

Good Work Project Report Series, Number 11

Good Work Among Albert Schweitzer Fellows

Wendy Fischman, Deborah Shutte, and
Becca Solomon

April, 1999

Jeff Solomon, Series Editor
Project Zero
Harvard University

COPYRIGHT 2001. All Rights Reserved

The Good Work Project

February 2001

Since 1995, three teams of investigators, under the direction of Howard Gardner, of Harvard University, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi of Claremont Graduate University, and William Damon of Stanford University, have been researching the ways in which leading professionals in a variety of domains carry out good work. "Good work" is used in a dual sense: 1) work that is deemed to be of high quality and 2) work that is socially responsible. Through intensive, face-to-face interviews, the researchers have investigated several domains, including journalism, genetics, business, jazz music, theater, philanthropy, and higher education. Pilot studies have been conducted of medicine and the rapidly emerging domain of "cyberlaw", with plans to explore these areas more fully in the future.

In addition to this central line of study, several other related lines of investigation have been launched:

1. The Origins of Good Work project is an examination of teenagers who excel in extracurricular activities.
2. The Dedicated Young Professionals Study focuses on those who have just begun (or will soon begin) promising professional careers.
3. Good Work in Interdisciplinary Contexts. Pilot studies of new arts/science media and of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Media Lab have been completed. Plans are underway to study interdisciplinary work at the pre-collegiate, college, and research institution level.
4. The Role of Contemplative Practices investigates the ways in which contemplation/meditation influence how professionals carry out work.
5. Encouraging Good Work in Journalism. This project, carried out in conjunction with the Committee of Concerned Journalists, is currently developing a "traveling curriculum" for use in newsrooms around the country.
6. Good Work as Transmitted through Lineages examines how the principle of doing good work is passed down through continuous generations of teachers to students or from mentors to less experienced professionals.
7. Good Work in Other Societies is a project spearheaded by colleagues at Denmark's Royal Danish School of Education that investigates good work in Denmark and Latvia. In the future, additional international components will be added.

The Project expects to issue a variety of books, reports, and related documentation. The present series, launched in early 2001, includes reports on several of the lines of research mentioned above. For further information on the Good Work Project, contact Professor Howard Gardner's office at 617-496-4929, via email at hgasst@harvard.edu, or through regular mail at 201 Larsen Hall, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

Papers On Good Work
February 2001

1. The Project on Good Work: A Description (April, 2000), Howard Gardner, Mihaly Csikzentmihalyi, and William Damon.
2. The Ethical Responsibilities of Professionals (July, 1998), Howard Gardner
3. The Empirical Basis of Good Work: Methodological Considerations (June, 1997), Howard Gardner, Anne Gregory, Mihalyi Csikzentmihalyi, William Damon, and Mimi Michaelson.
4. Good Work in Business (August, 2000), Kim Barberich and Howard Gardner.
5. Good Work Among Dedicated Young Professionals (July, 2000), Becca Solomon, Greg Feldman, and Marcy LeLacheur.
6. Contemplation and Implications for Good Work in Teaching (August, 1998), Laurinda Morway, Jeff Solomon, Mimi Michaelson, and Howard Gardner.
7. Good Work in a Complex World: A Cross Cultural Comparison (November, 1998), Hans Henrik Knoop and Howard Gardner.
8. Opportunities and Obstacles for Good Work in Medicine (August, 2000), Jeff Solomon, Jennifer DiBara, Sara Simeone, and Dan Dillon.
9. New Media Art: A New Frontier or Continued Tradition? (January, 2001), Kaley Middlebrooks.
10. The Origins of Good Work (April, 2000), Wendy Fischman and Grace Lam.
11. Good Work among Albert Schweitzer Fellows (April, 1999), Wendy Fischman, Becca Solomon, and Deborah Shutte.
12. High Abilities and Excellence: A Cultural Perspective (2000), Jin Li
13. Interdisciplinary Research and Education: Preliminary Perspectives from the MIT Media Laboratory (January, 2001), Dan Dillon.
14. Good Work in Cyberlaw (August, 2000), Evan Zullo.
15. Getting Kids, Parents, and Coaches on the Same Page (2000), Becca Solomon and Howard Gardner.

Acknowledgement

The Good Work Project is made possible by the generous support of:

The Bauman Foundation

The Carnegie Corporation

The Nathan Cummings Foundation

The J. Epstein Foundation

Fetzer Institute

The Ford Foundation

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

The Christian A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation

Thomas E. Lee

The Jesse Phillips Foundation Fund

Louise and Claude Rosenberg Jr. Family Foundation

Ross Family Charitable Foundation

The Spencer Foundation

The John Templeton Foundation

I. Introduction

In the component of our Good Work study devoted to Albert Schweitzer fellows, we interviewed young professionals involved in medicine and social services who were in the last stages of graduate training (current fellows) or early job experiences (former fellows). In particular, we sought to learn about fellows' goals, the challenges and pressures they faced, and the beliefs and values that led them to be involved in their community service work.

Originally founded in 1940 to help Dr. Schweitzer's hospital in Lambarene, Gabon (west central Africa) after supplies had been cut off from Europe as a result of World War II, the fellowship program has since expanded. Since 1991, the fellowship program has provided opportunities for graduate students in fields of health and social service to work in local communities around the United States, in addition to the Albert Schweitzer Hospital. The program is based on Dr. Schweitzer's belief that there is "a vast, untapped reservoir of idealism in our communities that, if nurtured, honored, and provided with specific opportunities for action, can become a powerful resource to assist vulnerable groups in our society" (Forrow and Wolf, 1998)¹. Once fellows are selected to implement their own community based project, they receive a one year stipend to carry out the work. Throughout the year, fellows meet together monthly to discuss their project work—the obstacles they encounter and suggestions for how to negotiate these challenges.

¹ Forrow, L. and Wolf, M. Ideals in Action: The US Schweitzer Fellows Programs. *Academic Medicine*, 1998. June, 658-661.

II. Choosing the Sample

We interviewed two groups of Schweitzer fellows in the Greater Boston area. First, we interviewed eight *current* fellows between the ages of twenty and thirty. Because we were interested in speaking with people who have had positive experiences, we selected these individuals based on Schweitzer staff recommendations. Next, we interviewed nine *former* fellows between the ages of twenty-six and thirty-six. To choose this group, we solicited recommendations from Schweitzer staff and also reviewed project reports. Our sample is comprised of seventeen subjects, nine women and eight men, who were involved in several health professions.

Schweitzer fellows develop community based projects, and these fellowship projects vary: some fellows work directly with patients in hospitals, others work at an organizational level, interacting primarily with other staff members. Two of our subjects carried out their projects at the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Lambarene, Gabon (west central Africa). The health fields represented include medicine, public health, social work, and occupational therapy.

Two thirds of the fellows contacted agreed to be interviewed. Very few people actually rejected the request, and if fellows did not express interest after they received the initial letter, they were not pursued. In addition to participation in the in-depth qualitative interviews, all of the subjects sorted thirty pre-established values for a more quantitative measure (Q-Sort).

III. Preliminary Findings

These preliminary findings are based on summaries written after the completion of each interview and include an analysis of all seventeen interviews.

A. What Motivates Subjects to Become Involved in This Program?

1. Formative Influences

In the larger Good Work project, we have been closely examining the formative experiences that impact how subjects regard life and work. Formative influences are varied, and include books, teachers, travel experiences, or the socio-political context in which one is raised. Many fellows mention ways in which childhood and adolescent experiences contribute to current goals and approaches to work. For example, almost all of the Schweitzer fellows participated in some kind of community service activity as children or teenagers. Not all of these activities were formally structured; sometimes fellows picked up trash in their neighborhoods or cared for elderly neighbors. These early interests may presage a life-long pattern of social involvement.

Difficult upbringing

Several fellows talk about challenges they faced when they were young, such as growing up in poverty, dealing with a parent's mental instability, or confronting racism. They frequently explain that working through these difficulties helped them to become sensitive, caring, and understanding people. One subject says that immigrating to the United States when she was young informed her career decision to help other people:

...part of me wants to do, spend a lot of life working for certain groups, you know that group of people whether they were immigrants, or they're just minorities, or urban kids, or whatever...I guess I see myself to some extent as part of a group that at one point or another benefited from help...I immigrated to this country when I was eleven, and for a while we really had people helping us, you know whether it was that we were on welfare for a while, and then we had people who volunteered to come to our home and tutor us in English..

Transforming experiences

Some Schweitzer fellows also describe a single life-changing experience that occurred early in their lives, a particular situation or event that expands perceptions and later influences their philosophy of work. We call these events *transforming experiences*.

Many fellows talk about how these transforming experiences change life goals, while also inspiring their fellowship projects. With two exceptions, these experiences are described as difficult. At the same time, however, the fellows describe these difficulties as learning experiences and an opportunity to re-evaluate what really matters in their lives.

One former fellow, for example, describes the tragic loss of his best friend due to AIDS. This subject believes that some people living with AIDS are embarrassed to seek medical services, a mindset that often exacerbates their problems. For his fellowship project he chose to work with adolescents at an organization that helped people with AIDS confront the reality of the disease. The purpose of his project is to encourage adolescents to ask for medical help when they are in need:

At the time...my best friend that I grew up with died suddenly...Many gay and lesbian, transgendered individuals, teenagers, they won't seek out health care. I think this is what happened to my friend, and it deeply affected me...my overall goal [of the Schweitzer project] was to make them [the teens with whom he worked] not afraid to go see the doctor, to go see the nurse...not be afraid that they're going to be discriminated against when it comes to health care...

Another former Lambarene fellow describes how her time in Africa brought to the forefront discrepancies between her life in the United States and the lives of others in less privileged countries. She became aware of similar issues when her parents took her to Haiti at the age of eight; what she saw there made her realize her position of relative

privilege. At that moment, she identified a life goal: to become a doctor, travel to Haiti, and help people. This fellow sees her project as a way of learning how to provide medical services to people in third world countries who lack the resources often taken for granted in the United States.

Role models

Family members also inspire fellows to choose a medical or health career. One fellow explains, "...my grandfather was a physician...so I think that I became aware of people's abilities to help on some level, medically. And involve themselves in the lives of patients...I think I had a fascination ever since I could remember him." One fellow talks about her desire to uphold the family tradition of community service work:

My grandmother was a Quaker, very active...She supported the American Friends Service Committee, she went on an international world peace tour, like in the nineteen thirties or forties to try and do one-on-one reaching out to people from other countries...So, she was, in a way, kind of more in an ideal, symbolic way a mentor for me, in that she was a nurse, and I just thought, I have family as another strong value that I have, and so it was a way to keep this family legacy alive.

B. What Resources Do Subjects Call Upon to Manage Their Work? What Strategies Do They Use?

1. Supports and Resources

Many Schweitzer fellows describe important supports that help them in their service work. Most often, this support comes from within the fellowship program. Religious faith is also often mentioned as a source of inner support.

The fellowship program

The fellowship program itself (including the staff and other participating fellows) is often identified as an essential support. Fellows mention the benefits of being able to share their experiences with, and receive feedback from, the group. One fellow says that the support of others in the group helped her to overcome obstacles in her own project, "That is such a support to draw on and people would share their own barriers that they'd come across, like for me...when I was setting up with an agency and it totally fell through and I had to walk away, and find another place. So the support from that group was just incredible. Other fellows talk about the importance of being part of a community. One fellow, for example, explains, "I think being a Schweitzer fellow meant being part of a community with the other fellows. And so one of the greatest things I got to experience was these meetings that we went to, where we'd sit around, and just be in the company of others who are doing these amazing things."

Some subjects contrast this sense of community with the "isolation" and lack of support they feel in graduate school. Advisors and professors may offer little or no encouragement, whereas peers in other projects are there to listen and/or problem solve. To some, this type of service work may seem unusual; for students in graduate school, lab jobs are the norm, "And many people would hear that and be like, you know, that's

kind of weird. 'Shouldn't you be doing research, or shouldn't you be doing something a little bit more medical?'" While some professors do encourage students to be involved in the fellowship, subjects describe a general lack of support from graduate programs. For example, one subject explains that his program only offers funding for students doing lab research abroad, and not to those who travel overseas to work in clinical settings. This subject paid his own way each time he traveled to Africa because he refused to do research while he was there; his interest was in working and living with people in need. He said of his graduate program, "I really enjoyed my educational experience, in the sense that I got training...and I got teaching from some of the best people in the world, which is wonderful, but in the same sense, I felt like I was an island. And that was why it was great to have the Schweitzer program."

While some fellows describe academic mentors (doctors or professors) as important in their training, many find the support received from their peers and the Schweitzer program staff more meaningful. As one fellow says of the Schweitzer program director, he understood that there was "more to life than living in the burbs." Fellows also mention knowing social activists and humanitarians who serve as important role models (or advisors).

Religion

Some fellows turn to religion as a source of hope or to help them cope with hardship. For example, one subject describes how participating in a Jesuit service helped her cope with the death of a patient who had also become a close friend:

...And the day that his funeral and burial were in Guatemala, I felt really strongly that I wanted to be present with that, but I couldn't be in Guatemala. And so I went to the Jesuit Urban Center...a portion of the service, or one of the songs was in Spanish, which I just was so moved by, I mean I was in tears pretty much the whole service, but I felt so much support there that I kept going back...I also needed a place to be able to have those feelings of

sadness. And I think maybe a lot of people in that setting could understand because maybe a lot of people do turn to religion for support in times of real sadness as well as other times, but for me, it made a big difference in a horribly tragic situation.

This fellow turns to religion specifically to help her deal with loss.

Whereas some subjects find faith as a result of the fellowship experience, a few come to the project with already established beliefs, and find them strengthened during their service work. For example, one subject describes his faith as follows:

I think to thrive means, for me, to have a really profound direction in life, and meaningfulness and purposefulness in living and feeling...there's a Jewish prayer, when you wake up in the morning, you kneel down and you, you're sort of thanking God for allowing you to stand, for example. Then you stand, and you're thanking God for that experience. And it's a wonderful notion about, in the very first moment of time of your day that you can actually be thinking of being thankful for it...I think that I hooked that, I could see people living alone feeling that way. Because it was just such a powerful, upward moving feeling...I wanted to know if people could feel that way even though they were isolated and lonely.

This subject is interested in working with the home-bound elderly and sees faith as a way to alleviate loneliness and inspire others.

2. Strategies

Schweitzer fellows are resourceful in their work. We are particularly interested in how they use creative solutions to overcome the challenges, or “obstacles” they encounter.

Reframing obstacles

More than half the fellows discuss the strategies they use to overcome challenging situations. One strategy fellows use is reframing obstacles, which means finding a way to cast a situation in a new light. They use this technique to deal with problems such as internal politics and lack of financial resources in the organizations where they work. For

example, one fellow explains that when he faced considerable disappointment with his fellowship experience, rather than quit, he altered his expectations of the project:

I changed my expectations. I just decided that even if I didn't have a lot of autonomy, I still actually was basically enjoying my experiences with patients. The patients that I saw in the clinic were very interesting to me. Even though I saw relatively few and didn't have the same independence. And outside of the clinic I was talking a lot with people, writing poetry, and it became very rich and interesting to me. So it became very valuable.

When probed about how they manage these situations, many fellows describe creative solutions. For example, in response to the shortage of medical practitioners in the face of a bombing in Nairobi, one fellow developed a short-term telephone consulting program, making plastic surgeons and trauma surgeons available by telephone. Kenyan doctors were thus able to supplement their knowledge. Another fellow describes the way he manages a music class when most of his students can not afford instruments. Because he does not have enough funding to buy them all instruments, he uses materials from his neighborhood's recycling bins to make musical instruments for the students, "...And so I would go through, rummage through, the recycling stuff and get little containers for drums and things and sticks for beating on and stuff that made noises...I had drum sets for all the kids in the middle school all from the recycle stuff." These on-the-spot solutions highlight the flexibility and resourcefulness of many fellows.

Integrating interests

The fellowship experience provides the opportunity to integrate personal interests—such as religion, art, nature, and community service—with health and medicine. In some cases, fellows call on these other interests to facilitate their work. Often these integrations become the source of innovative programs and projects, some of which have endured well beyond the conclusion of fellowships.

For example, after volunteering at a mental health center, one subject wonders about its stark impersonal environment. She decides to provide a more comforting atmosphere; she sets up gardens, establishes a resource library and brings in animals to visit with the patients. She explains that through her work, she sees “better parts” of her patients and their potential as caring, giving, sensitive people. This is a side of patients that many on the staff had never seen before. She has written a book about this project that has since been translated into Japanese and Chinese. The positive impact of this program is far reaching; health care providers and the general public benefit from clear information about how to implement this program.

Other fellows are in the process of institutionalizing their ideas because they believe that their projects will be useful to others. One fellow explains that in his daily work, he constantly has to negotiate time to treat his patients adequately. For monetary reasons, the administration pressures him to see as many people as possible. To deal with this pressure, he develops a new medical record system designed to document “all the different kinds of things we do for our patients.” He plans to show this system to the administration in order to give them a more realistic view of health care duties. As a continuation of his Schweitzer project, another subject traveled to Bolivia to live with and care for child prostitutes in an attempt to get them off the streets. He stays with groups of street children from 10pm until 3am. He sleeps in the sewers with them, rescues them from treetops, and takes them to an orphanage at 3am every morning (provided they agree to it). He lives with them on their terms in order to gain their trust. His approach is unique and unprecedented. He is in the process of setting up an orphanage for these children, where they can live and receive medical attention.

3. Maintaining Balance

Throughout the larger Good Work study, subjects talk about the difficulty of maintaining balance, particularly between the demands of work and personal life. Schweitzer fellows also describe a struggle for balance, but between different demands.

Many of the *current* Schweitzer fellows do not talk about maintaining balance between work and personal relationships. Rather, these fellows say that community service work “fill[s] a need;” a desire to help and serve others, a chance to gain experience, an opportunity to escape the narrow focus many students experience in graduate programs. For example, one fellow states:

I was looking for something to complement all the school work that we were doing in the nursing program—it was so book-oriented. If we weren’t doing book stuff, we were in the hospitals really focusing on illness, which is the whole idea of the nursing program. So I was looking for something that was going to bring me out of the hospital, out of the classroom, into the community...So ultimately it was to complement all the school stuff.

A few fellows do mention their concern about how to balance community work with graduate school or professional responsibilities. A current fellow, for instance, says that her community service work makes her a more well rounded and balanced person. Yet, as an intern, she has to juggle many time commitments to accommodate this schedule of volunteerism. Another current fellow explains that his interest in community service is not unique among his peers, but that the time issue “ke[eps] people away” because it is hard to “put a book down” when there is so much to learn.

In contrast, the *former* fellows talk about the difficulty of keeping balance between their personal lives and their desire to help others. One former fellow explains that at this stage in his life, he wants to dedicate himself completely to serving others. He feels that it

would be selfish to have a partner because his energy and attention would be divided between his partner and those he serves. While he chooses to focus solely on others, another former fellow says this lack of balance might involve risk. She fears internalizing the problems and sorrows of her patients. She tries to distance herself and she talks about how important it is to "know your limits" even as you empathize. These former fellows seem to be struggling with the idea of having personal time and space because they are so involved in the lives of others, not because of competing demands (such as family and work). Former fellows speak about balance as something they are striving towards in the future.

How Do These Goals Impact the Lives of Subjects Over the Long Term?

1. Goals

Almost all subjects emphasize that the fellowship program fosters a belief in the value of education, often reinforcing their own budding interests and goals. In particular, they talk about the importance of educating the public about health issues and preventive measures. Several agree with the sentiment of one subject who describes education as a vehicle through which one can "help the patients be able to help themselves." This notion of educating people to be self-reliant also extends to wanting to educate host organizations and community practitioners. Additionally, some fellows mention becoming educators themselves as a career goal.

Educating host organizations

Almost half of the subjects believe their purpose is to help host organizations educate their clients. Three fellows (working at different health centers) write educational

pamphlets for patients and provide training materials for staff. They also develop material to help clients communicate their needs to health care providers, including translation of materials into other languages. One fellow works on educational materials pertaining to domestic violence; another subject works on outreach services around health promotion and prevention for the Latino community. Two subjects work with center clients directly by facilitating discussion groups to educate adolescents about health issues.

Educating practitioners

A former Lambarene fellow discusses the importance of educating practitioners as well as patients. She is concerned with perpetuating a model that gets played out at the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Lambarene. European doctors come to the hospital to treat patients, but they do not provide training to the staff. Because the Gabonese hospital staff does not feel that they have had adequate training to care for patients, they frequently send them to the Schweitzer hospital. This subject says that, in addition to helping the patients, sharing knowledge with the Gabonese practitioners is the “biggest thing you can do” for the Gabonese. In this way they will be able to learn to help themselves and no longer be dependent on the help of others.

Choosing teaching as a career

Some subjects also talk about teaching as a long-term career goal. One current fellow says that her Schweitzer fellowship gives her a chance to see whether she wants to be an educator. As a physician, she plans to practice pediatrics, but she would also like to incorporate health education into her medical practice. A former fellow also plans to incorporate education into her position. Along with providing direct care to patients, she increases her staff development and education responsibilities at the center. In her direct

nursing work, she is primarily concerned with patient education including awareness of addiction issues. However, she is also teaching at a nursing program and hopes to incorporate addiction education into its curriculum.

One fellow, who wants to teach in academic medicine and do clinical work with those in need, mentions his struggle to maintain both goals. He explains:

...caring for poor people, and being an academician, have often been linked, but often wind up in conflict with each other wherever you do it. If you do it in a teaching hospital, you may not have much time to see the patients...If you do it in a community agency, your teaching time is going to be constrained, but you may have more resources to do good care for poor people. So they're often, they're interests that wind up next to each other, but are often to some degree in conflict.

The fellowship offers opportunities to integrate conflicting demands (teaching and service) and provides the opportunity to try out varied career approaches.

IV. Connections to the Study of Good Work

Our related study of Dedicated Young Professionals and our collaborative study with the Albert Schweitzer Fellowship Program links the young subjects of the Origins study (both dedicated young practitioners and young community service volunteers) to the older professionals in the Core study. In an effort to build a developmental model of Good Work, we are looking closely at the Origins findings for connections to other projects. Below, we discuss themes that are common to all projects.

A. Formative Influences

Schweitzer fellows emphasize the influence of family on their choice of service work. The sentiment expressed by a Schweitzer fellow about carrying on a family tradition is

very similar to that of a young Origins community service volunteer who explains, “I think I’m partially in it because it’s what my family stands for as a group.” Family members who are themselves active in community service work may prompt students and fellows to consider the importance of responsibility to others.

Schweitzer fellows also describe transforming experiences as pivotal to initial interest in service work. By contrast, such experiences are rarely mentioned by the young geneticists subjects (Dedicated Young Professionals study) or veteran professionals (main Good Work study). Rather, veteran professionals often describe chance situations that catapult them in a particular career direction (being “in the right place at the right time”). Schweitzer fellows describe early transforming experiences as difficult. The professionals who do mention transforming experiences usually mention events in adult life (rather than in childhood or adolescence) and do not describe them as problematic. In fact, we have been surprised by the consistently positive picture depicted by older scientists.

Similar influential experiences seem to be common among the young community service volunteers (Dedicated Young Practitioners, aged ten to fifteen). For example, some of the young volunteers talk about how work with the poor has allowed them to gain new perspective on their own lives. One volunteer, who participated in an excursion to Bolivia to work in an orphanage, remarks:

It’s a life-changing thing, actually. Cause you never know how much privilege you have. Like in daily life. Being white-skinned or whatever. Until you go somewhere, where that’s like—you are put on a pedestal, just cause you have that.

These types of experiences support the notion that early involvement in service work and awareness of the problems of others may impact a child’s sense of caring. We

wonder if voluntary or compulsory participation in community service in youth has a lasting impact.

B. Supports and Resources

Whereas most Schweitzer fellows emphasize the support received from the fellowship program or from religious beliefs, subjects from other components of the study most frequently discuss support from family and academic mentors. Young geneticists and veteran scientists (from the Dedicated Young Professionals study and the larger Good Work study) frequently talk about how mentors guide their careers. The young geneticists describe graduate school advisors as mentors. Similarly, older geneticists talk about being mentored as a part of their training for the domain. Interestingly, geneticists rarely mention religion.

In the Apprenticeship Project, we focus specifically on mentor/mentee relationships. We are interested in how values and ideas are passed on to succeeding generations, and are interviewing leading scientists, journalists, and other professionals and their students. In particular, we are exploring the extent to which mentorship values prevail and get passed down to succeeding generations. These findings should be useful in conjunction with the larger Good Work Study and ancillary projects.

C. Strategies; Reframing Obstacles

Schweitzer fellows call on a variety of resources to manage their work; they are resourceful and frequently recast obstacles to see them in a new light. Young community service volunteers (from the Origins study) also cope with obstacles in their work by reframing the challenge at hand, though this is mentioned less frequently. One volunteer,

for example, explains that when activities became monotonous, he asks himself if there is “anyway I can change it to stay interested in it...Instead of approaching something in one way, I try to flip it around and realize something else that’s in it. And it helps me.” We are looking at similar types of strategies used by adult subjects who are faced with difficult professional or ethical decisions. Adult subjects do mention reframing obstacles, but less often.

The Schweitzer fellows offer a valuable, perhaps exceptional, model in their integration of work and personal life through service to others.

The connection between doing good work and being a “good” person lies at the center of the Good Work study. We want to help students and the practitioners they work with to understand that doing “good work” means producing high quality *and* doing something that is beneficial to the public.

D. Strategies; Maintaining Balance

The Schweitzer fellows talk about balance and its tensions differently than do most of our other subjects (main Good Work project and ancillary projects); Schweitzer fellows see work and personal life as more integrated. Becoming a part of the community they serve is also important to them; several subjects talk about the importance of integrating themselves fully into the local environment. One fellow says that she gets the most satisfaction from her work when she is not only working with a community, but also becoming a part of it. Many Schweitzer fellows understand “principal community” to mean the people they serve. By contrast, many of our other subjects mention family and peers as their primary communities.

Many younger Origins subjects talk about the difficulty of keeping up with school, family, and friends while excelling within their domain. The young geneticists (young adults in graduate school or in their first job) in the Dedicated Young Professionals study mention the long hours required by their jobs and the challenge of maintaining other interests, especially making time for family. The veteran professionals (in the larger Good Work study) also juggle devotion to their work with family obligations. In fact, some women scientists consciously choose not to have children because of the “impossibility” of being both a mother and a scientist.

E. Goals

The importance of education is emphasized by most Schweitzer fellows. Many of the journalists we interviewed (in the main Good Work study) share the belief that educating the public is important. Like the Schweitzer fellows, they see their work as an

opportunity to educate. The value of educating others (expressed by many of the journalists and Schweitzer fellows), however, is not heard as frequently from the geneticists. While informing the public is important to most geneticists, to some education means convincing the public of the "rightness" of their perspectives. Schweitzer fellows and journalists, on the other hand, emphasize the importance of presenting a neutral viewpoint. This is essential to their understanding of education.

F. Responsibility

In the larger Good Work study, we have begun to examine the ethics of professionals according to a model of five different responsibilities: (1) responsibility to one's self, (2) responsibility to others (intimates or peers), (3) responsibility to one's institution, (4) responsibility to one's calling, and (5) responsibility to the wider world. We are now beginning to use this model to compare themes of responsibility across different ages and career levels.

1. Responsibility to Self

Young Origins students and volunteers most often indicate a sense of responsibility to the *self*. They describe their goals (to excel in their domain) with reference to personal satisfaction, accomplishment, and recognition. Many of the young students also mention education as a major objective in their lives. These students talk about the importance of their relationships with individuals who are close to them, including family, peers, coaches, and instructors. Frequently, maintaining balance between mastering their domain and sustaining close ties with friends and family is difficult. We believe that this tension may indicate a conflict between responsibility to *self* and responsibility to *others*.

The Schweitzer fellows (same age as young geneticists) mention a responsibility to *self* when they talk about wanting more balance in their lives. However, for them, responsibility to self may involve upholding personal standards when faced with ethically challenging situations. For example, one subject describes being asked to perform an abortion. Remaining true to his religious beliefs, he refused. Another fellow shares a different experience; his supervisor asks him to discharge a patient because he does not have enough insurance; the subject let the patient stay in spite of the risk to his own position.

At the same age level, the young geneticists also discuss a strong sense of responsibility to the self, particularly in terms of career advancement. Graduate students talk about completing their degrees; post-doctoral fellows mention publication as necessary for academic positions. However, for some this ambition is countered by the discouragement that comes with low pay, long hours, the extended process of completing a doctorate, and uncertainty about future career options.

2. Responsibility to Domain

Schweitzer fellows demonstrate responsibility to their domain, or responsibility to *calling* (along with responsibility to the wider world). For some, this sense of responsibility takes the form of educating others about their domain. Fellows develop materials for host organizations that are designed to help patients understand more about their own health. Some fellows also talk about the importance of educating the staff at health centers and hospitals; others emphasize training the new generation of practitioners.

The Schweitzer fellows are in the same age group as these young geneticists, and both groups demonstrate an awareness of the *domain*, which is not mentioned by the young students in the Origins component. The young geneticists describe a sense of responsibility to the general scientific community and to the integrity of the data collection process. They emphasize the importance of rigorous work without short cuts, critical thinking (about conclusions drawn, for example), and support publication of only the most robust findings. These subjects report that their responsibility to the domain stems from training received in graduate programs and from mentors.

3. Responsibility to Wider World

The Schweitzer fellows demonstrate a strong sense of responsibility to the *wider world*. The fellows emphasize serving those in need as well as themselves; they emphasize not only working in a community, but also becoming a part of it. They also work hard to develop creative solutions to problems, from dealing with politics within the organization to circumventing fiscal constraints. When solving problems, it is apparent that these fellows consider the needs of their clients first—well before institutional concerns.

The young community service volunteers (Origins study) also show an awareness of and commitment to the *wider world*. Like the Schweitzer fellows, they want to participate in their activities because they want to "give back" to a community in some way. Some volunteers mention personal satisfaction or, making others happy, as a reason for involvement—students feel good about themselves when giving to others.

Our preliminary review of young geneticists suggests that although they also believe in educating others, they believe society at large may be the ultimate caretaker for generations to come. The Schweitzer fellows suggest that they themselves are ultimately responsible for the public and future generations of practitioners in their field. This may be one of the most important differences between these groups; Schweitzer fellows and community service volunteers may have a precocious sense of responsibility to the wider world.

Not surprisingly, Schweitzer fellows often seem overwhelmed by this responsibility. Many raise concerns about ethics in their domain. This most often includes equitable allocation of resources so that all people have access to appropriate health care. The difference in views (between Schweitzer fellows and young geneticists) may have something to do with the difference between the domains (health care versus scientific research) and/or the associated training.

The difference in how these subjects think about kinds of responsibility highlight the importance of interviewing individuals at various stages in their lives. For example, it is possible that younger students, who have not formally committed themselves to their activities, do not yet feel a responsibility to the domain. Investigating these different age and career levels should ultimately allow us to build a developmental model of Good Work.

G. Q-Sort: A Comparison of Schweitzer Fellows to Other Subjects in their Domain (Community Service Volunteers) or Age Group (Dedicated Young Geneticists)

As part of the interview, we ask subjects to rank thirty pre-set values in terms of their importance for themselves as practitioners. Schweitzer fellows identify the most important values in this sort as “Understanding, helping, or serving others,” “Teaching and mentoring,” “Rewarding and supportive relationships,” and “Honesty and integrity.” Interestingly, the young community service providers (Origins) identify two of the same values as the most important. These include “Understanding, helping, or serving others” and “Rewarding, Supportive relationships.” Young geneticists share the Schweitzer fellows’ emphasis on the importance of “Honesty and Integrity” and “Teaching and Mentoring;” however, serving others and maintaining relationships are less important to them. While these age groups are comparable, the Q-Sort rankings show a more marked concern for others among individuals engaged in service oriented work (Schweitzer fellows and community service volunteers).

A second sort asks subjects to order the values in terms of their perceived importance to others in the field. Schweitzer fellows suggest that their colleagues in school and at work order these values differently than they do. This result may explain why their relationships with colleagues are not mentioned more often during the interviews. The only value among the top four that the fellows seem to believe their colleagues also regard as important is “Understanding, helping, or serving others.” The Q-Sort results for dedicated young geneticists indicate that they also believe that their colleagues have different value priorities.

Like the Schweitzer fellows, the young geneticists rank “Recognition from one’s field” and “Professional accomplishment” among the lowest order for themselves but among the highest for their peers.

A third sort asks subjects to identify the four values most important to them as individuals. The beliefs, goals, and perspectives that fellows share during the interview are reflected in this sorting activity. For instance, the four values Schweitzer fellows select as most important to them personally are “Rewarding and supportive relationships,” “Personal growth,” “Understanding, helping or serving others,” and “Creating balance.” All of these are highlighted in the interview data.

Based on the analysis of these sorts, we are able to make comparisons between the Schweitzer fellows and the young community service providers (ten to fifteen years old) engaged in the same work. We are also able to make comparisons between the Schweitzer fellows and the dedicated young professionals who are the same age, but involved in different areas of work (genetics).

The Schweitzer fellows, young geneticists, and young community service volunteers rank *extrinsic* and *contemplative* values such as “Fame,” “Wealth,” “Power, Influence,” and “Solitude, Contemplation” at or near the bottom of the list of values. Interestingly, however, both the Schweitzer fellows and the community service volunteers rank “Faith” in the middle of their lists; “Faith” is not as important to the young geneticists. This mention of faith may make sense given what we hear about the importance of religion for Schweitzer fellows, and for some, the notion of faith may go hand in hand with service work.