of campus life, the overall morale of students, and how legacies themselves had contributed to, reinforced, and made sense of certain cultural norms, (4) the cross-generational liminality of bringing closer together and serving as the primary connector of family and friends, and (5) the integrative, deterministic-like manner in which the fragmentation of identity and college experience had begun to cohere and find a synergistic resonance within the lives of legacies.[45] An excerpt from part of Kate's commentary seemed to capture the essence and richness of this category. Focusing on the backlash that she had received from peers who learned of her legacy status, Kate's interview response also touched on the social trigger of identity awareness, the achievement-orientation of students, shared experiences and, in turn, strengthened bonds with alumni parents, and the fate-like feeling of having been meant to attend the institution:

> …all of the legacies are here for the same reason that I am: their parents had a hard and good education. And once you're here your education just doesn't change because you're a legacy. It might up your chances of getting [admitted to Bucknell] more, but once you're in...if you rise to it, you obviously were meant to be selected. And everyone is meant to be selected, but you're obviously not here because you're a legacy — you perhaps maybe chose to come here due to legacy influence…

The works of Adams, Ryan et al. (2000) and Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006) help us situate this research finding within emerging contemporary theories on the relationship between family background and undergraduate environment and the resulting impact on college student identity formation. In the Adams, Ryan et al. (2000) study, the researchers found that first-year college students who (1) had come from a warm,

---

[45] The findings regarding the reputations of and assumptions about legacies on campus, in addition to institutional setting as trigger of identity awareness, have been consistent with prior research on the topic (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Howell & Turner, 2004; Martin & Spenner, 2009; Massey & Mooney, 2007). Scholars defined alumni children as one of three traditional affirmative action cohorts among minority students and athletes, anticipated the criticism and scrutiny that legacies might encounter from college community members, and, in two separate studies, found evidence of developmental challenges academically (Massey & Mooney, 2007) and vocationally (Martin & Spenner, 2009). Building on the previous work of these investigators, data in *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* provides insight into the depth, complexity, and meanings of legacy undergraduate experiences.

cohesive, open, and expressive family and (2) had encountered comparable relational dynamics with faculty and within the overall tone of campus life were more likely than other participants to attain identity achievement and establish fidelity (firm psychosocial commitments). With a greater presence of self-reflection and higher ego strength, attributed both to the "intellectual and supportive academic environment and a democratic family" (p. 111), the identity achievers demonstrated confidence in their choices and personal directions. Building on these findings, Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006) examined identity processing styles of students and found a correlation between family cohesion and a normative approach.[46] Nonetheless, close and friendly relationships with faculty were found to have led study participants, within the feeling of comfort and safety environmentally, to question, challenge, and explore their core selves.[47] Therefore, in light of contributions from both teams of researchers, we see that the interplay of family background and academic settings matters to the lives and trajectories of undergraduates.

Rich with implications for intervention strategies, which I address in the next section, Adams, Ryan et al. (2000) and Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006) further legitimized a nascent yet charged branch of inquiry: observing how the "values, attitudes, and expectations originally shaped by socialization experiences within the family may continue to be influential, even if they primarily exist in the emotional or psychological background of the student's daily routine" (Adams, Berzonsky et al., 2006, p. 83). The

[46] According to Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006), a "normative identity style involves passively adopting and following goals, standards, and expectations held by significant others" (p. 82), which tends to lead students toward Foreclosure as they make firm psychosocial commitments without the presence of meaningful self-exploration (Marcia, 1966).
[47] Among academically talented female students in particular, and especially of those who have achieved top-level careers in fields such as science, the presence of warm, supportive mentoring from faculty has been reported as a source of ongoing inspiration and something attributed, over time, to contributing to long-term vocational success (Subotnik & Arnold, 1996).

intertwining of family influence and the “daily routine” (p. 83) of students, as rooted within the immediacy of the Bucknell environment, underscored a main facet of the legacy experience.

Reflecting on how campus had become her “home,” Taylor articulated the transference of family from parents and siblings to her classmates and to Bucknell in general — which for legacies, given their lineage to the school, was pronounced. As Taylor explained, “I'll call up my friends, or we're in the library or something, and they're like, ‘Oh, where are you now?’ I'll be like, ‘I'm going home,’ like, meaning back to our room, back to our dorm, like, ‘OK — we'll see you there.’ And that's what we say….” With the simultaneous recreation and validation of family dynamics at Bucknell — an institution whose culture, after all, had been absorbed within and transformed by the identities of their alumni parents — legacies felt a fate-like sense of belonging. Natalie, for instance, described the “reassurance” inherent to her sparking cross-generational connections among legacy friends, their families, and her parents: “And it just feels like you were meant to be friends with that person. Or it just feels...it just gives you a sense of...I don't know what I'm thinking of...of reassurance, I guess, that you're in the right place. …It just feels right….”

Nevertheless, the theories derived from the research of Adams, Ryan et al. (2000) and Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006) have seemed somewhat incomplete in providing an incisive lens of interpretation for *Bucknell — the Environmental Context*. To understand the partial alignment of these researchers’ works with the third categorical finding of this thesis, I offer here an example of the seeming complexity of the data that I have collected and the subsequent resistance of fitting into established frameworks a priori. For instance, even as alumni children adopted at times a normative approach to psychosocial choices, such as enrolling and creating their paths at Bucknell, separation-individuation not only seemed a more plausible explanation for the convolutions behind identity commitments, but was also largely unaddressed in the prior research on identity formation and family and educational environments.

As one example, Margaret had followed her father in (1) choosing to attend the University, (2) initially pursuing both the same pre-medical academic course of study and vocational aspiration of being a doctor upon which he himself had embarked, and (3) recognizing how she had manifested an internalization of core cognitive and social family values. In other moments, Margaret maintained a vociferous distinction, especially in response to provocations in the environment suggesting otherwise, that she was autonomous and had, in fact, been having a unique experience.[48] The Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006) framework would suggest that Margaret had exhibited foreclosure, a psychosocial "anchor," as the researchers had posited, to prevent "drifting aimlessly in a sea of personal diffusion" and to deter "serious efforts to engage in an active process of self-analysis and self-evaluation, which is central to identity achievement" (p. 89). Reinforced by the "immediate social norms, conventions, and expectations" (p. 89) of honoring her family heritage at Bucknell, it would seem that Margaret, and many of her undergraduate experiences, had confirmed a normative identity processing style and foreclosure grouping. However, in Margaret's case, as in the cases of the other legacies in this study, conformity to and expression of parental and environmental pressures did

[48] As cited in Chapter 4, Margaret said that "…My dad went here, great, that's fine, whatever. I am here for my own reasons…I didn't go here because of my dad, I went here because of me and because I want to be here and because I want to study here and because I want to work hard. …I'm not doing it for my dad, I'm doing it for me…."

not necessarily indicate clear-cut, textbook delineations. The apparent dynamism of legacy meaning-making and ego formation, in which identification with family had been punctuated with affirmations of independence, had suggested a protean dimension — something that grounded theory may be better suited to address.

A Preliminary Model of Interpretation: Toward Grounded Theory

Based on the research findings of this thesis, and on the relevant supporting scholarship on human development as cited in this chapter, I propose an initial, tentative outline of grounded theory. Exploring the ways in which the three primary categories — *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, *Teaching and Learning*, and *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* — interact with one another, I aim to provide only a brief and nascent level of insight into the complex interior worlds of the legacy participants.[49] Additional research on the topic, however, may provide the strength and credibility of evidence necessary to substantiate, or challenge, the categorical relationships and preliminary conclusions that I have posed here.

Paradox of Influence and Identity, illuminating the processes by which legacies engaged in separation-individuation, emerged as the dominant phenomenon. Embedded within the two other, secondary categories, data had suggested that the alumni children in this study experienced a perpetual negotiation of wanting identities and lives of their own, yet also seeking to recognize, affirm, and pay homage to family. Legacy students' expressions of separation-individuation still surfaced, in other words, even as they

[49] According to Johnson and Christensen (2008), provisional conclusions that many qualitative scholars reach, as I myself have, still uphold standards of academic merit: "In fact, qualitative research," as the authors wrote, "can be very helpful in describing how phenomena operate (ie. studying process) and in developing and testing preliminary causal hypotheses and theories" (p. 279). With the goal of "studying process" (p. 279) at the forefront of this investigation of how legacies engage in meaning-making and psychosocial discoveries, my apparent hesitancy toward declaring definitive understandings and theories in the thesis thus follows an acceptable, and common, consequence of post-positivist inquiry.

explored (1) the meanings of their internal working models (*Teaching and Learning*) and (2) the impact on their trajectories of the confluence of voices stemming from family and Bucknell as institution and campus community (*Bucknell — the Environmental Context*). Nonetheless, *Teaching and Learning* revealed, thereby echoing the themes of *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, the core family values that students had internalized and infused into daily life but had also resisted in efforts to establish autonomy and independence. *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* elicited the compounding factors that underscored legacy meaning-making and psychosocial development. Triggering pressure points that in turn heightened an awareness of being legacies, the campus climate and culture, together with various agents of the University, encouraged the research participants to discover elements of *Teaching and Learning*, which pushed toward the forefront of their minds and self-narratives the crux of adolescence: integration of what separates them from and connects them to the people in their lives.[50]

An incomplete explanation of the forces, pressures, and processes that inform legacy identity formation, I address in subsequent sections of this chapter the limitations of the study as well as offer recommendations for additional research. Since the gaps in triangulation and, to an extent, in the gender slant of having all-female subjects have pervaded the thesis, not only may a note of caution be required in assessing my research findings and accompanying analysis, but follow-up studies may also prove helpful in revealing the essence — the *verstehen* — of legacy undergraduate experiences. At the same time, the preliminary categorical relationships and study conclusions that I have

---

[50] I have paraphrased Josselson (1987), who also wrote that adolescents perpetually revise themselves "to gain a feeling of individuality in the context of an ongoing relationship to parents" (p. 20). Establishing identity thus exists in constant limbo with evolving social relations.

reached could serve as one possible model of interpretation for, as I discuss next, student affairs practitioners, for other researchers, and for my own projects in the future.

Academics, Campus Life, and Career Development: Context-Specific Intervention Strategies for Legacy Students

In this section, I offer an abbreviated discussion on intervention strategies. Focusing on the contexts of academics, residential life, and career development, I draw upon data from this study as well as from psychosocial research on these topics (Adams, Berzonsky et al., 2006; Adams, Ryan et al., 2000; Chickering and Reisser, 1993; Cohen et al., 1995; Waterman & Archer, 1979; Waterman, Kohutis et al., 1977) to support my recommendations. Future scholarship on legacy identity development could further substantiate the meaning-making processes of alumni children and therefore lead to more authoritative, detailed proposals for student affairs practice. Nonetheless, the suggestions that I pose here may still be useful in providing an initial framework for action to best meet the needs of legacy students.

Academics: Choosing Majors and Faculty and Peer Mentoring

Within the academic dimension of their lives at Bucknell, legacy participants had expressed separation-individuation in regard to choosing majors. Taylor, for instance, gravitated toward Political Science, her mother's degree path, yet affirmed that she had selected the discipline for herself and on her own autonomous terms. Margaret had initially sought to emulate her father by taking a pre-medical course of study and wanting to become a doctor; however, she learned that she was better suited, based on her skills and interests, to pursuing History, Education, and Theatre. Kate struggled at times with pressuring herself to follow her father, enrolling in the same foundational science courses that he had taken en route to medical school, and striving to listen to her own distinct voice and act on her distinct academic and vocational visions. In cases such as these, where legacy students are unsure of themselves and of their academic choices yet seek self-awareness and affirmation of their emerging individualities, academic advising that steers them toward classes on poetry- and expressive-writing may spur identity achievement. Waterman, Kohutis et al. (1977) and Waterman and Archer (1979) found that undergraduates in their research had articulated psychosocial explorations and firm commitments after completing sustained, immersive creative writing activities, which had encouraged meaningful self-reflection. When compared to other academic methods of encouraging self-questioning such as journal-writing, Waterman and Archer (1979) maintained that poetry-writing seemed "more likely to involve a process of personal introspection and self-analysis" (p. 339). For students such as Taylor, Margaret, and Kate, poetry-writing has the potential to help them clarify — and unlock — their core selves. By tapping into their personal artistries, legacies could then sharpen an understanding of the values that guide their decision-making and find self-validation for who they are and where they are going.

As legacies reflected on their academic experiences, they had emphasized the importance of faculty and peers who served as mentors and, to an extent, as symbolic parents and family members. The transference of parent-dependent relationships from family to faculty in particular reinforced the process of separation-individuation for students, an ego-affirming way of meeting needs for validation and approval from adults yet without the same level of vulnerability inherent in experiences of primary caregiver omnipotence (Josselson, 1987). Natalie, for instance, had recognized the impact of faculty on her life, adults outside of her family to whom she would turn for support and guidance, and she recalled how the connection to professors — and to her classmates — had reinforced the sense of belonging, of Bucknell as home. Haley, too, discussed how one of her professors had been so inspiring that she decided to take all of his classes and work toward completing a minor in the faculty member's academic discipline. To engrain into the campus culture a persistent ethic of warmth, care, and compassion among faculty and students themselves may further benefit the psychosocial development of legacies. Adams, Ryan et al. (2000) and Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006), for example, found that identity achievement and fidelity were linked to "faculty members, students, and advisors who [were] supportive and encouraging" (Adams, Ryan et al., 2000, p. 117). Expounding on this observation, Adams, Berzonsky et al. (2006) wrote that "opportunities for performance, expression, and analytic thinking," yet within communal openness and cohesion, facilitates "students' personal and social development" (p. 117). Kate revealed the effectiveness of this strategy when she talked about the close rapport between her and a faculty member, a professor with whom she conducted research side-by-side in the lab: "It was like me being important…."

Campus Life: New Student Orientation and the Greek System

Discussing their lives beyond the classroom, legacy students focused, in part, on the importance and meanings of two main areas of co-curricular life: new student orientation and the Greek system. Margaret, for instance, remembered how instrumental orientation and her peer leaders had been, something that gave her an immediate sense of personal and social safety and empowerment. The transitional experience, she said, had enabled her to learn where on campus she could take care of certain needs, from finding the cafeteria for meals with friends to scouring the library for quiet nooks and corners in which to study, and it made her feel connected and close to other students and thereby anchored within the community. At the same time — and even for the students in this study who had yet to become eligible to join sororities — Greek life had found resonance among legacies. Natalie mentioned, for example, that being part of the Greek system contributed to the special, fate-like affinity she felt toward her friends and toward the University in general. Kate, who was unable to rush for a sorority in her first year of study per an institutional policy, looked forward to her sophomore year with much anticipation. Since Kate's father had been the president of his fraternity, she was determined to have a comparable experience to which they could relate together. Chickering and Reisser (1993), per the level of specificity that they contributed to defining the vectors of college student identity development, would suggest that the following needs had been underscored in legacy trajectories with the residential undergraduate experience: (1) to prove social competencies, (2) to receive approval, and (3) to begin to exercise interdependence. With sensitivity to these dimensions of legacy experiences — how children of alumni establish feelings of personal and social adequacy through friendships, continue to rely on positive feedback and encouragement from others, and solidify their individualities yet in the context of ongoing and reciprocal relationships — we may formulate suggestions for practice.

Since recreating their family dynamics on campus was pronounced for legacies, who demonstrated an enhanced predisposition toward sustaining interpersonal networks from which to explore identities and facets of undergraduate life, targeted orientation activities may smooth their transitions to college. Opportunities to engage in social bonding and niche-forming may provide an entranceway into building relational confidence and, in turn, a sense of home. Given a heightened need for approval, from both their actual and symbolic parents and family members, legacies should receive validation and encouragement from staff and peer leaders alike, which could reinforce the feelings of belonging at Bucknell and of having been destined to attend the institution. Nevertheless, once legacies establish their footing and anchor themselves in the community, interventions as part of the Greek system may further unleash an emerging interdependence, of cherishing the social inclusiveness and cohesion of Greek letter organizations yet finding and garnering acceptance for their own individualities. Workshops and programs could underscore how membership in groups, which offer supportive camaraderie, emotional safety, and familial comfort, has the potential to lead to self-agency, autonomy, and personal efficacy. Similar to student experiences of separation-individuation pertaining to family, involvement in Greek life may foster constructive, creative outlets for self-definition but in persistent relation to, and in understood negotiations with, the social.

Career Development: Fostering Trust, Autonomy, and Industry through Vocational Counseling

Legacy participants each talked about career aspirations, finding inspiration and guidance from parents and seeking, in addition, the advice of faculty. As she approached graduation, Natalie, for instance, recognized a turning point in her vocational plans, something that had stemmed from conversation with her father, as well as from a summer internship experience at his environmental business firm. Natalie recalled arriving at one specific, vivid moment of focus and clarity by the spring of senior year: she would combine the managerial influence of her father and his academic and professional background with her own skill set and interest in Environmental and Civil Engineering. Interviewing with several different employers, Natalie accepted a position, prior to commencement, with a consulting company whose work primarily concerns issues of sustainability. Margaret, on the other hand, had initially followed her father's exact path academically and vocationally; however, mid-way through her first semester of science classes, she switched her program of study to include a double major in History and Education. Both students, as was the case overall for the research participants in this study, had modeled — and sought to integrate with their own distinct personalities — parent professions, generative values, and experiences at Bucknell. Faculty were influential as well, offering insight into industries and potential jobs and how certain coursework and internships could prepare students to realize and secure post-graduation opportunities.

The work of Cohen et al. (1995) helps us address the underlying career development needs of legacies. At the heart of vocational challenges that college students had faced in their study, the researchers found that the Eriksonian principles of trust, autonomy, and industry had informed levels of indecisiveness and impacted subsequent explorations of and commitments to identity and future plans. Questions of trust surfaced in how subjects were receptive or resistant to advice, ideas, and information. Degrees of participant autonomy were revealed through expressions of vocational interests apart from family pressures and influences. Issues concerning industry had pertained to levels of active engagement with discovering personal identities, weighing different options and paths, and participating in relevant activities and events. With legacy students in particular, the transference of trust from parents to faculty not only serves as the first indicator of readiness to expand a supportive network of vocational advocates, but also the initial sign that students might be willing to evolve higher order psychosocial areas of growth.

Based on referrals of students to their institutions' career development centers, brief and solution-focused counseling should target legacy autonomy and industry, psychosocial dimensions that are especially poignant for alumni children per their having familial links to the institution. Already amid the navigation of solidifying their core selves as distinct from yet connected to family, legacies may benefit from sessions designed to affirm key distinguishing facets of their identities.[51] Reinforcing the self-confidence that may emerge from the burgeoning awareness, from becoming, as Taylor declared, "[one's] own person," career counselors could direct a strategic, intentional channeling of this newfound agency. Encouragement of meaningful involvement in additional vocational assessments and in career-based programs, such as internships and job-shadowing, may perpetuate an information-seeking behavioral norm, as well as validate the preparedness of students to enter into the next phase of their undergraduate lives: of (1) establishing purpose about where they are headed and why they wish to pursue particular directions and (2) developing congruence between their deeply

---

[51] According to Renn and Arnold (2003), who advocated an ecological model of understanding and responding to college student development based on the work of Bronfenbrenner, vocational counseling could include having undergraduates map their core qualities yet in relation to the different levels of environments in which they are immersed. To ascribe meaning and definition to the influences of and relationships between microsystems (peer groups, classes, roommates, residence halls, jobs), mesosystems (the interactions between microsystems), exosystems (family backgrounds, institutional policies and personnel, government and federal factors), and macrosystems (historical trends, generation-specific events, social forces, and the surrounding culture at large), students may then clarify their distinct identities and make career decisions accordingly.

embedded value systems and the corresponding personal choices that they make and enact (Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

Research Limitations

I acknowledge three primary gaps in the thesis. First, the lack of substantive triangulation may raise questions about the research findings and the resulting analysis that I have presented in this chapter. With an opportunity for legacy participants, as well as their alumni parents, to provide full copies or excerpts of e-mail and text messages that they had exchanged together — documents that may have underscored the co-construction of meaning-making and psychosocial processes — none followed through with submissions.[52] Relying predominantly on interview data, member-checking feedback, albeit thin and sparse, has added a second layer of evidentiary support and reduced my own researcher-bias in how I have interpreted and translated participant narratives. Nonetheless, the absence of another form of insight into the life-worlds of legacies suggests the need for a note of caution in approaching Chapters 4 and 5.[53]

The second limitation concerns the gender of participants. Including in this study only female legacy students has likely impacted the research. Though this thesis was not intended to produce generalizable knowledge, I am compelled, nevertheless, to account for the nuanced dynamics that having all women subjects may have contributed. For instance, I have asked myself — and have addressed in Chapter 1 as well as here in Chapter 5 — how gender has the potential to influence sensitivities toward family, the

[52] As mentioned in Chapter 3, legacy participants did not withdraw themselves entirely, or even rescind portions of their data, from the research, which maintained a level of consistency and collaboration throughout the process of inquiry.
[53] Even so, Creswell (1998) wrote that aligning one's research with already existing theories, as I have done with separation-individuation, the internal working model, and family backgrounds and educational environments, may corroborate findings and work toward achieving triangulation.

meanings and experiences of interpersonal relationships, and the drive to share self-narratives and to foster reciprocal yet interdependent understandings with others (Josselson, 1987; 1996).[54] Therefore, data as revealed in *Paradox of Influence and Identity*, *Teaching and Learning*, and *Bucknell — the Environmental Context* may be somewhat magnified, with a different depth of poignancy for women than could have been the case for male alumni children.

Lastly, I now revisit the aspiration of this thesis to adhere to goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics, a comprehensive framework to assess authenticity, quality, and rigor in qualitative scholarship (Manning, 1992; Jones et al., 2006). As discussed in Chapter 3, I have sought to attain goodness through an intentional cohering of (1) the phenomenological paradigm in which I have situated my work and (2) the practical steps of the research itself. Trustworthiness (credibility, plausibility, and applicability) has been mostly satisfied within the particular scope of this study. Pertaining to credibility, judgments that I have made about the process and procedures of inquiry fit the topic of investigation, as well as resonate with the guiding qualitative framework. For plausibility, the research findings have been probable and thereby relevant to the lived experiences of subjects, which member-checking feedback has confirmed. Document submissions, however, could have been another important measure of this specific criterion. How the research has awakened, enriched, and empowered legacies — the level of applicability — remains unreported at this time, but follow-up studies and the tracking of intervention program outcomes may reveal whether the third component of

---

[54] As I mention in Chapter 1, the self-selecting of research participants, whether based on gender differences or other core qualities and characteristics, may have shaped this thesis. For instance, through the consent process, legacies had to feel comfortable and willing to discuss their personal lives, relationships with parents, and private details about undergraduate life at Bucknell. Potential subjects who were perhaps reticent, or unready or unwilling to engage in self-exploration, thus did not join the study.

trustworthiness has been met. Ethically, the thesis appears to be sound, yet three caveats still exist: (1) involvement in the research could potentially lead to the discovery of the real identities of subjects based on the descriptive nature of the data, (2) legacies may have felt vulnerable, uncomfortable, or unsettled emotionally during interview sessions and throughout the study, and (3) not all participants have had an equal chance of receiving benefits from the research, such as programs and policies that may be implemented as part of responsive student affairs practice.[55]

Recommendations for Future Research

Per the limitations of this study, which has revealed some but not all of the complex layers of legacy meaning-making and psychosocial development, I recommend three areas for future research. First, a multi-institutional perspective that compares legacy groups from different types of colleges and universities could (1) yield insight into the impact of particular campus environments on identity formation, (2) offer further evidence in support of grounded theory to organize and explain overlapping phenomena regarding alumni child populations, (3) broaden the scope and dimension of the research lens, allowing for deepened saturation within a rich, comprehensive data set, (4) affirm an ambitious scholarly agenda that calls attention to the relevance of qualitative work in the field of college student identity development, and (5) provide legitimacy for the usefulness of phenomenological scholarship in student affairs practice. These are important points of consideration, as they may shape further understandings of the nuanced relationship between college environments and family backgrounds and the resulting impact on student growth and developmental outcomes. In addition, qualitative,

[55] By employing a thorough informed consent process, I have attempted to maximize participant autonomy and confidentiality and thereby protect students, as well as maintain the integrity of the thesis.

phenomenological research — and its relevance to posing, examining, and answering questions regarding undergraduate experiences and student affairs policies and practices — may in turn receive confirmation as being an acceptable and effective methodology of choice and move toward the forefront of future scholarship.

Second, follow-up studies should address how institutions themselves have "parented" graduates, who then influence, based on their formative undergraduate years and trajectories, the lives of legacy students in the here-and-now. From this level of insight, we may then learn how higher education environments not only impact graduates, but also extend a deeply embedded and recurring impact on families, on the internalization and cross-generational transmission of values, identities, and worldviews. Here, potential exists to reveal the presence of institutional-family norms, histories, and traditions among legacy populations, raising further questions about the nature of autonomous actions as liberated from or restrained by contexts of psychosocial formation. As I ask in Chapter 1, how do legacies exercise free-will in asserting independence through separation-individuation? How do they unknowingly reinforce established hindrances, as rooted in both family backgrounds and college environments, on their ability to grow in the ways that they want to? How does an increased self-awareness, via intervention strategies, empower creative control over identity formation? How may we support legacy students so that they achieve personal and professional eminence, to fulfill their talents and to shift institutional paradigms for future generations (Arnold, Noble, & Subotnik, 1996)? To this end, methodologies will need to accommodate direct, immersive collaboration with alumni and their children. In tracing the origins and exchanges of these engrained familial, educational, and psychosocial meanings, researchers may enrich even more so the empathic understandings of legacies and formulate effective, responsive policies and practices.

Continuing to evolve a comprehensive data set, future research should account for a third consideration: gender differences among men and women legacies. The inclusion of male participants, in addition to maintaining the involvement of female students, may further refine categories and themes, reflect the distinct influences of gender on legacy ego formation, and prepare practitioners to respond to diversity among alumni children and their shared yet individual needs. Sensitivity to these simultaneously shared and distinguishing undergraduate experiences, at the group and individual levels, has the potential to align intervention strategies with — and tailor environmental dynamics within colleges and universities toward — the complex realities and questions that inform legacy meaning-making and psychosocial processes. As student affairs practitioners, we may then draw upon deepened emotional compassion and sophisticated intellectual frameworks in our work with current legacies, as well as with alumni children of the next generation.

Summary and Conclusion

In this chapter, I have situated the research findings within corresponding theoretical frameworks while also highlighting their respective points of distinction. Mapping the relationships among data categories in the current study, I then have established the beginnings of grounded theory to illuminate the meaning-making and psychosocial processes of legacy participants. With the support of data from this thesis, as well as from prior scholarship on similar topics, I propose general intervention plans within the contexts of academics, campus life, and career development. In addition, I have highlighted the main limitations of this study, especially the lack of triangulation, which may raise some questions about elements of goodness, trustworthiness, and ethics. Based on these gaps, I offer recommendations for future research that could potentially lead to fuller understandings of (1) the complexity of legacy student life-worlds, (2) the impact of institutions on alumni families, and (3) the best possible practices to meet overlapping and diverse needs of legacy students. Nonetheless, completion of this inaugural investigation has contributed to our understanding of the research topic: what it has meant for legacy students to attend Bucknell, how legacies have constructed and co-constructed their undergraduate lives and experiences, and the importance of qualitative inquiry as method to reveal the convolutions of psychosocial processes — of what it means and how it looks and feels to come into being.

References

Adams, G.R., Berzonsky, M.D., & Keating, L. (2006). Psychosocial resources in first-year university students: the role of identity processes and social relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 35*(1), 81-91.

Adams, G.R., Ryan, B.A., & Keating, L. (2000). Family relationships, academic environments, and psychosocial development during the university experience: a longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 15*(1), 99-122.

Arnold, K.D. (1994). The Illinois valedictorian project: early adult careers of academically talented male high school students. In R. Subotnik & K.D. Arnold (Eds.), *Beyond Terman: contemporary longitudinal studies of giftedness and talent* (pp. 24 - 51). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Arnold, K.D. (1995). *Lives of promise: what becomes of high school valedictorians: a fourteen-year study of achievement and life choices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Arnold, K. & King, I.C. (1997). Volume introduction: reflections on student development. In K. Arnold & I.C. King (Eds.), *College student development and academic life: psychological, intellectual, social, and moral issues* (pp. vii - xix). New York: Garland Publishing.

Arnold, K.D., Noble, K., & Subotnik, R.F. (1996). Perspectives on female talent development. In K.D. Arnold, K. Noble, & R.F. Subotnik (Eds.), *Remarkable women: perspectives on female talent development* (pp. 1 - 22). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Bowen, W.G. & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: vol. 1: attachment.* New York: Basic Books.

Bucknell University class of 2014 profile (2010). Office of Undergraduate Admissions. Retrieved on August 8, 2010, from www.bucknell.edu/x519.xml.

Chickering, A. W. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.) San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, C.R., Chartrand, J.M., & Dowdy, P.J. (1995). Relationships between career indecision subtypes and ego identity development. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*(4), 440-47.

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. (2009). *Qualitative inquiry under fire: toward a new paradigm dialogue*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Eisenhart, M.A. & Howe, K.R. (1992). Validity in educational research. In M. D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 643-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Erikson, E.K. (1968). Life cycle. In D.L. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, *9*, 286-292. New York: Macmillan.

Gadamer, H.G. (1989). *Truth and method* (2nd ed). (J. Weinsheimer & D.G. Marshall, Trans.). New York: Crossroad.

Gallagher, K. (2008). The art of methodology: a collaborative science. In K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The methodological dilemma: creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 67 - 81). New York: Routledge.

Gee, J.P., Michaels, S., & O'Connor, M.C. (1992.) Discourse analysis. In M. D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 227-91). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: toward an interpretative theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Golden, D. (2006). *The price of admission: how America's ruling class buys its way into elite colleges—and who gets left outside the gates*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Hammersley, M. (2008). *Questioning qualitative inquiry: critical essays*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Holliday, A. (2002). *Doing and writing qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Howell, C. & Turner, S.E. (2004). Legacies in black and white: the racial composition of the legacy pool. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(4), 325-351.

Husserl, E. (1970). *Logical investigation*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Jansen, G. & Peshkin, A. (1992). Subjectivity in qualitative research. In M. D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 681 - 725). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Jones, S.R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: fundamental elements and issues*. New York: Routledge.

Josselson, R. (1987). *Finding herself: pathways to identity development in women*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Josselson, R. (1996). *Revising herself: the story of women's identity from college to midlife*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lightfoot, C., Cole, M., & Cole, S.R. (2009). *The development of children* (6th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.

Manning, K. (1992). A rationale for using qualitative research in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 132-36.

Manning, K. (Ed.) (1999). *Giving voice to critical campus issues: qualitative research in student affairs.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Manning, K. (2000). *Rituals, ceremonies, and cultural meaning in higher education: critical studies in education series.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Marcia, J.E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *3*(5), 551-558.

Martin, N.D. & Spenner, K.L. (2009). Capital conversion and accumulation: a social portrait of legacies at an elite university. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(7), 623-648.

Massey, D.S. & Mooney, M. (2007). The effects of America's three affirmative action programs on academic performance. *Social Problems, 54*(1), 99-117.

Noble, K.D., Subotnik, R.F., & Arnold, K.D. (1996). A new model for adult female talent development: a synthesis of perspectives from *remarkable women*. In K.D. Arnold, K. Noble, & R.F. Subotnik (Eds.), *Remarkable women: perspectives on female talent development* (pp. 427-40). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Peshkin, A. (1991). *The color of strangers, the color of friends: the play of ethnicity in school and community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peshkin, A. (2001). *Permissible advantage: the moral consequences of elite schooling.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Renn, K.A. & Arnold, K.D. (2003). Reconceptualizing research on college student peer culture. *Journal of Higher Education 74*(3), 261-91.

Rogers, C.R. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Subotnik, R.F. & Arnold, K.D. (1996). Success and sacrifice: the costs of talent fulfillment for women in science. In K.D. Arnold, K. Noble, & R.F. Subotnik (Eds.), *Remarkable women: perspectives on female talent development* (pp. 263-80). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Waterman, A.S. (1999). Identity, the identity statuses, and identity status development: a contemporary statement. *Developmental Review*, *19*, 591-621.

Waterman, A.S. & Goldman, J.A. (1976). A longitudinal study of ego identity development at a liberal arts college. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *5*(4), 361-369.

Waterman, A.S., Kohutis, E., & Pulone, J. (1977). The role of expressive writing in ego identity formation. *Developmental Psychology*, *13*(3), 286-287.

Waterman, A.S. & Archer, S. (1979). Ego identity status and expressive writing among high school and college students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *8*(3), 372-341.

Waterman, A.S. & Waterman, C.K. (1971). A longitudinal study of changes in ego identity status during the freshman year of college. *Developmental Psychology*, *5*(1), 167-173.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Statement for Legacy Students

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Being Legacies at Bucknell University

You are invited to participate in a research study for a master's thesis in College Student Personnel in the Department of Education. The purpose of the study is to understand what it means to be legacy students at Bucknell University and how family connections to Bucknell influence the undergraduate experiences of legacies on campus. Results from the research may help faculty, staff, and administrators to best meet the educational needs of legacies.

INFORMATION

You may participate in the research in the following ways:

- You may meet with the researcher for a one-on-one interview, which will last no more than two hours. The interview will be a detailed discussion about your Bucknell University experience, including, but not limited to, topics such as your academic life, co-curricular activities, post-graduate plans, religious beliefs, politics, dating relationships, and relationships between you and your parents. There are no right answers to the questions that will be asked, and you do not have to talk about anything that you do not want to;

- You may provide at the time of the interview the name(s) and contact information for your parent or parents who have graduated from Bucknell University. This will help the researcher get the consent of your family member(s) to participate in the study, too;

- After the interview, you may submit copies of e-mails and/or transcriptions of text messages between you and your parent or parents who have graduated from Bucknell University. You may share as many or as few copies of e-mails and text messages that you are comfortable with, and you may decide whether to share full e-mail and text message conversations or shorter excerpts;

- You may provide ongoing feedback on the research and the thesis report to make sure that the researcher includes in the study only the information that you want to be included and that the thesis report reflects accurately and genuinely the information that you have shared;

- You may suggest other legacy students who are interested in participating in the study.

The total time commitment of participating in the research is roughly five-and-a-half hours. Although the study may last until fall 2010, your participation is not expected to be as long.

The researcher would like to audio-record and transcribe the interview with you, as well as collect copies or excerpts of e-mails and transcriptions of text messages between you and your parent or parents who have graduated from Bucknell University. You have the option, however, of choosing your level of participation; you may decide whether you want to 1) interview with the researcher, 2) have the interview audio-recorded, and/or 3) submit copies of e-mails and text messages. You may be involved in the study in all three major ways, in a combination of the three but not in all of them, in one of the options, or in none. And you may determine whether you wish to help the researcher contact your parent or parents and/or identify other participants for the research.

Excerpts and/or entire passages from the interview transcripts, e-mails, and text messages may be included in the written research report. The researcher will provide you with a copy of the interview audio-recording and transcription so that you may determine which information you would like or not like to include in the research. The copies of e-mails and text messages need only pertain to conversations that you have had with your parent or parents about your Bucknell University experience with academics, campus activities, and career plans and goals. The e-mail and text messages may further include information that your parent or parents have shared about their own undergraduate experiences on campus. The researcher will ask your parent(s) for their consent to include their correspondence with you in the research. Only the information from the e-mails and text messages that you and your parent or parents mutually agree to submit to the researcher will be used; if either you or your parent or parents object to the submission of any specific e-mail or text messages, the content from those particular communications will not be included in the research.

Results from the interview and transcription, and from the e-mail and text messages, will be used for research purposes only. Any information that you share is intended to help the researcher understand the topic of the study. The interview audio-recordings and transcriptions will be kept in electronic format in the researcher's private Bucknell computer network space and in a computer program called Transana; only the researcher has access, through a designated username and confidential password, to the information in the private network space and in Transana. The electronic versions of the e-mail and text message transcriptions will be saved and stored securely in the researcher's private Bucknell network space and in the Transana computer program. The information that you share will be stored for three years after the completion of the study. At that time the information will be destroyed.

Throughout the research you may be asked to provide feedback about what and how the information you share has been interpreted and written, something that may require another hour of your time. You may determine how much or how little feedback you wish to give.

RISKS

The information that you share about yourself, your family, and your life at Bucknell University may be personal and intimate. You may feel uneasy or upset at times as part of your participation in the research. Whereas you may talk about sensitive topics during the interview, and/or reveal something private about yourself and your family through the copies or excerpts of e-mails and text messages, you may decide how much and to which extent you want to share specific information.

BENEFITS

By participating in the study, you may develop a deeper self-understanding of your undergraduate experience. You may learn as well, through collaboration with the researcher, how you and your family participate in what it means for you to be a legacy student. The results of the study may in turn help faculty, staff, and administrators at Bucknell University to best meet the educational needs of legacy students who are currently on campus and who may enroll in the future. Recommendations for programs, activities, and advising in academics, campus life, and career development may also come from the research.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The researcher will keep all records stored securely and confidentially. Interview transcriptions and any quoted passages and excerpts taken from them, and from the copies of e-mails and text messages that you may submit, will refer to you and your family member(s) using fake names (aliases) to protect your and your family's identities. The research thesis report will refer to you using aliases as well. Documents that link your real names to aliases will be kept securely in the researcher's private Bucknell computer network space. Materials from the research will be kept for three years after the study is completed; after that time, the information will be destroyed.

Although the researcher will do everything possible to ensure confidentiality, there is still a chance that someone may be able to identify you based on the information that you contribute to the study. However, with your opportunity to provide ongoing feedback, you may determine what and how much you want to share.

CONTACT

Anytime you have questions or concerns about your participation in the study, you may contact the researcher directly: Jarrett Warshaw, jbw018@bucknell.edu, 516-398-8817.

You may also contact the researcher's thesis advisors and the chair of the Institutional Review Board respectively, who may answer questions about the research and your rights as a participant: Joe Murray, Associate Professor of Education, joe.murray@bucknell.edu, 570-577-1324; Richard Henne, Assistant Professor of Education, rhenne@bucknell.edu, 570-577-1583; and Abe Feuerstein, Associate Professor of Education, Associate Dean of Social Sciences, Chair of Institutional Review Board, abe.feuerstein@bucknell.edu, 570-577-3293.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation is voluntary. Without consequence you may at anytime withdraw from the study entirely or withdraw portions of the information that you give. If you withdraw from the study, or withdraw portions of the information that you give, the information will not be used in the research and will be destroyed at your request.

CONSENT

I have read and received a signed copy of this form. I have had all of my questions about participating in the study answered to my satisfaction. By signing below, I agree that I am at least eighteen years' old.

I agree to participate in the study. Yes □ No □

Participant's Signature:

Date:

Participant's name, printed:

Appendix B

Informed Consent Statement for Alumni Parents

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Being Legacies at Bucknell University

You are invited to participate in a research study for a master's thesis in College Student Personnel in the Department of Education. The purpose of the study is to understand what it means to be legacy students at Bucknell University and how family connections to Bucknell influence the undergraduate experiences of legacies on campus. Results from the research may help faculty, staff, and administrators to best meet the educational needs of legacies.

INFORMATION

You may participate in the research in the following ways:

- You may submit copies of e-mails and/or transcriptions of text messages between you and your son or daughter who is currently enrolled at Bucknell University. You may share as many or as few copies of e-mails and text messages that you and your son or daughter are comfortable with, and you may decide whether to share full e-mail and text message conversations or shorter excerpts;

- You may provide ongoing feedback on the research and thesis report to make sure that the researcher 1) includes only the information from the e-mails and text messages that you and your son or daughter both want to be included, and 2) that the researcher reflects accurately and genuinely in the research report the information from the e-mail and text messages that you have shared;

The total time commitment of participating in the research is roughly two hours. Although the study may last until fall 2010, your participation is not expected be as long.

The researcher would like to collect copies or excerpts of e-mails and transcriptions of text messages between you and your son or daughter who is currently enrolled at Bucknell University. Excerpts and/or entire passages from the information may be included in the written research report. The copies of e-mails and text messages need only pertain to conversations that you have had with your son or daughter about his/her experience with academics, campus activities, and career plans and goals. The e-mail and text messages may further include information that you have shared about your own undergraduate experiences at Bucknell University. The researcher has asked for the consent of your son or daughter to include him/her as a participant in the research, too. Only information from the e-mail and text messages that you and your son or daughter mutually agree to submit to the researcher will be used; if either you or your son or daughter objects to the submission of any specific e-mail or text messages, the content from those particular communications will not be included in the research.

Results from your participation will be used for research purposes only. Any information that you share is intended to help the researcher understand the topic of the study. Electronic versions of the e-mails and text message transcriptions will be saved and stored securely in the researcher's private Bucknell computer network space and in a computer program called Transana; only the researcher has access, through a designated username and confidential password, to the information in the private Bucknell network space and in Transana. The information that you share will be stored for three years after the completion of the study. At that time the information will be destroyed.

Throughout the research process you may be asked to provide feedback about what and how the information you share has been interpreted and written, something that may require at least another hour of your time. You may determine how much or how little feedback you wish to give.

RISKS

The information that you share may be personal and intimate. You may feel uneasy or uncomfortable at times as part of your participation in the research. Whereas you may discuss some private information through the copies or excerpts of e-mails and text messages that you submit, you may decide how much and to which extent you want to share information about yourself and your family. Only the information from the e-mail and text messages on which you and your son or daughter mutually agrees to submit will be included in the research.

BENEFITS

By participating in the study, you may develop a deeper self-understanding of your own undergraduate experience, as well as help your son or daughter to make sense of his/her life at Bucknell. You may learn, through collaboration with the researcher and with your son or daughter, how you and your family participate in what it means for your son or daughter to be a legacy student. The results of the study may in turn help faculty, staff, and administrators at Bucknell University to best meet the educational needs of legacy students who are currently on campus and who may enroll in the future. Recommendations for programs, activities, and advising in academics, campus life, and career development may also come from the research.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The researcher will keep all records stored securely and confidentially. Any quoted passages and excerpts taken from the copies of e-mails and text messages that you may submit will refer to you and your family member(s) using fake names (aliases) to protect your and your family's identities. The research thesis report will refer to you using aliases as well. Documents that link your real names to aliases will be kept securely in the researcher's private Bucknell computer network space. Materials from the research will be kept for three years after the study is completed; after that time the information will be destroyed.

Although the researcher will do everything possible to ensure confidentiality, there is still a chance that someone may be able to identify you based on the information that you contribute to the study. However, with your opportunity to provide ongoing feedback, you and your son or daughter may determine what and how much you want to share.

CONTACT

Anytime you have questions or concerns about your participation in the study, you may contact the researcher directly: Jarrett Warshaw, jbw018@bucknell.edu, 516-398-8817.

You may also contact the researcher's thesis advisors and the chair of the Institutional Review Board respectively, who may answer questions about the research and your rights as a participant: Joe Murray, Associate Professor of Education, joe.murray@bucknell.edu, 570-577-1324; Richard Henne, Assistant Professor of Education, rhenne@bucknell.edu, 570-577-1583; and Abe Feuerstein, Associate Professor of Education, Associate Dean of Social Sciences, Chair of Institutional Review Board, abe.feuerstein@bucknell.edu, 570-577-3293.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation is voluntary. Without consequence to you, to your children who are currently at Bucknell University, or to your children who may enroll at Bucknell University in the future, you may at anytime withdraw from the study entirely or withdraw portions of the information that you give. If you withdraw from the study entirely, or withdraw portions of the information that you give, the information will not be used in the research and will be destroyed at your request.

CONSENT

I have read and received a signed copy of this form. I have had all of my questions about participating in the study answered to my satisfaction. By signing below, I agree that I am at least eighteen years of age.

I agree to participate in the study. Yes □ No □

Participant's Signature:

Date:

Participant's name, printed: