

5-20-2005

From TA to Faculty Member: The Socialization of Doctoral Completers

Leonard Williams
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td>

Recommended Citation

Williams, Leonard, "From TA to Faculty Member: The Socialization of Doctoral Completers" (2005).
University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations. 248.
<https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/248>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

FROM TA TO FACULTY MEMBER:
THE SOCIALIZATION OF DOCTORAL COMPLETERS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
The Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations

by

Leonard A. Williams

B.A., Northwestern State University, 1993
M.Ed., University of New Orleans, 1998

May 2005

© 2005, Leonard A. Williams

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with pleasure that I extend gratitude to all those that assisted in this endeavor as it was truly a group effort. The assumption that the dissertation is completed with a whole lot of smoke and mirrors is incorrect as this project would not have happened without the support of a group of exceptional individuals:

Committee Chair and Major Professor There are truly not enough words to express the gratitude for the guidance provided by Dr. Barbara J. Johnson in pursuit of this goal. Her words of inspiration, support and motivation were always what was needed at the right time and I thank her for that assistance.

Doctoral Committee Members I appreciate the assistance and guidance given by my doctoral committee members Dr. Jim Killacky, Dr. Janice Thomas and Dr. Amy Wells. Their keen insight challenged me to consider aspects of this research project that I would not have developed on my own.

Former Faculty in the UNO College of Education I am forever grateful to former UNO faculty members Dr. Joe Berger and Dr. Mike Paulsen whom I met early in my graduate career and encouraged me to pursue the doctoral degree.

Classmates My three “partners in crime” in this effort were Adrienne Mustiful, Arrianna Smith and Linda Blakley. Their support and assistance as friends, colleagues and critics will always be remembered in completion of this research project.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my loving wife, Angela, who endured many missed events, lonely nights and assorted coffee rings on furniture around the house as I worked on this project. Thank you so much for your support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF TABLES	x
ABSTRACT.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study	6
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study	7
Overview of Methodology	8
Definition of Terms.....	9
Organization of the Study	10
CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Organizational Socialization.....	12
Anticipatory Socialization	13
Graduate Students in Academia.....	14
Understanding the Role of Graduate Education	15
Experiences of Doctoral Students in Graduate School.....	19
Experiences of Women Graduate Students.....	25
Experiences of Minority Graduate Students.....	27
Experiences of TAs in Academia	29
Lack of Financial Support or Benefits	29
Training for Teaching?	31
Importance of TA Training in Academia.....	33
Dimensions of TA Training.....	34
Interrelatedness of the Dimensions of TA Training	35

Challenge of TA Training.....	35
Newcomer Experiences and Socialization.....	36
Forms of Surprise.....	37
New Faculty Experiences in Academia	39
Socialization Process for New Faculty	39
Accommodation Stage	40
Role Management	42
New Faculty Stress	43
Stress from Lack of Time	44
Stress from Isolation and Loneliness	44
Stress from Lack of Emotional and Departmental Support	45
Stress from the Recognition and Reward Process	45
Stress Over Lack of Resources	46
Stress Over Unrealistic Expectations.....	46
Disciplinary Differences and New Faculty Socialization.....	47
Women and Minority Faculty Experiences	49
Minority Faculty in Academia	50
Women Faculty in Academia.....	52
Conceptual Framework.....	54
Conclusion	59
CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	60
Introduction.....	60
Research Questions.....	61
Rationale for Utilizing a Qualitative Research Approach	61
Rationale for a Phenomenological Study.....	64
The Role of the Researcher.....	65
Views the World Holistically.....	66
Systematically Reflects on Who He/She is.....	66
Is Sensitive to Personal Biography	67

Recognizes Subjectivity.....	67
Uses Complex Reasoning	68
Ethical Considerations	68
Pilot Study.....	70
Pilot Study Results.....	71
Site and Sample Selection.....	72
Site Selection	72
Site Profile: Downtown University (DU)	75
Gaining Access	75
Selection of Participants	76
Online Survey Evaluation.....	77
Contacting Participants	78
Rationale for Interviews.....	79
Interview Guide	80
The Interview	81
Field Notes.....	83
Transcribing	83
Data Analysis.....	84
Coding.....	84
The Matrix Approach for Analyzing Data.....	85
Trustworthiness.....	85
Delimitations.....	88
Limitations	88
CHAPTER IV RESULTS.....	90
Participants.....	91
Anticipatory Socialization: Doctoral Training and Teaching Assistantships	96
Choosing the Faculty Career.....	98
Graduate School Environment.....	99
Entry into Graduate School and TA Positions.....	101

Support From Others.....	110
Major Themes: TA Training and the Disconnect of Faculty Life	116
Positive Aspects of the Teaching Assistant Experience	117
Comfort in the Classroom.....	117
Comfort in Classroom Related Activities.....	119
Better Prepared to Deal with Realities of Faculty Life.....	120
Negative Aspects of TA Training.....	124
Lack of Preparation for Graduate Student Management	125
Vagueness of the Tenure Process	128
Changed Assumptions of the Faculty Career.....	132
Lack of Direction as a Faculty Member	137
Not Prepared for Isolation and Stress	139
Conclusion	141
CHAPTER V Discussion.....	143
Overview of Study	143
Positive Aspects of Teaching Assistantship Preparation	145
New Faculty are Comfortable in the Classroom as a Professor.....	146
New Faculty are Prepared for Additional Classroom Related Tasks	147
New Faculty are Better Prepared to Cope with the Realities of Faculty Life.....	147
Negative Aspects of the Teaching Assistantship Preparation.....	148
New Faculty Have Little or No Training to Support Graduate Students.....	149
New Faculty are Overwhelmed with the Vagueness of the Tenure Process	150
Assumptions of the Faculty Career Changed.....	151
New Faculty Experience a Lack of Direction in their First Year	153
New Faculty are Not Prepared for the Isolation/Stress.....	154
Implications for Policy and Practice	156
Future Research	158
Conclusion	160
REFERENCES	161

APPENDICES	169
VITA	185

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 – Model of Doctoral Student Transition to Faculty Role	56
---	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Participants at Suburban University (SU)..... 92

Table 2 Participants at Suburban University (DU)..... 94

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between teaching assistantship training while in graduate school and the perceived preparation of new faculty entering the academy. This study also took into account the types of tasks participants completed while serving as teaching assistants and how those tasks related to preparation for faculty life.

Through the participants shared experiences three positive themes emerged from their experiences as new faculty. Additionally, the participants perceptions of the faculty work role were strengthened as a result of the teaching assistant experience. Unfortunately, five negative or less desirable themes emerged indicating that additional training is needed during the teaching assistantship experience to better prepare doctoral students for the faculty work role.

Taken together, the themes discovered from this study not only necessitate the need for future research but also support implementation of training for all teaching assistants who aspire to enter the academy. By focusing on the teaching assistantship as a possible training mechanism, the experiences of new faculty can be further enhanced.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The academic community has identified three work roles faculty must perform in order to be successful in their chosen profession – research, teaching and service (Boyer, 1990; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Yet as thirty to forty thousand new faculty are hired every year to fill vacant positions at institutions of higher education, research indicates that many new faculty are not being trained to perform those tasks (Fink, 1992). Although almost half of newly hired faculty each year are untenured professors changing institutions; an overwhelming number are recent doctoral completers who are starting their new career as a faculty member (Fink, 1992). On average, doctoral completers have 3-7 years of academic training in primarily research related activities, yet they are expected to perform the role of a faculty member with little or no preparation related to the expected tasks of the position. For example, new faculty are expected to prepare syllabi, teach classes, mentor students and manage the psychological and physical demands of a new career immediately upon their arrival at their new institution. But are they ready for their new career and have they been trained properly? Have they had enough experience to “hit the ground running” (Whitt, 1991)? In order to answer those questions it is prudent to identify and conceptualize all of the ways a new faculty member can receive the necessary training to enter academia. The expectation by administrators in academia is that new faculty have received the proper training to begin their professional career. However, that assumption may not be correct when discussing faculty preparation.

Additionally, the academic community has argued that doctoral students employed as teaching assistants (TA) are being prepared to teach classes, mentor students and lead academic discussion (Weidman & Stein, 2003). Furthermore, the attainment of a teaching assistantship is

often viewed as a rite of passage (Nyquist, Abbott, & Wulff, 1989). By identifying aspiring faculty early, graduate program faculty indicate that the chosen TA is worthy to be trained for a future in academia (Sprague & Nyquist, 1989). Even though the practice of awarding teaching assistantships to individuals expressing a desire to be faculty appears to be a perfect way to prepare future faculty, research indicates that TAs are overworked, overstressed, overwhelmed and undermotivated (Tice, Gaff, & Pruitt-Logan, 1998; Weimer, Svinicki, & Bauer, 1989). Likewise, new faculty experience the same feelings of tension and stress upon entry into the academy (Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). Perhaps, the same stress that TAs are experiencing carries over into their entry into the academy as faculty members (Gaff, 2002). If new faculty are experiencing job related stress, then how much of it can be attributed to their preparation for life as a faculty member? Shouldn't new faculty have anticipated the stress associated with life as an academician? Is the graduate program an ideal setting for future faculty to be trained? Are those who work as a TA while in graduate school really prepared to enter the academy as a professor?

Even as doctoral programs are preparing their students to create new knowledge and develop research, the exposure they receive to the other responsibilities of the professoriate are limited (Fink, 1992). New faculty entering the academy are expected to teach, advise and mentor undergraduate students (Austin, 2002b). However, research identifies that TAs may not be trained for the TA role or their role of future faculty (Lafer, 2003; Lumsden, Grosslight, Loveland, & Williams, 1988). It is from the perspective of former TA training that this study attempted to identify the relationship between faculty preparation and TA employment. New faculty entering the academy are expected to hit the ground running and are typically required to be productive in their research and publication (Whitt, 1991). However, the training received in

doctoral programs and through teaching assistantships may not be enough to prepare future faculty for their expected roles within the academy.

Statement of the Problem

Retirement of WWII era faculty, lack of emphasis on faculty careers by higher education and the influence of online education have left a large void to fill when colleges and universities wish to attract and hire qualified, prepared faculty members (Austin, 2002b). However, at the same time, the higher education community has experienced substantial budget cuts forcing many colleges and universities to decrease salary offers and delay tenure requests in order to budget for the future (Perry, Menec, Struthers, Hecther, Schonwetter, & Menges, 1997). Subsequently, the recruitment of doctoral students to the faculty work role as a viable career option is becoming more and more difficult (Lovitts & Nelson, 2000). For example, Smallwood (2004a) found that 40-50% of students in graduate programs dropout partly because of the uncertainty of the academic job market upon graduation. Consequently, there is a smaller pool of potential applicants to add to the faculty ranks. These discouraging events come at a time when colleges and universities are being asked to do more with less.

Institutions are expected to add to local and state economic development and complete research projects that do more than just advance research but also affect the constituents to the college or university (Austin, 2002a). Faculty members are expected to garner grant monies to support financial shortfalls while at the same time provide the service and teaching inherent in their normal work role (Perry et al., 1997; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The delicate balance of providing teaching support for undergraduate students and managing research projects for the greater good of the institution means that new faculty to the profession will be required to be better prepared to accomplish more goals in a shorter amount of time (Austin, 1992; Boice,

2000). Yet the ability for new faculty to accomplish these tasks immediately upon entering academia may be more of a question of training and preparation in graduate school and not just an issue for the institution hiring the individual (LaPidus, 1997b).

The faculty of tomorrow are expected to enter the academy with a greater understanding of the academic work culture in order to succeed in their chosen occupation as quickly as possible (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Not only are new faculty expected to provide the broad-ranging activities involved in teaching and service, they are also asked to perform research related activities earlier in their academic careers in order to fulfill the goals of the academic department or the institution (Austin, 2002b). The expectation by many is that new faculty entering academia learned what was expected of them while they were in graduate school (Austin, 2002a). Furthermore, the expectation is even higher among those that served as teaching assistants (TAs) during their doctoral training (Julius & Gumpert, 2002). Yet some TAs are not receiving the training necessary to be effective in their role as a teaching assistant (Nyquist et al., 1989).

Doctoral students who are able to obtain a TA position provide much of the undergraduate teaching and mentoring at many colleges and universities (Nyquist et al., 1989). At a time when a greater emphasis is placed on undergraduate education, higher education is relying on TAs to provide the support necessary to accomplish some of the institutions' goals, mainly teaching undergraduates. Higher education experts support the idea of the TA experience as a valuable learning tool and substantial preparation for a career in the professoriate (Julius & Gumpert, 2002). Yet, TAs report that they are "fed to the wolves" as they are expected to teach and advise undergraduate students with little or no training on how to do so (Smallwood, 2004a). Consequently, TAs report feelings of stress and anxiety in understanding their work role as they

attempt to not only learn how to do their job, complete their doctoral research, but also provide an enriching undergraduate experience in place of full-time faculty (Sprague & Nyquist, 1989). TAs are aware that they are being used as “fillers” to compensate for the lack of available resources to hire more full-time faculty and by filling that role, many TAs report some of the same stress and anxiety over their work role as new faculty (Gaff & Pruitt-Logan, 1998; Smallwood, 2004b). Some may ask whether or not under-prepared, stressed TAs will result in under-prepared, stressed new faculty?

Ultimately, new faculty joining the academy are expected to transition instantly from their role as a doctoral student to a confident, prepared faculty member almost instantaneously. They are also expected to take on the role of researcher, mentor and teacher so as to support the goals and mission of the institution. Yet the reality of the responsibilities of a new faculty position are causing more stress among those new to academia (Austin, 1992, 2002a, 2002b; Fink, 1992; Freudenthal & DiGiorgio, 1989; Gaff, 2002; Sorcinelli, 1988; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) found in their research that there was a strong link between new faculty stresses and attrition from academia with 71% of new faculty indicating their job was very stressful. Gates (2000) attributed the increase in stress felt by new faculty to the reaction to some issues that they were not prepared to handle while completing doctoral studies while in graduate school. Although there are many studies that suggest a need for better preparation of the faculty role by graduate schools (see e.g. Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Golde & Dore, 2001; Olsen, 1993; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001), there are very few studies that examine a relationship between the TA experience and the experience of new faculty in academia. It is within the realm of preparation for faculty roles that the problem facing higher education rests in the experiences of teaching assistants who aspire to a career in

academia. In order for colleges and universities to fulfill the social, educational and research related goals inherent in their individual mission statements, the development and training of future faculty is crucial to that end. Without a well-prepared corps of new faculty entering the academic arena, colleges and universities will have additional problems living up to their mission and fulfilling the needs of the community. Hence, this study examined the relationship between the TA experience and the experience of new faculty.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between teaching assistantship training while in graduate school and the perceived preparation of new faculty entering the academy. This study also took into account the types of tasks participants completed while serving as a TA while in graduate school and how those tasks related to preparation for faculty life.

Research Questions

The primary research question for this study was: How do new faculty perceive their TA experience as a device to prepare them for a career as a faculty member? The secondary research questions were:

1. How does the TA experience influence the attitudes and opinions new faculty have regarding their new role as a faculty member?
2. What development of future faculty takes place while graduate students are in TA roles?

3. Does the TA experience provide an adequate training mechanism for new faculty entering the academy?
4. What opinions and attitudes do new faculty have towards their socialization and integration to the academy?

Significance of the Study

This study focused on the TA work role that many doctoral students perform while in graduate school. TAs are exposed to some of the more intricate aspects of the faculty role while working along side faculty and acting in place of faculty in academic situations (Nyquist et al., 1989). It is during the TA experience that future faculty get a preview of life of faculty. Many studies identify what programs and methods institutions can employ to assist in the transition of new faculty once they are hired including orientation programs, seminars and additional training (Austin, 1992; Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Bogler & Kremer-Hayon, 1999; Boice, 1991, 1992a, 1992b; Boyle & Boice, 1998; Fink, 1992; Freudenthal & DiGiorgio, 1989). Graduate students performing as TAs are considered to be good candidates for faculty positions because they have had experience in the academic work role (Tice et al., 1998). Yet there are not many studies that attempt to link the TA work experience with the preparation for the faculty role. Hence, this study will contribute to the literature. Additionally, findings of this study may lead to strategies and programs that can be developed for graduate school administrators and doctoral program coordinators to better prepare future members of the professoriate.

Besides the institutional benefit, external constituents such as parents of undergraduate students and legislators could find the results useful. External constituents may see the commitment that institutions are making to better prepare future faculty and provide better instruction in the process. This study could serve as a resource for graduate students who are

considering a career as a faculty member by identifying the necessary training they will need once they enter the profession. For some doctoral students, the development of this training may be self-implemented. For others this training may exist on their campuses and the results of this study may encourage them to seek out those resources to aid in their transition to a faculty role.

Overview of Methodology

Two universities served as the sites for this study. The faculty members selected had the following attributes: a) employed as a teaching assistant during their time in graduate school, b) completed a PhD program no more than four years prior to the beginning of their career as a professor, c) employed at a higher education institution in a tenure-track position and, d) a responsibility for teaching at least one undergraduate course per semester since their hiring.

In order to gather the participants' perceptions and experiences of their doctoral education and TA employment as it relates to faculty role preparation, this study used qualitative data collection. Qualitative data collection allowed the participants to be more introspective and reflective (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This data collection method also allowed participants to express their experiences and perceptions while in graduate school in their own words (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Interviews were audio taped and transcribed as indicated by techniques outlined by Miles and Huberman (1994). Follow-up "fact-checking" phone calls were made to clarify any unclear items discovered in transcription. Field notes were taken to provide additional context once data analysis began (Glesne, 1999).

Definition of Terms

The terms listed below were used throughout this study to make a correlation to the data being collected:

Academy is defined as the common term used to describe any institution of higher learning. This term is used most frequently when referring to the career or profession of being a faculty member.

Anticipatory socialization is the way an individual perceives the norms, values and ways of doing prior to entering the organization (Van Maanen, 1984).

Doctoral candidate/student is defined as a student enrolled in an accredited, PhD granting program at an institution of higher education.

Graduate student is defined as any individual who is enrolled in a program beyond a bachelor's degree and has not obtained a terminal degree

New (faculty), Junior (faculty), Tenure-Track (faculty) synonymous terms that describe any faculty member who has not gained a level of tenure at a college or university.

Socialization is defined as the way that an individual entering a new setting acquires the skills, beliefs, ways of acting and personal identity necessary to join that organization (Van Maanen, 1984).

Tenure is defined as both the process of and identification of a faculty member who has received a guaranteed contract for continuous employment with a college or university (American Association of University Professors, 1974).

Teaching Assistant (TA) is defined as a doctoral student who works at least 20 hours per week assisting a senior faculty in his/her department. This includes Research Assistants (RA)

who have teaching responsibilities. The individual will also participate in undergraduate education

Terminal degree is defined as a Doctor of Philosophy or PhD.

Vocational Tasks is defined as any jobs or responsibilities of a faculty member relative to their day-to-day work role. Included but not limited to: advising students, teaching and lecturing classes, grading papers, mentoring students, and performing university service.

Organization of the Study

This chapter provided the overview, purpose and significance of the study. Chapter two will present a review of literature related to doctoral student preparation, education, and experiences. In addition, chapter two will explore literature related to teaching, research and graduate assistant training and development in doctoral programs. Chapter three will present an in-depth view of the methodological aspects of this study including site selection, participant selection and data analysis procedures.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The primary intent of this study was to examine the perceptions of new faculty in relationship to their preparation for a career in academia. Specifically, this study explored the experiences of new faculty who served as teaching assistants while completing their doctoral training. Additionally, this study attempted to identify the training and preparation necessary for doctoral students who aspired to enter the academic community as faculty members and what can be done to assist in that process.

Throughout this chapter, the term socialization will be used to identify the process new faculty experience when entering their new academic setting. The use of socialization will also be used to identify the process by which doctoral students understand the ways of acting, thinking, and feeling when entering graduate school and beyond (Van Maanen, 1984). To understand socialization, this chapter will examine selected research on socialization, particularly research related to organizational socialization and the academic environment. Additionally, this chapter will present literature related to the experiences of doctoral students in graduate school, the training of teaching assistants, and the experiences of new faculty entering the academy. The final section of this chapter will delineate the conceptual framework used to guide this research and discusses how it will translate to data collection methods explained in chapter three.

Organizational Socialization

Van Maanen (1984) proposed that organizational socialization was not a “fancy term” but rather a “theory” that influences much of the research related to understanding how individuals perform in new social settings. It is through the theory of organizational socialization that an individual entering a new setting acquires the skills, beliefs, ways of acting and personal identity necessary to join that organization (Van Maanen, 1984). Feldman (1976) identified organizational socialization as a process whereby the individual “learns the culture and values of the new job setting” (p. 1-2). It is also during the process of socialization that individuals adjust to the work environment and develop their own set of work skills necessary for effective entry into the organization (Feldman, 1976). It is through the adjustment to the work environment that stages related to socialization are relevant to the adjustment of doctoral students to academia and likewise the adjustment of new faculty to the academic work role.

Many theories of organizational socialization attempt to identify the relationship between individuals and their entry into the new organization (Feldman, 1976; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Van Maanen, 1984). Though most research in organizational socialization produced slightly different results, the fundamental stages related to the process are similar. Merton (1957), Feldman (1976; 1981) Tierney and Bensimon (1996) and Van Maanen (1984) presented stages of organizational socialization that newcomers experience when entering a new work role: anticipatory socialization, accommodation (or assimilation) and role management (or role continuance). During the anticipatory socialization stage the individual “imagines” how to perform in the given work role; during the accommodation (assimilation) stage the individual begins to make rational decisions based on how well they “fit” with the organization; and during the role management/continuance stage, the individual decides if the work role they have chosen

was a good career decision (Feldman, 1976; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Van Maanen, 1984). The process by which graduate students imagine their life as a faculty member begins as they are socialized into the graduate school environment (Weidman & Stein, 2003). More directly, the anticipatory socialization stage acts as the agent by which doctoral students making the transition to the faculty role develop their thought and perceptions regarding faculty life. During anticipatory socialization the individual imagines how life will be once they are a faculty member (Bess, 1978).

Anticipatory Socialization

Anticipatory socialization is best explained as the way an individual perceives the norms, values and ways of doing prior to entering the organization (Van Maanen, 1984). Van Maanen (1976) proposed that anticipatory socialization can act as an agent of functional or dysfunctional socialization if the individual is not willing to accept the new norms and values of the organization. In relationship to new faculty socialization, the norms and values of the organization may conflict with the expectations of the individual (Bess, 1978). For example, new faculty members may feel uncomfortable in their new academic setting because it is not how they perceived the academic setting would be while in graduate school.

Tierney and Bensimon (1996) suggested that anticipatory socialization takes place prior to the individual arriving on campus as a professional faculty member. The graduate school experience acts as an agent of anticipatory socialization as the graduate student begins to understand the role of faculty. Doctoral students observe faculty and the activity of the academic department and subsequently form attitudes and opinions about life as a faculty member (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Also as the individual performs the role of a teaching assistant they have some insight into the work role of faculty and how to perform in that role (Weimer et al., 1989).

Anticipatory socialization can also be described as a process by which the individual prepares for a new role by conceptualizing how to think, act, feel and perform while in that role (Merton, 1957). It is during anticipatory socialization that doctoral students conceptualize the faculty role and visualize “what it would be like” to be a faculty member and perform the necessary tasks (Bess, 1978; Tierney, 1997; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman et al., 2001).

Graduate Students in Academia

Students entering graduate school for doctoral training are attempting to build many different relationships with students, professors and others within the institution in order to understand the academic environment (Weidman et al., 2001). They are also attempting to “fit in” to their new environment based on the disciplinary norms of their chosen field of study (Weidman et al., 2001). A humanities doctoral student studying 18th century literature will have a graduate school experience quite different from a doctoral student in the sciences who may focus more on research and lab work (Weidman et al., 2001). Consequently, doctoral students “must learn to not only cope with the academic demands but also to recognize values, attitudes, and subtle nuances reflected by faculty and peers in their academic programs (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 2). The doctoral student entering the academic community is required to view their environment as more than just school but rather a thriving community that comprises distinct attitudes, personalities, history, goals and purposes (Hartnett & Katz, 1977). It is the history of both the academic department and the development of graduate education that have influenced the process by which graduate students then become faculty members.

American graduate education has followed a process developed by German colleges and universities that has persisted from the early ages to today (LaPidus, 1997b). The apprentice-faculty or in modern times doctoral student would not only focus on their subject matter but also

develop skills necessary to be an adequate professor. Not much has changed since the German graduate education model became prevalent in the United States, yet the relationship doctoral students have had with their academic programs has evolved over time (LaPidus, 1997b).

Understanding the Role of Graduate Education

Not only are doctoral students attempting to navigate the relationships, ways of doing and acceptable behavior within the academic setting, they are also trying to develop a professional identity among senior faculty and other academicians and peers (Weidman et al., 2001). The generally accepted view of graduate education is that it prepares the individual for a career in higher education, usually as a faculty member (Hartnett & Katz, 1977). Yet the current debate in graduate education is whether or not the purpose of doctoral preparation is to prepare future teachers or future researchers? If one chooses to enter academia as a professor, in most cases, they are required to have completed a PhD in their chosen subject matter. For the purpose of many colleges and universities, the completion of the doctoral degree and the socialization process in graduate school provides the necessary training for a career as a professor.

For example, the typical doctoral experience for a graduate student includes a three to five year course of study with emphasis on primary research in the students' subject area. During this time, it is understood that the student will also investigate and observe the role of faculty. Likewise, the graduate school experience allows the individual to acquire new information about the academic organization through communication in and out of the classroom and develop research skills in the process. The socialization of doctoral students to the academic setting is not only important to their success as a student but also if they have aspirations to become a faculty member. It is not surprising that researchers investigating graduate school

education identify the development of future faculty as a primary contributor to the vitality of the faculty supply in higher education (Austin, 2002b; Gaff, 2002).

Bess (1978) considered that socialization to the academic workplace began during an individuals' undergraduate years as they viewed the role of the professor through different eyes. The individual may view the professor and the academic workplace as a juxtaposition of what is considered "normal" work conditions based on limited information an undergraduate student has regarding the role of faculty at a college or university (Bess, 1978). However, the most realistic forms of graduate school socialization occur once the individual has entered the academic setting.

Golde and Dore (2001) considered four primary questions that graduate students must consider when entering the graduate school setting: "Can I do this?" referring to the intellectual requirements of graduate school; "Do I want to be a graduate student?" referring to the commitment of studying, test taking, writing, etc.; "Do I want to do this work?" referring to the development of attitudes towards the academic workplace as a possible career; and "Do I belong here?" referring to the individual questioning their worth in the academic department. The socialization process of graduate students is a "give-and-take" process whereby the individual is affected by the socialization of the organization and the individual affects the organization through participation and involvement (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) discussed the "six polar dimensions of organizational socialization" (Van Maanen, 1984) to the development of graduate students while in the academic setting: collective versus individual, formal versus informal, random versus sequential, fixed versus variable pace, serial versus disjunctive, and investiture versus divestiture. Each of the dimensions can be related to the socialization of graduate students by way of tactics or approaches to development. Though

described as polar opposites, it is prudent to discuss each of the dimensions as part of a continuum that the graduate student moves from one end to the other.

Collective versus individual socialization. Collective socialization refers to a set of common experiences encountered by all graduate students entering an organization (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Graduate students may experience collective socialization if there are departmental initiatives for orientation or mentoring. Whereas, individual socialization refers to a process that may be more personal and isolated (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001).

Formal versus informal socialization. Formal socialization refers to how individuals learn to accomplish a certain set of shared goals such as in the case of graduate students completing a qualifying examination or certain series of courses (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001). The informal socialization process refers to the unstructured methods used by graduate students to help interpret the formal socialization processes (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001).

Random versus sequential socialization. Random socialization refers to the ambiguous steps the graduate student must take to be socialized into the organization, such as when they are ready to propose the dissertation (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001). Whereas, sequential socialization refers to the ordered, sequence of events that aid in socialization (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001).

Fixed pace versus variable pace socialization. Fixed pace refers to the timeline a graduate student is required to follow to reach a level of completion in the graduate program and the socialization process (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001). Variable pace refers to the undefined, set of factors that contribute to the graduate student's completion (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001). Weidman et al. (2001) use the example of medical, law and dental

schools as fixed pace socialization processes and most other graduate and professional programs that move at a pace as defined by the student and the major professor.

Serial versus disjunctive socialization. Serial socialization refers to the process by which the graduate student is mentored or tutored by individuals already in the organization such as second or third year students (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001). Disjunctive socialization refers to the lack of role-models who can take the new graduate student under their wing and assist in the socialization process (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001).

Investiture versus divestiture socialization. Graduate students experiencing investiture are allowed to “hold on” to their beliefs and anticipations of the graduate school experience (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001). Interlopers such as faculty, major professors, and other students recognize the preconceptions of graduate school and assist the individual in creating a more realistic view of the academy using those preconceptions as a base for discovery (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001). Divestiture requires much less acceptance of the preconceived norms of the graduate school experience. Whereby the individual is influenced to denounce the preconceived notions of the graduate school experience and accept new beliefs that challenge the beliefs already internalized. Those close to the newcomer will attempt to remove any personal characteristics incompatible with the organization (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al., 2001).

Each of the six sets of socialization processes frames the variables related to the graduate school experience as each graduate student learns how to perform in the academic setting. The combination of all of the dimensions of socialization translate to how the individual accepts the new setting and the experiences derived from inclusion in graduate school. Though related to entry, the new graduate student must investigate their place in the organization in order to glean the necessary attributes that are important to existing organization members (Tierney, 1997;

Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman et al., 2001). The newcomer or novice to the academic setting must make sense of their new role and begin to conform to the “normal behavior” as exhibited by those around them (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). In attempting to conform to the external surroundings, the graduate student is forced to make a decision as to which aspects of the socialization process assist the individual in making sense of the new surroundings. Failure to understand the aspects of socialization result in a negative experience while in graduate school which may contribute to negative experiences when pursuing a faculty career (Tierney, 1997; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Experiences of Doctoral Students in Graduate School

Doctoral training for most graduate schools has not changed since its roots in Germany hundreds of years ago (Hartnett & Katz, 1977; LaPibus, 1997b). This includes being involved in activities that are intended to enrich the student through qualitative and quantitative inquiry, exploring and testing theories and possibly performing some research related to their field of study (Applegate, 2002; LaPibus, 1997b). One can assume that the graduate school experience for doctoral students is also a time when the individual is exposed to the faculty role, yet research only indicates uncertainty and doubts among doctoral students who aspire to become faculty members (Applegate, 2002; Austin, 1992, 2002a; Nyquist, Manning, Wulff, Austin, Sprague, Fraser, Calcagno, & Woodford, 1999).

Two major studies identified the experiences of current and past doctoral students and gleaned information that is similar to the previous findings regarding doctoral students. In 1999, Golde and Dore surveyed over 4,000 doctoral students to comment on their feelings of preparation for a career in academia (Golde & Dore, 2001). The 1999 Nerad and Cerny study commissioned by The National Association of Graduate and Professional Students (NAGPS)

focused on student learning environments, advisor/advisee relationships and doctoral student learning outcomes. The Nerad/Cerny study took a retrospective approach at studying PhD's ten to fourteen years after they received their degrees by examining how faculty felt regarding their preparation for their career and how their own doctoral experience assisted them during job search and career development processes (Nerad, 2003).

Results from these two surveys presented findings regarding the doctoral education process that were consistent across all of the studies: 1) doctoral students are trained with too narrow a focus; 2) doctoral students are not trained to perform other tasks such as working in groups, managing resources (people and fiscal), implementing organizational plans and operating within institutional processes; and 3) doctoral students are not prepared to teach or manage the classroom environment which includes writing a syllabus, grading papers, performing academic administrative tasks, and mentoring undergraduate students (Golde & Dore, 2001; Nerad, 2003). Nerad (2003) contends that the third issue regarding classroom management and working with undergraduate students is the most compelling because of the overwhelming impact that those skills have on the stability of the undergraduate academic process.

Many doctoral students question their intent to become a faculty member based on their personal observations of life as a faculty member (Bess, 1978). Current faculty become the source of positive and negative reinforcement of the future faculty role (Austin, 2002a; Nyquist et al., 1999). As mentors and advisors, current faculty provide positive support to doctoral students wishing to take on the faculty role (Hartnett & Katz, 1977). Yet current faculty also provide a source of negative "support" as their interaction with doctoral students may reveal the undesirable aspects of faculty life (Hartnett & Katz, 1977). Austin (2002b) asserts that "...faculty members apparently are not taking up the responsibility of helping doctoral students

frame an understanding of what it means to be a professor...” (p.129). She identified four themes that deal particularly with the disconnect that many graduate students feel when transitioning to a full-time faculty position: disorganized graduate preparation for career development, lack of feedback to aspiring faculty or new faculty regarding expectations, limited understanding of faculty career options and institutional types, and lack of understanding of quality of life for those pursuing this career (Austin, 2002b). Often graduate students conflicted by attitudes of their advisors have chosen instead to rely on the equally confused opinions and knowledge of well-intentioned classmates (Austin, 2002b; Gaff, 2002). Nyquist et al. (1999) identified three emergent themes in their study of doctoral student experiences in graduate school: difficulty in adapting to values, receiving mixed messages and requests for support.

Difficulty in adopting to values. Doctoral students view the academic setting as one of ever-changing values and role definitions (Nyquist et al., 1999). The problems experienced by many graduate students results from the internal struggle of the students’ value structures juxtaposing the values and expectations of their graduate program. Hartnett and Katz (1977) argued that most graduate students lack the fundamental guidance needed to make sense of the values and norms of the academic environment. Doctoral students spend great deals of time trying to demystify the values of graduate education in order to find a purposeful fit with their own values and goals (Nyquist et al., 1999). The time spent by doctoral students identifying the values espoused by their academic department may contribute to the uncertainty the individual has regarding their future in the profession (Nyquist et al., 1999).

Receiving mixed messages. The interaction that doctoral students have with their faculty advisors is an important point to consider as the current faculty spend the greatest amount of time with the student (Weidman et al., 2001). Nyquist et al. (1999) observed in their study of doctoral

candidates that students began their program with very humanitarian goals and high hopes of in-depth study of their chosen discipline. Those same students, they found, were doing just enough to get out and get out quickly (Nyquist et al., 1999). Nyquist et al. (1999) attributed the “hurry up and finish” attitude to the experiences of doctoral students who, after seeing what faculty life was really like, started to form negative opinions regarding their program and the thought of being a professor. Austin (2002) found that many graduate students said they wanted to do “meaningful work” and work that “enriches the lives of students” yet those same students became disillusioned with the academy. What was the primary reason for this change in attitude?

Perhaps, it can be attributed to the mixed messages that graduate students received from senior faculty (Austin, 2002b). The same graduate students that had “lofty” humanitarian goals were hearing the exact opposite from senior faculty and dissertation advisors who devalued those aspirations (Austin, 2002b; Nyquist et al., 1999). At the same time graduate students identify that service and teaching rank high on their list of responsibilities once they receive a faculty position (Golde & Dore, 2001). Yet at the same time, students receive conflicting comments voiced by faculty members who downplay the importance of those activities (Nyquist et al., 1999). In essence, graduate students in an attempt to develop a commitment to service are bombarded with words indicating just the opposite (Golde & Dore, 2001; Nyquist et al., 1999).

Requests for support. Given the amount of research and study surrounding the training and preparation of new faculty for teaching (e.g. Boice, 1991; Boice, 1992b; Boyer, 1990), the Nyquist et al. (1999) study found that doctoral students wanted more assistance in preparing for the role of a faculty member and were not able to receive that training. Yet for many TAs the opportunity to discuss teaching with faculty, being observed in their classrooms and receiving critical feedback was not available in most of the graduate programs participating in the Nyquist

et al. (1999) study. Overwhelmingly, graduate students were asking for support in all aspects of their academic experience from preparing research projects to preparing for the faculty role, yet the reality as perceived by many graduate students involved in the study was “figure it out on your own” (Nyquist et al., 1999). Banner and Cannon (cited in Nyquist et al., 1999) discussed the lack of intellectual engagement when referring to teaching preparation even though doctoral students were clearly begging for support.

Austin (2002) agreed with the Nyquist study and found that the pleas for support tied strongly to a lack of interaction between the student and faculty advisor. Additionally, doctoral students were only being exposed to the negative aspects of the faculty role and often too early in their graduate school career (Austin, 2002a). In exploring the total experiences of doctoral students in graduate school, it is appropriate to frame the discussion in the results of the data obtained from the aforementioned studies. Within the development of graduate student socialization, the intended purpose is to create an atmosphere that attributes to positive results, yet in many cases the research says otherwise (Austin, 1992, 2002b; Golde & Dore, 2001; Nerad, 2003; Nyquist et al., 1999).

For many doctoral students the decision to remain in graduate school is attributed to the interaction they have with their major professors or faculty advisors (Nyquist et al., 1999). Specifically, the major professor or faculty advisors become a strong influence in the anticipatory socialization process (Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Bargar & Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983). It is through the graduate student/faculty advisor relationship that doctoral students can gain the greatest insight of what contributes to the faculty role. However, the interaction that usually exists between graduate students and their major professors does not always serve as an agent of anticipatory socialization (Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Bargar & Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983).

Austin (2002) presented in her address to the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) that graduate students “seldom engage with their faculty members in extensive conversations about what it means to be a faculty member, how higher education is changing, and what range of skills and abilities they should develop” (p.129). Austin’s remarks came from the compilation of studies she and others conducted regarding the doctoral education process and noted the changes that need to occur. The outcome of the studies showed two overwhelming factors in the development of doctoral students who may choose to pursue a career in academia – too much emphasis on the negative aspects of the faculty role and, a lack of training for a future faculty position (Austin, 2002b; Golde & Dore, 2001).

Negative aspects of the faculty role. Austin (2002b) found in her research that doctoral students were exposed to the negative aspects of faculty life unintentionally by major professors or other departmental faculty. These aspects include uncertainty over departmental goals (e.g. teaching versus research), lack of adequate family time, rejection of personal research projects by colleagues and, amount of time dedicated to prepare for classes and advising students (Austin, 2002b). Although the overwhelming impact of these negative aspects are all within the work role of faculty, Austin points out that if the negative aspects are not placed in proper context, doctoral students form incorrect opinions about the faculty role.

Lack of training. It seems that doctoral students are just as confused in deciding on what they will do once they become a faculty member due in large part to the lack of preparation they receive to introduce them to their future work roles and responsibilities (Golde & Dore, 2001). Golde and Dore (2001) identified in their study that the “training doctoral students receive is not what they want nor does it prepare them for the jobs they take” (p.7). Additionally, graduate students are very naive and in some cases “just plain ignorant” when it comes to specific career

related variables related to the profession (Golde & Dore, 2001). Nearly half (47.9%) of the respondents were “definitely” going into the academy, even though only 20% of them were “very clear” as to the customary practices of faculty member roles and responsibilities (Golde & Dore, 2001). Golde and Dore (2001) concluded that many graduate students did not understand the unique relationship between graduate school and preparation for a career as a faculty member.

The graduate school experience for future doctoral students will likely include many of the themes presented. Many doctoral students contend with loneliness, uncertainty, severe anxiety and role confusion due to the experiences during their graduate school enrollment (Austin, 2002b; Hartnett & Katz, 1977). Additionally, there is research related to the graduate school experiences of minority and women graduate students that indicate even more evidence of dissatisfaction with graduate education (Maher, Ford, & Thompson, 2004; Menges & Exum, 1983; Pruitt & Isaac, 1985; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The barriers for minority and women graduate students are evidenced in their doctoral completion rates. Of the 39,955 doctoral degrees awarded in the year 2000, women received 45 percent and minorities received 19 percent (Hamilton, 2004). Interestingly enough, the year 2000 represents the highest percentage of PhD’s received by both minorities and women. One can conclude that the experiences of women and minority graduate students contain unique features worth further exploration.

Experiences of Women Graduate Students

Women in graduate school face many pressures that are similar to their male counterparts including lack of financial support, relationship building with a faculty advisor or major professor, learning to conduct research and marital or family issues (Maher et al., 2004). However, for women doctoral students, some pressures in their graduate school experience are

directly related to their gender (Menges & Exum, 1983). Tierney and Bensimon (1996) agree that the socialization experiences for men and women are consistently diametric to one another because of the factors related to the history of higher education.

Higher education has historically been an arena for men in faculty positions (Menges & Exum, 1983). Though women have served as instructors in lower-level positions at colleges and universities, primarily tenure-track positions were reserved for males who chose the faculty role (Menges & Exum, 1983). In the sciences, women faculty were considered an oddity and to a certain degree they still show lower overall numbers to white males and males in general (Hamilton, 2004). The imbalance in science and engineering faculty is perpetuated through graduate school enrollment. Perhaps, there is a disparity between the number of men and women in graduate school for sciences and engineering due to the small numbers of women faculty who are available to advocate and encourage undergraduate women to enter the academy (Menges & Exum, 1983).

Maher et al. (2004) found in their research several themes that emerged related to the development of women graduate students: women graduate students have difficulty forming relationships with their faculty advisors, reliable funding sources for women graduate students was more of an overwhelming issue, responsibilities to family and home life becomes more detrimental to completion, research experience is limited and learning to negotiate the educational system is key to completing doctoral training. Even though the aforementioned themes could be compatible with male graduate students, it is women graduate students that are most effected by these factors related to their doctoral education (Maher et al., 2004). Accordingly, the development of women graduate students who choose the faculty role are more affected than their male counterparts (Menges & Exum, 1983).

Experiences of Minority Graduate Students

Pruitt and Isaac (1985) stated that “As is the case in internal labor markets, university departments tend to establish rather stable recruitment channels, most prominent among which are the ‘old boy network’ and alumni who refer relatives and friends” (pp. 528-529). These statements were written to best illuminate the recruitment, admission and retention of minority students to graduate degree programs (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). In 2001, minority students in graduate programs represented only 24 percent of the 971,635 graduate students enrolled in the United States (CGS, 2004). The individual breakdown of minority enrollment shows: African Americans represented 10 percent (98,307), Hispanic/Latino represented 7 percent (69,066), Asians represented 6 percent (56,513) and, American Indians represented 1 percent (6,514) of the total enrollment in graduate schools in 2001 (CGS, 2004). These numbers represent a growth in enrollment for minority students even with the highest percentage of one ethnic group at 10 percent – African Americans.

The school environment for minority graduate students is just as if not more stressful than that of their white counterparts (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). The experiences of minority graduate students are a result of larger problems inherent in many graduate programs. The low enrollment of minority graduate students are in-line with the even lower number of minority faculty which may cause difficulty in advisor/advisee relationships (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). Minorities in graduate school who choose to focus on minority related issues face resistance and rejection from non-minority faculty members who have no interest or frame of reference to the subject matter (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). Furthermore, the social network for minority graduate students is small. In some specialized fields such as the sciences and literature, one or two minority students is common and accepted by graduate programs (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985).

The socialization of minority graduate students is based on many factors including the students' undergraduate institution climate, the current campus climate, program reputations and cost of attendance (Weidman et al., 2001). Minority students wishing to partake in the full socialization experience of graduate school must be willing to recognize the factors related to the academic hierarchy which in some settings dictates the type of experience the student will have. Some graduate programs still serve as filters and practice homosocial reproduction – allowing only those who resemble the faculty entry into the academic profession (Weidman et al., 2001). Although difficult to conceptualize, the numbers of minority graduate students support the assumption that minority involvement in graduate school is partially related to the numbers of minority faculty in higher education (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985).

Even though doctoral students continue to persist towards completion and ultimately make the transition to the academy as a faculty member, the socialization process for them is not easy. Besides learning the values, norms and ways of doing within the academic department, the doctoral student must also adjust to the role of scholar without much faculty support or guidance (Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Bess, 1978). Furthermore, the doctoral student is also trying to understand how their graduate school experience will relate to their future role as faculty, yet there is very little information provided to assist in the transition.

The same can be said for teaching assistants who fulfill many roles in colleges and universities. Studying their socialization and developmental experiences is important as the teaching assistant or TA is often referred to as the “future faculty” (Chism, Cano, & Pruitt, 1989b). However, research indicates that in some cases, the training of TAs is less than adequate and moreover not directly beneficial to their role as both graduate student and teacher (Chism, Cano, & Pruitt, 1989a).

Experiences of TAs in Academia

TAs represent a valuable part of the academic enterprise as they are responsible for much of the undergraduate teaching at many colleges and universities (Rhoades & Rhoads, 2002). Working as a TA represents for many the beginning of their career as a faculty member (Mueller, Perlman, McCann, & McFadden, 1997). According to Mueller et al. (1997) “almost half of current faculty in all disciplines were TAs” (p.167). The TA has also been classified as simply as a temporary part-time employee and as complex as an important link in the education of undergraduates at colleges and universities (Gaff, 2002). Faculty shortages in higher education whether related to retirement, lack of opportunity or more prevalent – budget cuts (Gaff, 2002; Julius & Gumport, 2002) have forced colleges and universities to utilize TAs as the primary source of undergraduate teaching and advising (Gaff, 2002). In some cases, though, TAs enter the academic environment with little training or direction as to how they should complete their duties or what should be done to perform their role (Welford, 1996). A recent survey of TAs showed that they taught an average of five undergraduate classes per semester, prepared lectures and syllabi, graded exams, critiqued student papers and assigned letter grades (Lafer, 2001). Surprisingly, most TAs perform these tasks with very little financial support and no benefits (Julius & Gumport, 2002).

Lack of Financial Support or Benefits

The basic tenet of business in a free-enterprise system is to maximize profit by lowering costs. For most business enterprises, the most effective cost-cutting strategy is to find good labor that work cheaply (Rhoades & Rhoads, 2002). As it relates to colleges and universities, graduate students employed as teaching assistants represent the cheap labor (Rhoades & Rhoads, 2002). For example, in 1999 the average salary for a tenure track professor teaching at least 3 classes

per semester was between \$50,900 and \$71,000 per year (Lafer, 2001, 2003). However, the average salary for a graduate student employed as a teaching assistant responsible for four to five classes per semester was \$5,000 - \$20,000 per year (Lafer, 2001, 2003). The reliance on graduate students to teach undergraduate students comes at a time when colleges and universities are doing as much as possible to reduce institutional costs and respond to budget shortfalls caused from lack of private donors and grants (Julius & Gumport, 2002). Additionally, between 1975 and 1995 nationwide total faculty numbers decreased 10 percent as overall college enrollment began to show significant increases (Lafer, 2001, 2003). The increase in enrollment and decrease in faculty due to a number of reasons including the inability to pay faculty what they feel they deserve became a larger issue as colleges and universities had to find people to teach their undergraduate students (Julius & Gumport, 2002). Higher education needed individuals to teach undergraduates who were less expensive to employ than full-time faculty but also effective in the classroom (Julius & Gumport, 2002). This resulted in the reliance on graduate students (Johnson & McCarthy, 2000; Lafer, 2001, 2003; Oliner & Kaufman, 1975; Rhoades & Rhoads, 2002; Stygall, 2003).

Research and teaching assistants are now part of cost-lowering strategies in order to fill the gap where faculty are not being hired to do so (Lafer, 2001; Rhoades & Rhoads, 2002). TAs are being used in place of full-time faculty to perform many tasks including teaching, lecturing, class management, student educational development, paper and test grading. Even though these tasks have always been a part of the job duties of a TA, the level and amount of these tasks has increased as faculty salaries have decreased and faculty numbers within departments are woefully lower than what they need to be (Lafer, 2003). Yet as higher education relies on TAs for the primary teaching and service to the university, the question still remains whether or not

the experiences are actually training TAs for a continuing role in academia? More importantly, what skills are TAs learning as they perform such service for the university and if they do not have those skills are they learning them while on the job?

Training for Teaching?

“The teaching function is obvious in academic settings where most of one’s work involves facilitating students’ learning in the classroom and the laboratory” (Lumsden et al., 1988, p.5). In their research, Lumsden et al.(1988) surveyed 447 graduate psychology programs to identify the level of training placed on teaching by the graduate faculty particularly in relationship to developing teaching in TAs. Though not limited to just TAs, Lumsden et al. (1988) explored the relationship of all graduate students in psychology had with assisting in undergraduate education. Although an overwhelming number of study participants were identified as TAs, the typical graduate student in their study was a member of five levels of educational participation (Lumsden et al., 1988). The five levels were identified as:

- a. Level 1 – Assisting the instructor with routine matters. NOT conducting student discussion groups OR presenting lectures
- b. Level 2 – Conducting student discussion groups based on topics presented by the course instructor
- c. Level 3 – Periodically presenting lectures with faculty member present and setting the agenda for the class session
- d. Level 4 – Engaging in course responsibilities that were evenly divided between graduate student/TA and faculty member

- e. Level 5 – Teaching the entire course alone or in conjunction with other graduate students/TAs (Lumsden et al., 1988).

The results of the Lumsden et al. study (1988) found that over 70 percent of the doctoral programs surveyed disclosed that their graduate students were in Level 5 with the next highest being Level 3 at 25 percent. The colleges and universities that responded to the survey indicated that they expect graduate students and TAs to take on the heavier load of teaching undergraduate students regardless of their level of training to perform those tasks (Lumsden et al., 1988). Although Lumsden et al. (1988) also explored the use of doctoral students guiding research for master's level students, the number of institutions reporting the use of graduate students in the classroom far outnumbered the use in guiding research. The acceptance and use of graduate students/TAs in the classroom is much more prevalent than first imagined according to Lumsden et al. (1988). Likewise, the use of TAs in the classroom and in classroom related activities was prevalent in an additional study exploring the teaching responsibilities of TAs (Mueller et al., 1997).

Mueller et al. (1997) conducted a study of 108 psychology departments to investigate the responsibilities of TAs and their relationship with undergraduate education and teaching. The Mueller et al. (1997) study identified 10 areas that were most frequent among duties and responsibilities of TAs – 1) hold office hours, 2) grade exams 3) conduct discussion groups without the professor, 4) supervise labs without the professor, 5) prepare exams, 6) lead class discussions without the professor, 7) present lectures, 8) prepare lectures, 9) take responsibility for entire class discussion, and 10) advise or counsel students without the professor present. Over half of the respondents to the Mueller et al. (1997) study reported that TAs prepare their own lectures, write their own course syllabi and even teach a course with limited faculty supervision.

Yet those that responded to the survey also identified that teaching assistants received the least amount of time in training on how to prepare lectures, write their own course syllabi and teach a course (Mueller et al., 1997). Essentially, TAs were performing tasks that they were receiving little or no training to do (Mueller et al., 1997). The proper training of TAs becomes of primary concern as their level of preparation is important to the development of the undergraduate students they are teaching.

Importance of TA Training in Academia

Some researchers estimate that more than 500,000 new faculty will be needed by 2014 to fill the gaps in the professoriate (Nyquist et al., 1989). In order to fill those gaps, higher education will rely on not only the development of teaching assistants as future faculty, but also TAs will serve in the critical role of providing additional support in undergraduate teaching and mentoring (Nyquist et al., 1989). Likewise, large research institutions are relying on full-time faculty to teach graduate courses and provide support in research which by and large provides major funding for institutions (Shannon, Twale, & Moore, 1998). Yet the reliance of full-time faculty for graduate education has placed a larger burden on TAs to provide most of the teaching for undergraduates (Shannon et al., 1998). It is here that the development of TAs not only for their current role in academia is important but also their future role as faculty.

There is no question that the development of TAs is paramount to the success of higher education as colleges and universities rely on the service that TAs provide, yet who will provide the training necessary for their development? In attempting to answer that question, the development of themes related to TA training is difficult to conceptualize. Nyquist et al. (1989) questioned the conceptualization of TA training by splitting the challenge into three distinct inter-related aspects – the dimensions of their training (and its inherent purpose), the

interrelatedness of the dimensions, and the challenge to work with them collectively in the support of TAs in academia (Nyquist et al., 1989). By exploring the aspects as explained by Nyquist et al. (1989) it may explain the rationality for proper TA training which could contribute to well-prepared faculty.

Dimensions of TA Training

One of the most important aspects of the TA dynamic in graduate education is the relationship that is created between the TA and their supervisor who may be their major professor or advisor (Nyquist et al., 1989; Shannon et al., 1998). The demands of the TA come from many sources including faculty, administrators, undergraduate students and institutional constituents (Nyquist et al., 1989). TAs do not work in isolation and are forced to make sense of many different influences while trying to be many things to many different people (Nyquist et al., 1989). Other aspects of this dimension include discipline based norms and practices, instructional goals for undergraduate students and institutional support for the development of TAs employed in teaching and research roles (Nyquist et al., 1989). The TA is required to be a mentor and a teacher while being a student, which may be a challenge for those that are not prepared to take on that responsibility. Consequently, the socialization process for that individual to higher education may not be a positive experience but rather a negative one once they complete their degree.

The dimensions related to TA training also must take into account the personal goals and aspirations of the TAs themselves. If the TA is employed only to cover expenses incurred in school, then could the teaching and mentoring responsibilities be less valued for a TA who may have no interest in academia? Whether related or not, TA training is personal and individual while maintaining a consistent level of knowledge accumulation (Mueller et al., 1997; Nyquist et

al., 1989; Shannon et al., 1998).

Interrelatedness of the Dimensions of TA Training

Nyquist et al. (1989) focused “not only on the dimensions of the TA experience but also on their interrelatedness” (p.11). It may be adequate to provide training on how to conduct a scholarly lecture but a stronger training mechanism can be created if we craft the training that makes a closer tie between disciplinary differences in the instruction and the development of lecturing techniques (Nyquist et al., 1989). Whereas an English literature lecture may be effective with a few notes and some discussion of the assigned reading, a scientific lecture may be more effective by using more visual devices to enhance the lecture. By combining the training dimensions of TA preparation they may in turn have more enriched experiences in their preparation for faculty (Mueller et al., 1997; Nyquist et al., 1989).

Challenge of TA Training

The challenge in TA training and development is for what purpose should TAs be developed? Many institutions that do report TA training identify that there is a broad chasm between what the academic department wants and what the intuition wants (Shannon et al., 1998). Whereas the academic department prefers TA training to focus on teaching and classroom management, the institution believes policies and procedures of the university are more important in the development of TAs (Shannon et al., 1998). Accordingly, the ability to find some commonality between the two training regimens may provide for a better prepared TA (Nyquist et al., 1989; Shannon et al., 1998). Although Nyquist et al. (1989) warned that the development of comprehensive training programs, if not conceptualized properly, may lead to “mixed-messages” being sent to TAs, the end result of adequate training for TAs may result in

better socialization experiences for new faculty.

Newcomer Experiences and Socialization

The Model of Newcomer Experiences defined by Louis (1980) specifically identifies the newcomer entry period as the time when the individual makes sense of the changes he or she is experiencing in the organization. The three aspects of the newcomer experience include change, contrast and surprise (Louis, 1980). The change aspect refers to individuals making a transition from one setting such as a graduate student to a new setting such as a faculty member (Louis, 1980). The change aspect is important as the individual gains a professional identity, has discretion in scheduling work time, encourages peer interaction for work related project completion and seeks feedback on role performance – all experiences that the individual may not have anticipated prior to starting their new work role (Louis, 1980). Comparatively, the change aspect may be drastic for new faculty because it is during this time that the perceptions of faculty life formed through anticipatory socialization are validated against the actual experience (Bess, 1978; Louis, 1980).

Secondly, the contrast aspect refers to the differences the individual encounters in relationship to the perceptions of their old settings and the realities of the new ones (Louis, 1980). For example, a new faculty member may contrast the process of advising undergraduate students with different past perceptions that include being advised themselves as an undergraduate, viewing undergraduate advisement when they were a graduate student and now performing undergraduate advisement as a faculty member. The contrasts that exist for the newcomer may act as a “trigger” to try and conceptualize and make sense of the aspects of their new role in the organization. The new faculty member will compare their past or old experiences with the current or new experiences in order to accept the new role at a more gradual

rate rather than casting off all old perceptions in favor of new experiences quickly (Louis, 1980). The contrast aspect links with anticipatory socialization as an agent of understanding and validating the role of the faculty member based on the perceptions of what life as a faculty member would entail.

Finally, the surprise aspect describes the difference between the newcomer's perceptions of the new setting and the actual experiences in the new setting (Louis, 1980). The surprise aspect is best described as the moment when a new faculty member realizes that life as a professional faculty member was nothing like what was anticipated. As Louis (1980) points out, "anticipations may be conscious, tacit, or emergent; either overmet or undermet anticipations can produce surprise" (p. 237). The individual in the new setting can experience many forms of surprise based on the anticipation regarding the organization.

Forms of Surprise

During the surprise aspect, the individual is most likely to make both conscious and unconscious judgments about the new setting (Louis, 1980). The most common form of surprise is identified as "unmet expectations". The individual experiences undermet, conscious job expectations and role fulfillment. This form of surprise normally occurs when the individual first enters the new job setting (Louis, 1980). The second form of surprise is "unmet personal expectations". This refers particularly to the decisions the individual makes in regards to the anticipation of what the new setting will provide to fulfill personal goals and preferences (Louis, 1980). For example, a new faculty member may realize that the amount of non-class, free-time is overwhelming as the lack of structure is unsettling. Yet it was during graduate school that this same doctoral student valued the amount of free-time as a positive aspect of the faculty role.

The third form of surprise refers to “unmet unconscious job expectations”. Specifically, unmet unconscious job expectations could be external factors that are not important during initial entry to the organization, but become important during ongoing socialization. For example, a new faculty member may not realize to ask if the office has windows when interviewing for a job, yet the lack of an office with windows may become a source of irritation once the new faculty member is in that setting (Louis, 1980).

The fourth surprise aspect is inaccurately forecasting internal reactions to new experiences. Using the new faculty member with a windowless office for example, the self-realized anger and dread of going to an office with no windows everyday causes the new professor to question whether this career is for her. The final surprise aspect refers to the inaccurate assumptions made regarding the culture the newcomer is entering (Louis, 1980). The newcomer believes that everything is known about the new organization until entry and realize that assumptions were inaccurate (Louis, 1980). The newcomer “relies on cultural assumptions brought from previous settings as operating guides in the new setting...” (Louis, 1980).

The new faculty member is forced to approach the surprise aspects in the same manner by coping with the change or contrast aspects by “sense-making” (Louis, 1980). It is the sense-making process that allows the newcomer to analyze experiences in old settings or situations and compare them to current experiences. New faculty engage in sense-making through experiences as a newcomer to the academy and perceptions of the academy formed in graduate school.

Tierney (1997) stated that “graduate school and job interviews might be considered primary avenues for exploration of anticipatory socialization (p. 8).” For the newcomer to the academic market, the graduate school experience is central to the development of future faculty. However, despite the 30-plus reports calling for a reform in graduate school education, very little

has been done to better connect the graduate school experience with the preparation of new faculty for the academic role (Nyquist et al., 1999).

New Faculty Experiences in Academia

Individuals aspiring to enter the academy as a faculty member are not just making a transition, they are actually participating in another socialization process (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The graduate school socialization process is intended to assist the doctoral student by exposing them to the norms, values and ways of doing in the graduate school setting. Likewise, the new faculty socialization process is intended to assist new faculty to learn the norms, values and ways of doing in the academy. The socialization process that started in graduate school for doctoral students continues in the transition to the faculty role. However, the success of new faculty is largely related to the socialization process to academic norms that took place in graduate school. Thus, it can be assumed that the socialization process is ongoing.

Socialization Process for New Faculty

As indicated earlier, the stages of socialization identified by Merton (1957), Feldman (1976; 1981), Tierney and Bensimon (1996) and Van Maanen (1984) are based on theories of organizational socialization. The combination of their research resulted in a three stage model of organizational socialization whereby the newcomer learns the culture and values of the new organization. The three stages of organizational socialization central to this study are anticipatory socialization, accommodation, and role management (Feldman, 1976, 1981; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Van Maanen, 1976, 1984)

During anticipatory socialization the individual conceptualizes what they may encounter once they enter the faculty role. The doctoral student in theory begins to shape perceptions about their future role in the faculty setting. Even though the former doctoral student is now considered

a new faculty member, their acceptance of the new role should be easier because they were exposed to the faculty role while in graduate school (Bess, 1978). The challenge for new faculty is comparing their anticipatory perceptions of the faculty role to their new experiences in that new role. As explained earlier, the graduate school experience is not fully exposing graduate students to the faculty role which may result in negative newcomer experiences in the academy. This section will examine the experiences of new faculty in the context of the remaining stages of socialization: accommodation and role management. It is during these two stages that the experiences of new faculty in their professional roles relate strongly to training received while in graduate school.

Accommodation Stage

Feldman (1976) identifies the accommodation stage as one where the newcomer fully enters the organization and begins to learn the roles of the new setting. The newcomer will also work to establish relationships with other faculty, department heads and non-academic professionals within the university setting (Feldman, 1976). Most notably, the newcomer will begin to understand and internalize the culture of the organization while trying to make sense of the rules of operation in this new setting (Feldman, 1976; Louis, 1980; Van Maanen, 1984). During this stage, the perceptions of the newcomer and what they experienced in the anticipatory stage assist in the orientation to the new organization (Van Maanen, 1984).

The beginning of the new faculty member's career is a crucial time as they are experiencing uncertainty about job roles, overwhelming responsibilities and very little direction as to what to do or how to do it (Olsen & Crawford, 1998). This is the time when new faculty are most susceptible to feeling confused and uninvolved because they are trying to make sense of the new setting, the new role and how they should interact with other faculty in that new role.

The manipulation of environmental and cultural factors as well as understanding the organizational ways of doing assist new faculty in moving through the accommodation stage to fully incorporate their new role (Van Maanen, 1976). Most importantly, it is during the accommodation stage that the new faculty member attempts to internalize what is expected of them from the institution and how to fulfill those expectations (Feldman, 1981).

Olsen (1993) conducted a longitudinal study that examined the work satisfaction of new faculty at the end of their first and third year in the academy. The purpose of the study was to identify what socialization experiences are important during the initial entry of the new faculty as those experiences will have a profound effect on the individual through the course of their career. The study was also guided by the exploration of the intrinsic rewards and extrinsic factors of a faculty career. Essentially, if faculty at the beginning of their career were dissatisfied, then what made them choose this career in the first place? The intrinsic rewards refer to the personal satisfaction the individual would derive from a faculty career (Olsen, 1993). Whereas, the extrinsic factors of the faculty career refer to the conditions of the job itself and how the individual deals with those factors (Olsen, 1993).

According to Olsen's 1993 study, the most intrinsic rewards for faculty were the ability to have independent thought and action, a true feeling of worth and accomplishment within the academic milieu, opportunities for growth and role related self-esteem (Hackman & Lawler, cited in Olsen, 1993). Yet it is also during the first years that faculty find difficulty in accepting the intrinsic rewards of being a faculty member because of the issues of adapting to their new role and learning the institutional, professional and departmental culture (Gaff, 2002; Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998). New faculty members may show strong dissatisfaction to the academic work role if the job does not provide them with a sense of opportunity, challenge and

accomplishment through which they are able to transpose the expectations from graduate school to the realities of the profession (Olsen, 1993). The intrinsic rewards from the faculty career have as much to do with anticipatory socialization as the experience itself. The extrinsic factors or the “conditions under which the work is done” are linked by Olsen (1993) to the dissatisfaction of new faculty in the setting or work role they must perform in. The primary causes of dissatisfaction are lack of university support, problems with the university reward system and low salaries (Olsen, 1993). Additionally, faculty must cope with an institutional governance system that may be confusing, decentralized and convoluted (Olsen, 1993).

The difficulties new faculty encounter in their new role may contradict the experiences of graduate school if the individual was not introduced to those difficulties while in graduate school (Olsen, 1993). Olsen (1993) argued that much of the stress experienced by new faculty was due to the intrinsic dissatisfactions and extrinsic difficulties of new faculty while in the accommodation stage of their socialization to the faculty role.

Role Management

Feldman (1976) identified the role management stage as the time when a newcomer to an organization is trying to establish their own personal identity while understanding the complexities of the job and family conflicts. Feldman (1976) suggested that during role management “conflicts between work life and home life [such] as schedules, demands on the employees’ families, the effect on the job on the quality of home life...” (p.435) are important to manage during this stage of socialization. It is during the role management stage that the individual can assess to a larger extent their satisfaction with the decision they have made to enter the organization (Feldman, 1976). Similarly, Olsen and Crawford (1998) studied the “Met

Expectations” hypothesis as discussed by Porter and Steers (1973) in order to identify the career satisfaction an individual experiences specifically related to role management.

The “Met Expectations” hypothesis defines the phenomenon whereby the individual exhibits better job performance and less job related stress if their job expectations (whatever they are) are substantially met (Olsen & Crawford, 1998). The expectations of the faculty member are central to their initial satisfaction and job performance in their new role in the academy (Olsen & Crawford, 1998). The stress experienced by new faculty develop as the expectations of the individual and the realities of the organization do not “fit”. The work stress experienced by faculty are not derived from “major life events” such as moving to a new city, starting a new job in a new profession or performing in a new role for the first time, but rather the reality of everyday life (Olsen, 1993). The stress experienced by new faculty remain as a constant area of research, discussion and debate. The next section will explore the literature related to new faculty stress and their entry into the faculty role. Even though stress is constant through the career of the faculty member, it is at job entry that stress is most compelling to the socialization of new faculty.

New Faculty Stress

New faculty entering the academy are experiencing stress from the intrinsic and extrinsic demands and responsibilities of life in the professoriate (Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998). Particularly within the first four years of entering the academy, new faculty are more prone to some of the less desirable responses to work related pressures and responsibilities (Olsen, 1993). In that context, for new faculty, the first few years are filled with feelings of loneliness and isolation (Austin, 1992; Boice, 2000; Finklestein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992; Wheeler, 1992; Whitt, 1991); a lack of emotional and financial support (Bianco-Mathis & Chalofsky, 1999;

Boyer, 1990; Nyquist et al., 1999; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Rosch & Reich, 1996; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Whitt, 1991), and nervousness about the tenure process (Rosch & Reich, 1996; Whitt, 1991). New faculty are concerned with reward and recognition, time constraints, departmental influences, professional identity and uneasiness of student interaction (Gmelch, Wilke, & Lovrich, 1986; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Turner & Boice, 1987). What is central to all of the findings regarding new faculty stress is the relationship that each stress factor has with the academic preparation of doctoral students while in graduate school. It is during the doctoral training period or anticipatory socialization period that future faculty are able to prepare for the stress to come, yet as indicated by the studies mentioned here, doctoral students are not exposed to those stresses.

Stress from Lack of Time

One of the most detrimental aspects of stress on new faculty is the lack of time to complete tasks related to teaching, research and service (Fink, 1984; Fink, 1992; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Whitt, 1991). The primary source of stress for new faculty is the struggle to balance research and teaching related responsibilities (Fink, 1984). The result as Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) found was new faculty reported health related problems particularly fatigue, insomnia and anxiety attacks (Turner & Boice, 1987).

Stress from Isolation and Loneliness

New faculty entering the academy report that they experienced feelings of isolation and loneliness as they are in effect performing their research and other job related functions alone for the first time (Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992). Without the aid of their doctoral program colleagues, new faculty entering the professoriate are both newcomers to the

organization but also relative strangers to other colleagues within the department (Bogler & Kremer-Hayon, 1999; Boice, 1991). Although new faculty expect a collegial atmosphere from their new department, they find their arrival to be part of the “day-to-day” routine whereby no special effort is made to welcome in the new faculty member (Sorcinelli, 1992). The result is new faculty feeling that they are on an island without much support and/or assistance from colleagues or other administrators during the beginning years of their academic appointment (Finklestein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992; Olsen, 1993).

Stress from Lack of Emotional and Departmental Support

As new faculty experience stress from loneliness and isolation, they also experience anxiety over the lack of support relative to their professional development (Bianco-Mathis & Chalofsky, 1999; Nyquist et al., 1999; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992). Sorcinelli (1988) found that new faculty felt they could approach senior faculty and ask for assistance. However, the rationale for not doing so was a lack of trust in the support that they might receive (Sorcinelli, 1988). Hence, even though senior faculty were available to help in ways of general encouragement, new faculty felt unwilling to ask for specific assistance with more concrete academic needs (Sorcinelli, 1988).

Stress from the Recognition and Reward Process

Several studies identified a stressor of new faculty as the lack of a clear recognition and reward process within the academic department (Boice, 1991; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987). In Sorcinelli’s 1988 study, it was after new faculty returned to campus for the beginning of their second year of academic appointment did they feel stress over the lack of feedback from departmental leaders about their performance from the previous year. Boice (1991) found that

new faculty in his study were not willing to take chances with their teaching or had apprehension about trying something new for fear that they would be rejected and given bad evaluations by teachers and departmental leaders.

Stress Over Lack of Resources

The expectation of new faculty when first starting in their new position is to be productive in their research projects and tasks (Sorcinelli, 1988). The lack of resources for new faculty has become a source of stress as the availability of financial resources for equipment and other needs is not as readily available (Sorcinelli, 1992; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991). Coupled with the stress over support for research projects and time constraints for completing tasks, the lack of resources adds another layer of anxiety for new faculty starting their career in academia (Sorcinelli, 1992; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991).

Stress Over Unrealistic Expectations

Comparatively speaking, the aforementioned stress factors for new faculty relate in some way or another to the stress new faculty feel over unrealistic expectations (Whitt, 1991). Whitt (1991) observed in her studies of new faculty, that those that chose to complete a doctoral degree had a strong desire to succeed no matter the sacrifice. Likewise, new faculty experience stress over expectations set by themselves in order to complete tasks related to their research, teaching and service (Whitt, 1991).

Collectively, new faculty experience stress as a result of their eagerness to begin their academic career and lack of knowing regarding the expectations and responsibilities of the faculty role (Fink, 1984; Reynolds, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). The initial entry period on campus by new faculty is considered key to developing strategies for making

sense out of the changes they are experiencing and the expectations they have of themselves and of the academic department (Boice, 1992b; Cawyer, Simonds, & Davis, 2002). Understanding the individual differences and nuances within the academic department are for some new faculty, as stressful as understanding their broader identity within the academic organization (Lucas & Murray, 2002). Even beyond the academic department, the discipline of the new faculty member may contribute to the socialization and stress faculty encounter (Braxton & Berger, 1999). As indicated by Braxton and Berger (1999), there are many discriminate differences of academic disciplines which may serve as a source of unexpected difficulty for new faculty.

Disciplinary Differences and New Faculty Socialization

New faculty entering academia have socialization experiences that vary by discipline. The differences, as noted by Braxton and Berger (1999) are related to the ways in which various disciplines collectively evaluate and prioritize scholarly interests. Specifically, high consensus disciplines are considered more technical in nature, such as science and engineering and place more value on research and theoretical findings (Braxton & Berger, 1999). Whereas low consensus disciplines, such as the humanities and social sciences place less value on research methodology and theoretical assumptions (Braxton & Berger, 1999). The distinct differences between the high and low consensus disciplines becomes of larger concern when new faculty are developing their teaching and research priorities without considering their graduate school training environment (Braxton & Berger, 1999; Rosch & Reich, 1996).

Braxton and Berger (1999) found that high consensus disciplines placed more emphasis on research orientated behavior as opposed to low consensus disciplines that placed more emphasis on teaching. Although what Braxton and Berger found may be true across the disciplines, the difficulty for new faculty may be present when the tendencies of the discipline do

not match the mission of the institution. Rosch and Reich (1996) reported that new faculty have a certain set of expectations that are congruent with their experiences while in graduate school. Particularly, new faculty pre-conceive that their new institution will have the same mission and consensus as their doctoral training institution (Rosch & Reich, 1996). For example, a new faculty member graduating from a well-respected, research-oriented, doctoral granting institution may experience a difficult transition if selected to start a position at a teaching-oriented, liberal arts college. Although this new faculty member may enter into their new institution in the same discipline, the mission and purpose of the university may be difficult to grasp for the new faculty member, especially if they were only trained to perform research (Braxton & Berger, 1999; Rosch & Reich, 1996). In many ways the expectations by new faculty of their academic department are germane to investigating the socialization process that new faculty will experience once they enter the academic profession. Along with the uncertainty new faculty experience relative to demands of the job, time management, resource allocation and, support and evaluation, the added factor of disciplinary cultures may contribute to new faculty stress. These stress factors among others, points to the need for programs that would expose faculty aspirants to the academic landscape before they arrive on campus (Fink, 1992).

In addition to the aforementioned research related to new faculty stress, there is additional data that suggests that women and minority faculty have experiences that are not similar to their white male counterparts. Collectively, these studies have shown experiences that are inherent to the particular differences of women faculty and minority faculty (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1999; Jackson, 2004; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995; Thompson & Dey, 1998; Turner, 2002).

Women and Minority Faculty Experiences

The emergence of studies related to women and minority faculty represents a new aspect in faculty research as the “face” of academia has changed from the long standing acceptance of white males as the only individuals competent enough to become faculty members (Olsen et al., 1995). This change in academia stems from the acceptance and assurance that at varying degrees women and minority faculty will gain tenure and succeed in the academic environment. Yet even with the marked success of women and minority faculty, the research focused on their experiences while in academia empirically demonstrates some of the struggles that were not documented in the past.

The existing literature on women and minority faculty shows some disparaging results of changes on the academic landscape (Olsen et al., 1995). Women and minority faculty exhibit lower research productivity, heavier teaching responsibilities, and unequal commitment to institutional service than their white male counterparts (Olsen et al., 1995). The overarching theme represented in all of the available research indicates that women and minority faculty place a higher value on teaching and service as they have an intrinsic need to “give back” and provide for the community (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1999; Olsen et al., 1995). However, at the same time women and minority faculty who tend to focus on service and teaching are denied tenure due in part because they have not been productive in their research compared to white males in the academy (Olsen et al., 1995). Although much of the existing literature identifies the experiences of women and minority faculty as one in the same, it is prudent to look at their individual experiences as they relate to this study.

Minority Faculty in Academia

New faculty in academia whether minority or majority experience some of the same stresses as mentioned earlier in this chapter (Olsen et al., 1995). However, due to the unique nature of the minority faculty members' experience in academia, some of their issues and problems are intensified (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). Minority faculty report that sometimes they feel unwanted, unappreciated, unwelcome and only hired to fulfill affirmative action quotas (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). Other studies showed that minority faculty experience unclear messages from departmental chairs, have social anxiety from loneliness and isolation and have a more difficult socialization process upon initial entry (Exum, Menges, Watkins, & Berglund, 1984). Additionally, minority faculty are more susceptible to not understanding the specific cultural differences in the academic environment and report lack of collegiality and "coldness" when trying to create collegiality among colleagues (Exum et al., 1984; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Olsen et al., 1995). Although each of these experiences may not be shared by all minority faculty, they do become prevalent when considered along with the process of gaining tenure at a college or university.

Johnsrud and Sadao (1998) studied the "common experience of otherness" and found that many of the barriers of socialization related to minority faculty were reflected once the tenure review process began. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, minority faculty do perform more service within the academic community which is not a particularly valued attribute when compared to research activities (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). The amount of time minority faculty spend on student advising, teaching and service is admirable, but not recognized or rewarded when it is time for tenure review (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998). Although minority faculty have a much greater desire to provide institutional service as a way to "give back", the challenge is to

have that same desire to embrace the research role of the minority faculty member (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Olsen et al., 1995). The challenge to develop a broader sense of what it means to be a faculty member has as much to do with the minority professor's fit within the academic enterprise (Olsen et al., 1995).

Olsen, Maple and Stage (1995) studied the experiences of minority faculty in their research on "institutional fit" in academia. In conceptualizing "institutional fit", Olsen et al. linked the satisfaction of the minority faculty member to the level of comfort they perceived at their employing institution. In doing so, they also set out to conceptualize the factors that contributed to the success of the minority faculty member. The results of the Olsen et al. (1995) study revealed that although minority faculty are much more concerned with service as a reason to pursue their goals in academia, they are aware that service will not help them obtain tenure. Olsen et al. (1995) found that minority faculty were not socialized properly in their process to become a faculty member which led to a greater ambivalence towards nurturing the academic socialization process. In addition, the graduate school experience of minority faculty has a lot to do with their attitudes and opinions about working in the academic environment (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Overall, the experiences of minority graduate students are less than supportive, especially in predominately white institutions (Pruitt & Isaac, 1985). Likewise, minorities entering the professoriate upon completion of their doctoral degree have not had as much mentoring and support in order for them to be prepared for a career in academia (Blackwell, 1989). Minorities entering the academy are experiencing many situations related to their academic career for the first time and are expected to be prepared to perform at the same level as their white counterparts (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Yet, minority faculty often have not had the same level of

training, preparation and experiences in order to enter the academic environment with an overwhelming sense of what to do and how to do it (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Although the lack of mentors, limited experience in the academic community and unclear goals are not specific to minority faculty, the burden of “cultural taxation” is a phenomenon that is relevant in discussing the socialization processes of minority faculty (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Padilla (1994, as cited in Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) defined cultural taxation as “the obligation to show good citizenship toward the institution by serving its needs for ethnic representation on committees, or to demonstrate knowledge and commitment to a cultural group, which may even bring accolades to the institution but which is not usually rewarded by the institution on whose behalf the service was performed” (p.26). To that end, minority faculty are expected to provide the additional service inherent in their responsibility to the racial group they represent (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Yet with the burden of “cultural taxation”, minority faculty are often identified only with the service they provide and not the scholarship they can offer. Consequently, the focus on cultural based service makes it difficult for minority faculty to perform their research in order to gain tenure (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Women Faculty in Academia

For women in academia, the experiences they encounter are not developmentally positive as they are trying to gain professional and academic identity within their chosen discipline (Turner, 2002). Statistics show that the number of tenured women in academia is below 50 percent while the number of men is above 70 percent (Trautvetter, 1999). These numbers alone do not represent the full experiences of women faculty as they are challenged to overcome the stress inherent in being a professor let alone being a woman.

Although women faculty like minority faculty experience the same types of stress, women faculty report that they have more difficulty experiencing collegiality, they must allocate their time differently and cope with anxiety more often than their male faculty colleagues (Trautvetter, 1999). Additionally, women faculty seek collegiality more than males and are more interested in social support rather than the isolated lifestyle often associated with faculty in higher education (Trautvetter, 1999). Because women faculty in most cases, also bear the weight of family care, they are often committed to many different “masters” as they negotiate their family and work responsibilities (Olsen et al., 1995; Trautvetter, 1999; Turner, 2002).

One of the overwhelming experiences of women faculty which has been studied more over the past twenty years is the stress and pressure women receive regarding pregnancy and child care (Armenti, 2004b). Armenti (2004a) reported that women faculty are facing greater levels of stress over what is being called the “May baby” phenomenon. “May babies” refers to the process by which women faculty plan pregnancies to occur during the summer months of the academic year in order to not lose precious time on the tenure clock at their institution (Armenti, 2004b). Many women faculty members explained that they were fearful of the response they would receive from their institution if they were to give birth at another time in the year (Armenti, 2004b). Additionally, women faculty who chose to give birth at another time during the year reported that they would intentionally hide their pregnancies so as not to appear weak or unavailable to their department chairs or deans (Armenti, 2004b). As Armenti (2004a) discussed, the decision to have a child for many women faculty members was delayed until after obtaining tenure for fear that their contract would be cancelled. The added stress and pressure of family responsibilities is also related to the child care role once the baby is born (Armenti, 2004a, 2004b).

Women faculty responsible for newborns and toddlers are more susceptible to neglecting research and publishing during the critical one to four year period prior to tenure review (Armenti, 2004a, 2004b). Even women faculty with older children reported stress from balancing their many responsibilities and coping with academic departments that were less than sensitive to their needs (Armenti, 2004a, 2004b). The mother role by women faculty also plays a large role in other developmental activities of faculty, especially new women faculty (Trautvetter, 1999). Women faculty are less likely to be mentored and spend time interacting with senior faculty if they are required to care for a child (Armenti, 2004b; Trautvetter, 1999). As Trautvetter (1999) found in her study, the development of collegiality among colleagues including mentoring and advice seeking were the most important factors in positive development of women faculty.

Boice (1992b) suggested that women (and minorities) are not as likely to maintain a positive mentor relationship as white males do. Boice (1992b) even suggests that women are not as likely to have assigned mentors or even have clear, documented tenure requirements as male faculty.

Furthermore, the development of both minorities and women in academia is inherent in the process of developing all doctoral students for the faculty role. Although minority and women faculty have a unique set of circumstances related to their socialization and development, it is the transformation of those circumstances to a positive experience that may allow for greater success in new faculty socialization.

Conceptual Framework

In developing the conceptual framework for this study, the primary area of concern is the relationship between the anticipatory socialization process for graduate students aspiring to enter

the faculty role and the outcome of their initial entry into the academy. Inasmuch as the other environmental factors are important to the development of new faculty, it is the sense-making of the realities of faculty life in contrast to the perceptions of faculty life which effect the experiences of pre-tenure faculty.

The conceptual framework for this study, depicted in Figure 1, was developed using the literature and the Louis (1980) Model of Newcomer Experiences whereby the three primary aspects of development for the individual entering the academy (change, contrast, surprise) are also interconnected with the anticipatory socialization aspect of the graduate school experience. This model takes into account the related variables associated with the transition of doctoral completers to new faculty academic roles. The arrows between each point in socialization (anticipatory socialization, change, contrast and surprise) represent an undetermined amount of time based on the individuals' own development within the academy. It can be deduced, that the time between anticipatory socialization and contrast could be the amount of time an individual uses to not only complete their doctoral degree but to also obtain a position in academia.

By developing the conceptual framework based on the model presented by Louis (1980), the relationship between the newcomer and their entry into the organization is best identified within the structure of the organization.

In identifying the individual stages of the framework, the addition of the anticipatory socialization aspect attempts to display the relationship that the doctoral program experience has with the stages that follow.




Figure 1 – Model of Doctoral Student Transition to Faculty Role

Anticipatory Socialization – The Graduate School Experience. The first stage is anticipatory socialization in graduate school. As suggested by Tierney and Bensimon (1996), this process is the point in which the individual first sees the academic enterprise and starts to “think” that they will become a member of the professoriate one day. During graduate school the individual begins to understand the role of faculty. Some doctoral students view faculty as

more than just professors, but rather role-models to what type of career can be obtained through the course of their academic studies (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The individual also views the inner-workings of the academic department as a functioning organization rather than just part of the institution (Bess, 1978). The individual at the stage of anticipatory socialization prepares for a new role by internalizing how to think, act, feel and perform if they were in the role of faculty (Merton, 1957). This stage can act both positively and negatively in relating the academic work role to future faculty (Bess, 1978; Tierney, 1997; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman et al., 2001).

Change – Making the transition. The second stage is change within the organization (Louis, 1980). Change is related to how new faculty understand their role in the organization and acquire the knowledge to understand where the individual or new faculty member fits in. Schein (1971) identified three specific aspects that individuals within the change or organizational entry stage must complete to successfully complete this process. The first being that the individual must gain the knowledge of the organization and their specific role within the organization (Schein, 1971). Secondly, the individual must understand the authority and hierarchy of the organization in order to recognize the relationship between peers and superiors (Schein, 1971). Finally, the individual understands the boundaries of their role and how they can adjust those boundaries including time spent on work, self-directed management and inclusion of others in their day-to-day tasks (Schein, 1971).

Contrast - Making sense of the differences. The third stage of the framework is contrast whereby the individual begins to compare their perceptions of faculty life against the realities of faculty life in their normal task completion. During the contrast stage, new faculty will pay special attention to their graduate school experience as it relates to what they “thought” faculty

life would really be like in comparison to the outcome of their involvement as a faculty member. The propensity for stress in new faculty can be attributed to the contrast stage whereby the individual is now experiencing the reality of the career that they formed their opinions, preconceptions and perceptions about.

Nerad (2003) discovered that faculty did have a rude awakening when starting their academic career. Specifically, new faculty, reflecting on their graduate school experience identified that when they started their career, it was clear that they should have received more training in graduate school in areas such as teamwork, task completion, managerial and technical skills (Nerad, 2003).

Surprise – Realizing the difference between perception and reality. Finally, the fourth stage related to the conceptual framework is surprise. The identification of the four types of surprise - unmet expectations, unmet personal expectations, unmet-unconscious expectations and inaccurate assumptions challenges the new faculty member to understand the changes that they are feeling both internally and externally. Similar to the identification of the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards/disappointments as explained by Olsen (1993) the surprise aspect requires the new faculty member to assess what is important in their understanding of the academic work role and how they will be successful in it.

Louis (1980) explained that in the surprise stage, the individual could experience one or all of the types of surprise at the same time as they relate to: conscious expectations about the professional position are not fulfilled, expectations (both realized and unrealized) about one's self are not met, work expectations are undermet or are not fulfilled at all, challenges to forecast what "normally" happens within the organization, and challenges to the personal assumptions the new faculty member has made or makes of the organization and its inner workings.

Using this conceptual framework, participants will be asked to relate their experiences during their graduate school training, particularly what they anticipated about starting their career in the professoriate. In doing so, new faculty will also identify the change, contrast and surprise aspects of their own experiences when entering the academy as a doctoral completer. By combining the anticipatory socialization aspect along with the Model of Newcomer Experiences as postulated by Louis (1980), the sense making aspect of new faculty connects to display the process by which new faculty enter the organization.

Conclusion

The socialization process for new faculty began when they were in graduate school and deciding on an academic career (Bess, 1978). During the graduate school experience, doctoral students were exposed to the disciplinary aspects of their academic field and subsequently introduced to research methodology related to the same. Yet, during this period, doctoral students were not exposed to the work responsibilities, tasks and expectations of faculty life. Although several thousand new faculty start academic positions each year (Gaff, 2002) only a small number of them feel comfortable and prepared to begin their career as a faculty member (Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992).

Even though literature exists showing that new faculty experience stress over the tenure process, recognition, feedback for work performance, time allocation and balancing work versus personal time (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989), most new faculty enter the academy oblivious to the realities of an academic career. To that end, the goal of this study was to examine the relationship that exists between what new faculty perceive regarding the academic workplace prior to entry and what they experience once they started their career as a professor.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

New faculty entering the professoriate are faced with the task of not only fitting into their new position as a worthy academician but also dealing with the pressure of learning the role of a faculty member (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). At the same time new faculty are adjusting to being a faculty member, they are also experiencing higher levels of work-related stress including feelings of isolation, unsure work responsibilities, lack of direction and uncertainty about their career decisions (Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Wheeler, 1992). Can these stresses be related to adjusting to the work role? Or is the stress a by-product of under-preparation for the career they have chosen? Much of the current literature suggests that doctoral degree programs are doing a less than adequate job in preparing future faculty for their new career (Austin, 2002b; Golde & Dore, 2001; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992; Wheeler, 1992).

Insomuch as the preparation of new faculty is perceived to be a part of the doctoral training program, it is to this end that this study attempted to identify the perceptions of new faculty as it related to their doctoral preparation. More importantly, this study attempted to link the teaching assistant role in graduate school with the new faculty members entry experiences in the academy. Specifically, this study was intended to provide insight into the activities that are existent and non-existent as they relate to the training and transition process of doctoral students who chose to become members of the professoriate.

This chapter will explain the methodology used to assist in answering the research questions for this study. Additionally, this chapter will explain the use of the qualitative research

method, provide justification for phenomenology as a research tool, articulate research questions guiding this study, data collection and analysis methods, and discuss trustworthiness and this study's delimitations and limitations.

Research Questions

The primary research question for this study was: How do new faculty perceive their TA experience as a device to prepare them for a career as a faculty member? The secondary research questions were:

1. How does the TA experience influence the attitudes and opinions new faculty have regarding their new role as a faculty member?
2. What development of future faculty takes place while graduate students are in TA roles?
3. Does the TA experience provide an adequate training mechanism for new faculty entering the academy?
4. What opinions and attitudes do new faculty have towards their socialization and integration to the academy?

Rationale for Utilizing a Qualitative Research Approach

Qualitative research seeks to answer the research question by understanding the reality of the circumstances of the individuals involved in the study (Creswell, 2003; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). To that end, the researcher collects data *from* the participant through interviews and *about* the participant by observations in the field and in the interview session itself (Huberman & Miles, 2002). Rossman and Rallis (2003) suggest two unique features of qualitative research as 1) "the researcher is the means through which the study is conducted and 2) the purpose is to

learn about some facet of the social world” (p.5). Since the qualitative researcher acts as the conduit through which the data flows, the relationship between the researcher and the participant is central to the success of the study. Bogdan and Biklen (2003) explain that qualitative research can be characterized “as a dialogue or interplay between researchers and their subjects” (p. 7). As my goal was to explore the preparation of new faculty, I used a qualitative research approach to collect data. My dialogue with new faculty provided insight into their perceptions of doctoral training and how prepared they felt for their career as a faculty member.

Qualitative research differs from quantitative research as the intent is to gain data that is full of description of people, places and interactions between the researcher and the participant (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). In order to utilize the qualitative methodology to its full potential, Bogdan and Biklen (2003) suggest five features of qualitative research. The intent is for the researcher to incorporate as many of those five features in the study to realize the maximum potential of qualitative research. Since the goal of this chapter is to explain my research methodology, I will outline Bogdan and Biklen’s five features of qualitative research and relate those features to the development of my study.

First, qualitative research is naturalistic as the researcher is involved or entrenched in the setting of the participant of the study (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 2003). The researcher will capture not only the data from the participant, but also the participants’ surroundings. By developing a keen sense of the location that the participant sees everyday, the qualitative researcher is able to walk in the shoes of the participant and experience first-hand the environment (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). For my study, the intent was to visit the new faculty member in their office or on their campus in order to get a “feel” for their environment. If, for example, a new faculty member explained that they felt disconnected from the rest of their

colleagues because of the physical location of their offices, as the researcher, I saw that distance and related that to the context of the study.

Secondly, qualitative research is descriptive. The strength of qualitative research is the ability to collect words and context instead of numbers from surveys (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The contextual data includes interview transcripts, visual objects (such as photos and video), researcher field notes, memos and other secondary sources such as websites, historical accounts and personal communications. As the researcher for this study, my intent was to develop a rich set of data including interview transcriptions from new faculty, field notes describing the new faculty members' mood and non-verbal reactions to questions and secondary sources in order to better understand the participant and their perceptions of doctoral training and new faculty experiences.

Thirdly, qualitative inquiry is concerned with process and not just the end result of the phenomenon (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Specifically, the qualitative researcher is looking to identify the stages related to the research question being answered. The process feature can best be described in the context of my study topic. My primary concern for this research was to identify the perceptions that new faculty had regarding their doctoral training and how that training related to their experiences as a new faculty member. The process I was concerned with was doctoral training. If this study were solely focused on the end-results, then I would only identify the perceptions of new faculty in their current role as new faculty and not the process that led them to their current work role as faculty.

The fourth feature Bogdan and Biklen (2003) identify is the inductive nature of qualitative research. In contrast, quantitative research is deductive whereby the researcher starts with a theory and tests whether or not that theory is valid (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Rossman &

Rallis, 2003). The development of knowledge in a qualitative research project is put forth from the analysis of the data, without any hypotheses or primary evidence to prove or disprove (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The qualitative researcher is primarily concerned with analyzing the data collected to inform the question and determining if additional or different questions need to be answered. Comparatively, new faculty shared their perceptions of doctoral training which informed the research questions listed previously.

Finally and most importantly, qualitative research is intended to have meaning (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The qualitative researcher should seek to find the participants' perspective and present the perspective in such a way that the reader is able to understand the participant as an individual and not just a member of a study (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The researcher also develops meaning as the participant is able to relate their life-story or experiences and in turn humanizes the research project and the purpose for the study. New faculty face many challenges and stresses while at the same time trying to fit into their new role as a faculty member (Austin, 2002a; Boyer, 1990). By using qualitative research, my intent was to present the perspective of new faculty by gaining insight into their doctoral training and development.

Rationale for a Phenomenological Study

Within qualitative research methodology, there are several types of inquiry methods that the researcher can use: phenomenological, case study, historical, ethnographic, and grounded theory research (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 2003; Glesne, 1999). This study used the phenomenological tradition within the qualitative methodology as the framework for data collection and analysis.

The phenomenological study has its roots in the development and exposition of the lived experiences of participants (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The intent of phenomenology is to

“understand the meaning of events and interactions to ordinary people in particular situations” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p.23). Although all qualitative research is intended to uncover the meaning of events that happen to ordinary people, in phenomenology, the development of the researcher’s personal reflections on the topic is included in the final analysis (Laverty, 2003).

With a phenomenological study, the focus is on descriptions of how people react and perceive the particular phenomena or experience of the study (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). It was my decision to use phenomenological inquiry as I was interested in the “lived experiences” of new faculty and how they perceived their doctoral training while in graduate school. Even though the data collected was the perception of new faculty regarding their doctoral training, the phenomenon being investigated was the anticipatory socialization paradigm.

The Role of the Researcher

As I have developed this study to investigate the research questions posed earlier, I asked several questions of myself pertaining to my involvement and purpose for conducting this study. I also questioned my ability to perform qualitative research and how I would perform in that role. In trying to answer those questions, I immediately wanted to develop an understanding of what characteristics a qualitative researcher should possess in order to get the most from their study. Rossman and Rallis (2003) identify principles of good practice that qualitative researchers should try to follow to develop a meaningful research project. The principles identified served as a guide to determine my own preparation for qualitative research. According to Rossman and Rallis (2003) the qualitative researcher: views the world holistically, systematically reflects on who he/she is, is sensitive to personal biography, recognizes subjectivity, and uses complex reasoning. Each of the five characteristics noted by Rossman and Rallis (2003) are relevant in discussing my role as the researcher for this project.

Views the World Holistically

The qualitative researcher can be viewed in a reflexive light as the researcher accepts the data from the individual, internalizes it and then reflects it back in some logical and organized demonstration of research protocol (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Though in the process of being reflexive, the researcher must be willing to make sense of the data that the participants present even if those statements are not organized according to the context of the study (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The qualitative researcher is not looking to understand the meaning of some phenomenon being investigated, but rather how the participant and the world interact to produce the data being collected (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 2003; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In other words, how does the participant deal with the world around them instead of how the participant attempts to change the world (Lancy, 1993). The qualitative researcher must be comfortable with the fact that unlike quantitative research, the “data do not speak for themselves” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p.36). I see myself as a learner and a researcher as I gather the pieces of information from the participant and make sense of their phenomenon in the world.

Systematically Reflects on Who He/She is

The researcher looks at the world through glasses tinted by past experiences and social constructs (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The researchers’ gender, race, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, political orientation, religion, financial background, family habitués, and beliefs are central to how they view the world (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). As mentioned earlier, since the researcher is central to the development of the data analysis and discussion, the ability of the researcher to reflect on their own views about data being collected is important to the entire study (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). My worldview comes from my personal biography and

experiences as an African-American male from a middle-class, educated family. The ability for me to reflect on my personal life-experiences were key to not making assumptions during the research design and data gathering processes.

Is Sensitive to Personal Biography

Similar to the self-reflection of the researcher, being sensitive to personal biography speaks more to the data analysis process in presenting data as objectively as possible (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Though subjectivity exists in all forms of research, the intent is to minimize the level of researcher subjectivity as much as possible. As an African-American male from a middle-class, educated family, my experiences and views towards education may differ from that of a research study participant. Yet it is in within my role as the researcher to bring forth the participants voice without imposing my voice in their place. The sensitivity of my personal biography that I brought to the study better assisted the reflexive nature of this qualitative analysis of the graduate school phenomenon (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Recognizes Subjectivity

In discussing my role as a qualitative researcher in this study design, the characteristics of the researcher (as outlined by Rossman & Rallis, 2003) become central to the development of the study itself. My primary interest in this area of study was sparked by my own experience of being a PhD student as I completed the requirements for the doctorate degree. I also questioned that if I were to begin a career as a faculty member upon completion of my PhD, would I be ready to do so? My involvement with higher education has been lengthy as I was exposed to college professors in my home environment by way of grandparents and parents who were college professors. During my developmental years before college, I did not think about the

experiences of faculty and how graduate school related to the development of new faculty. However, during my own PhD experiences and professional career as a college administrator, I have raised some of the questions central to this research proposal – “How do doctoral students learn to be faculty members”? Moreover, I have questioned– “How am I being prepared to be a faculty member?”

Uses Complex Reasoning

As mentioned earlier, qualitative research is an inductive process whereby the researcher enters the project without any hypothesis that point to the “suggested” outcome during data collection. Rather than using a hypothesis to prove or disprove, qualitative researchers use a conceptual framework to best focus and shape the design of the research (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). What makes qualitative research so interesting, is the ability for the researcher to make decisions regarding the data during the entire process of data collection and data analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). This is not to say that other researchers will not interpret the data differently, but rather the interpretation of the data must be substantiated logically through the presentation of the researcher’s findings and discussion (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 2003; Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

As a reflexive researcher, my intent is to relate the experiences of new faculty regarding their doctoral training while in graduate school. The fact that I am a doctoral candidate too places additional emphasis on my ability to reflect on my own experiences both biographical and my current role as a student and researcher.

Ethical Considerations

In any study, the researcher must develop a set of ethical guidelines based on personal intuition and adherence to policies set forth by the sponsoring organization such as a foundation

or university (Creswell, 2003; Glesne, 1999; Huberman & Miles, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The development of ethical considerations for the study must be central in all actions regarding the research design, data collection, data analysis and final reporting (Creswell, 2003). The word ethics comes from the Greek word ethos which translates to “character” – the character or principles of the researcher are on display as the study represents the good or bad, right or wrong aspects of the researcher (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

In using phenomenology as the research approach, my concern with ethics is central to my development of this study. Rossman and Rallis (2003) and Bogdan and Biklen (2003) present four major perspectives to consider when developing ethical guidelines for the research study: the ethic of consequence asks the researcher to consider how will this study effect the participant during and after the study has been completed; the ethic of rights and responsibilities considers that the researcher must at all times remember that the individual is a human being and they should be treated with the same rights that the researcher would ask for themselves; the ethic of social justice requires the researcher to consider the voice that has not been heard, to consider all sides of the story and explore all available viewpoints related to the issue being analyzed; and the ethic of care admonishes the researcher to not remove themselves from the idea that we as human beings share some level of care for our fellow human beings. To be specific, the investigator should not allow harm to befall a participant in order to maintain a level of researcher objectivity. Those four ethical considerations create an overarching level of responsibility that I had as the researcher to my subjects and the process of data collection and data analysis for this study.

Bogdan and Biklen (2003) also put forth two major considerations to explain ethical standards in qualitative research: subjects are volunteers and are aware before entering the study

of any possible dangers or negative outcomes from participation; and subjects are not exposed to any risks greater than any gains derived from participation in the study.

Participants were asked to acknowledge their understanding of the research design prior to participation in the data collection process. Participants signed a consent form before the interview began indicating that they understood the purpose of the study and any risks associated in their participation. Participants were provided with a detailed explanation of the procedures that would follow during the remainder of the study including the collection, analysis and reporting of data. To preserve privacy and confidentiality of subjects, a pseudonym was assigned to each of the study participants as well as the institution where they are employed.

Pilot Study

During the summer of 2004, a pilot study was conducted to determine the viability of a larger study on doctoral preparation of new faculty entering the academy. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) identified the pilot study as “useful for testing many aspects” of proposed research (p. 38). The participants in the pilot study were informed that their participation would lead to the decision to further investigate the relationship between the doctoral school experience and the preparation of new faculty for their academic work role. It was within the confines of the pilot study that the development of a focus on the TA experience began to take shape. The participants answered interview questions related to the primary research question guiding the pilot study: How do new faculty perceive their graduate school experience prepared them for a career in academia? The secondary research questions were:

1. How did new faculty learn the daily vocational tasks expected of new faculty?
2. How do the actual experiences of new faculty compare to their perceived views of faculty life?

3. How do new faculty respond to informal or formal socialization methods when entering the academy as a new professional?
4. What opinions and attitudes do new faculty have towards their socialization and integration to the academy?

Pilot Study Participants and Site

Four faculty members representing various academic disciplines were interviewed in order to identify their experiences while in doctoral training that assisted in their preparation for the professoriate. The four participants were all faculty members at an urban, Research Intensive (Carnegie, 2004) institution in the Southern part of the United States. The institution has an average undergraduate enrollment of at least 13,000 students, participates in national and international research projects and has as its mission undergraduate education. From the investigation of the participants, data was collected, analyzed and distilled to identify the true meaning and essence of their words and observed reactions to interview questions (Creswell, 2003).

Pilot Study Results

Four themes resulted from the pilot study which aided in the development of the current research. The four themes were: 1) new faculty found it challenging to balance their perceptions of faculty life with the realities of faculty life, 2) new faculty were attempting to cope with job related expectations and work responsibilities, 3) the added importance of previous experiences as a teaching assistant prior to starting the faculty role and, 4) the perceived lack of emphasis on teaching by both graduate programs and their new employer. The discovery that new faculty were often challenged to make sense of their perceptions of faculty life versus the realities of faculty life related to the need to expose new faculty to the faculty role prior to doctoral degree

completion. The difficulty that new faculty had in understanding their work roles and responsibilities indicated that doctoral students should be exposed to faculty work roles within their academic program. New faculty found that there was little emphasis on the role of teaching both by their doctoral program and their new employer hence sending mixed messages about the role of faculty in the institution. However, it was the impact of the TA experience on the overall preparation of new faculty that added a new dimension to the importance of future research on the connection between the TA experience and development of future faculty. Taken together, the themes discovered from the pilot study added a level of “real-life” evidence that the experiences of new faculty entering the professoriate were worth further exploration.

Site and Sample Selection

The strength of any research design is the organized and systematic approach of collecting data (Creswell, 2003). The data collected informs the research questions which aids in determining if the research was worth completing. In this section, I will discuss the steps and decisions made to select the site for the study, gain access to the site, and select a population of individuals and participants for the study.

Site Selection

The intent of this study was to capture the perceptions of new faculty regarding their TA experiences and how those experiences related to their preparation for the faculty work role. By allowing for the voices of the participants to come through in this study, it was necessary to select both sites and participants that provided a broad range of experiences in their initial years as faculty. This study was conducted at two, four-year universities in the south-central part of the United States. The universities are classified as “urban institutions”, meaning they serve the population of students in and around their community particularly in heavily populated,

metropolitan areas (Klotsche, 1966).

The primary reason for selecting these sites is because although they are urban institutions, they are also classified as Doctoral/Research– Extensive Institutions (Carnegie, 2004). The Carnegie Foundation has classified institutions since 1971 and the classification is based on the variety of graduate programs, a wide range of baccalaureate programs and conferring at least 20 doctorate degrees per year (Carnegie, 2004). The institutional classification coupled with the location and size of the two sites relates to the diverse mix of faculty and faculty experiences.

Elliott (1994) suggested that the urban campus is responsible for meeting the needs of many different constituents including the mission of the institution and a unique mix of students with many different backgrounds and experiences. Additionally, urban campuses “have attracted and nurtured faculty who live in and experience the city’s diversity. Urban faculty understand the university’s multiple constituents. They know the needs, challenges and opportunities of the city and they frequently engage in research and service activities that will benefit from it” (Elliott, 1994, p.66). The urban faculty member has the ability to interact with more individuals from diverse backgrounds even at research-heavy institutions (Elliott, 1994). The urban faculty member is required to be knowledgeable and flexible in order to carry out the multiple missions of the college or university (Elliott, 1994; Goodall, 1970; Spaight & Farrell, 1986). Usually, the urban faculty member is able to tolerate the sometimes inconsistent nature of the university’s printed mission and what actually takes place in the classroom or laboratory (Elliott, 1994). Urban faculty also come from diverse backgrounds themselves as they are attracted to the metropolitan nature of the institution and the diversity of the surroundings and students (Elliott, 1994; Goodall, 1970; Spaight & Farrell, 1986).

Likewise, the urban institution attracts a heterogeneous student population which allows for diversity of preparation and thought within the educational community (Elliott, 1994; Spaight & Farrell, 1986). Spaight and Farrell (1986) proposed in their article that students attending urban institutions come from racially, financially, and educationally diverse backgrounds which requires different teaching and curriculum styles for effective education. Hence, this study focused on the urban campus due to the diversity of both the faculty employed at the institution as well as the students attending. The decision not to include an institution that would be more rural or even a land-grant institution was based on the unique characteristics that the urban institution provides. Whereas a large, land-grant, flagship institution is able to provide more support to research and knowledge, the profiles of both the faculty and students are not as diverse as they would be at an urban institution (Elliott, 1994).

Therefore, for the purpose of this study, two urban institutions were selected - one institution will be referred to as Downtown University (DU) and the other will be Suburban University (SU). Both institutions are classified as urban universities and they identify themselves as such. DU has an average undergraduate enrollment of 35,000 and SU has an average undergraduate enrollment of 16,900 students.

Site Profile: Suburban University (SU)

SU is over 30 years old with undergraduate, graduate and medical education. SU offers programs and services related to student involvement including an honors program, study abroad, and other support services. SU participates in many grants and research initiatives related to their medical center and other disciplines within the university. SU is home to a large graduate school with more than 70 research centers, focusing on such diverse issues as AIDS vaccines and aging to the environment, urban affairs, and telecommunications. SU has seen enormous

growth over the past 10 years, increasing enrollment at times when other state institutions saw a decrease. Part of the reason for the growth can be attributed to the low cost of tuition at SU.

Site Profile: Downtown University (DU)

Comparatively, DU was founded in the early 1920's by the state legislature as a junior/community college. In the mid-1930's, DU was pressured to reform itself and become a four-year institution. By the end of the 1930's, DU was a full-fledged undergraduate institution and later added some graduate courses. Today, DU offers doctoral degrees and professional degrees in law, optometry, pharmacy, and social work.

Gaining Access

Rossman and Rallis (2003) wrote that “unless the site is entirely open to the public, you generally need to obtain an invitation before entering the field” (p. 156). Gaining access to a site can be a lengthy process as relationships with individuals who oversee the site must be negotiated and created (Creswell, 2003). The challenge for most researchers is developing a relationship with an individual, a gate-keeper, who can extend the invitation to the researcher to conduct the study at their site or deny access (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

The gate-keeper for this study was the Provost at each respective campus (DU and SU). In most cases, the Provost is the chief academic officer responsible for faculty issues including salaries, hiring, development and recruiting of new faculty. Since the Provost is the primary contact for faculty issues and concerns, I felt that the Provost was the logical choice to request permission to recruit candidates for my study. Hence, the Provost was sent a formal letter (Appendix A) requesting a list of faculty who had been employed at DU and SU since 2001.

Selection of Participants

In order to conduct this study in the traditional methods of qualitative inquiry, I selected my subjects based on developing a homogeneous group. To develop the homogenous group I enlisted the *purposeful sampling* method to determine who would be included in the study group (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) identify that purposeful sampling allows the researcher to identify typical cases or in this case participants that share some similarity in background. As Glesne (1999) indicates, within a homogeneous group, the goal is to select subjects that share some aspects in order to visualize and identify their similarities even though they are different.

To determine the homogenous group, I identified variables that allowed delineation of new faculty eligible for inclusion in the study. The current literature related to new faculty development and anticipatory socialization makes a connection to four themes that I used as criterion for selection of participants for this study: the teaching assistant experience provides future faculty with proper exposure to the faculty role (Nyquist et al., 1999; Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998) the first four years of employment for new faculty is important to the positive development of new faculty (Nyquist et al., 1999; Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998); and new faculty who teach undergraduates experience the most stress in transitioning from doctoral student to faculty member (Austin, 2002a; Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Wheeler, 1992; Whitt, 1991).

To that end, the homogeneous group selected for this study shared the following aspects: a) employed as a teaching assistant during their time in graduate school, b) completion of a PhD program no more than four years prior to the beginning of their career as a professor, c) employed at a higher education institution in a tenure-track position, d) a responsibility for

teaching at least one undergraduate course per semester since their hiring. Fourteen individuals were selected and they agreed to participate in a tape-recorded, face-to-face interview and provided when necessary, some verification of collected data via telephone after data analysis began (Glesne, 1999).

Once the gate-keeper at each institution provided me with a list of faculty names, email address and telephone numbers in order to make contact with the population of new faculty, individuals involved in the population were contacted by electronic mail (Appendix B) and asked to participate in a screening survey (Appendix C).

Online Survey Evaluation

The seven-question online survey (Appendix C) allowed the individual to answer questions and submit them electronically in order to determine who should be invited to participate in the study. Questions on the online survey included information central to the study as well as questions regarding how to contact, where to contact the individual if chosen for inclusion in the study. Once the online survey submission date had passed, approximately three weeks after the email request (Appendix B) had been sent, the instrument was evaluated in order to determine a group of individuals to contact for participation. Although the response rate was not foreseen, there was an adequate number of participants of each site interested in participating in this study.

The online screening survey was used only to identify individuals meeting the eligibility criteria for participation in the study. Subsequently, only respondents that: a) were employed as a teaching assistant during their time in graduate school, b) completed a PhD program no more than four years prior to the beginning of their career as a professor, c) were employed at DU or

SU in a tenure-track position and, d) were responsible for teaching at least one undergraduate course per semester since their hiring.

In order to achieve a diverse sample of the faculty at both DU and SU, individuals were selected according to their discipline. The intent was to select individuals that represented many different academic areas of study so as to hear the individual voices of their preparation process for academia. A report was run from all of the surveys showing the potential participants discipline and other vital information. The results of the report were analyzed and categorized in order to determine which individuals would be contacted for inclusion in the study. The individuals selected matched all four attributes listed previously.

Contacting Participants

Prospective participants responding to the online survey instrument were sent an invitation letter (Appendix D). The invitation letter contained specific information regarding the research topic, the purpose of the study, and additional information regarding the arrangement of a time and place to meet to conduct the interview. Also included with the letter was the consent form (Appendix E). The signed consent forms are being kept in a locked file cabinet accessible by only me. Moreover, the consent forms are maintained in a separate, locked file cabinet from the transcripts in order to establish an added level of anonymity.

Four days following the mailing of the invitation letter, an e-mail (Appendix F) was sent to each participant asking if they had received the formal letter and if they needed clarification with any parts of the proposed study. At this time they were asked to email me a date, time and location that was suitable to their schedule for a 60 minute interview. However, once the particulars of the interview were established, an email was sent (Appendix G) to confirm the interview session.

At least one day prior to the interview with the selected participants, an e-mail message (Appendix H) was sent reminding them of the date, time and location of the scheduled interview. If there was not an affirmative or reply email from the participant, then they were called by telephone to confirm the date, time and location of the interview (Appendix I).

The interviews were conducted in the participants' office. The interviews were audio taped in full-disclosure of the participant for transcription and review purposes. A digital voice recorder was used and as a method of backup, an emergency kit was available with a spare tape recorder, blank tapes and batteries.

Rationale for Interviews

The interview as it relates to qualitative research is important as the data will be “heard” by the researcher (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). In simplest terms, the qualitative interview allows for the researcher to obtain information from the participant through a face-to-face, one-on-one “conversation” (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The conversation is key to the interview as the researcher should interact with the participant in order to illicit the responses that are central to the study design (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The researcher will be required to process the data being presented by the participant and react immediately to statements, feelings, and answers in the same way two friends would react in a non-research related conversation (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Rubin and Rubin (1995) propose three key points that distinguish qualitative interviewing from other forms of qualitative data gathering: 1) qualitative interviews are modified conversations; 2) qualitative interviewers are interested in the understanding and internalization of the data presented rather than attaching the data to academic theories; and 3) qualitative interviews have a random flow even though the researcher has an intended path for the interview

to follow. These three tenets of qualitative interviewing were central to the data collection process as I attempted to “hear” the data. The idea of “hearing” the data is important in qualitative interviewing because the researcher is more than just an investigator but also a participant in the conversation (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Although Rubin and Rubin (1995) suggest that “Qualitative interviewing is a way of finding out what others feel and think about their worlds” (p.1), another central theme to interviewing is the idea of observing the participant during the interview process (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The use of observation is a very important tool used in conjunction with the interview because the participant will react to the researcher in non-verbal ways such as facial expressions and body language (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The use of the interview as the primary method of data gathering and observation as a sub-method was important in data collection. The interview itself did not inform the research questions without the added benefit of the researchers’ opinions regarding the reaction and non-verbal language of the participant. In the design of this research project, I developed an interview guide (Appendix J) that outlines the “itinerary” of the interview. However, that sequence of questions may have changed based on my observations of the participants’ non-verbal reactions to questions that were asked (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Interview Guide

The interview guide is intended to act as a “road-map” for the qualitative researcher and will inform the researcher during the actual interview as to what topics are important points of discussion (Creswell, 2003). For the researcher, the interview guide becomes an invaluable resource during the course of the interview as it represents an outline of the interview and keeps the researcher mindful of topics related to the study and time spent discussing those topics

(Creswell, 2003). Rossman and Rallis (2003) suggest that some studies are conducted using the “interview guide approach” (p. 181) whereas the researcher is guided solely by the interview guide. Even though Rossman and Rallis’ (2003) statement is true, the qualitative interview is flexible enough to allow for some deviation from the interview guide in its application during the interview. It is in the researchers’ best interest to design an interview guide to identify central themes and topics along with specific questions that will aid in informing the research question (Creswell, 2003; Rossman & Rallis, 2003; Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

For my study, an interview guide was created (Appendix J) with major topics, themes and questions included in order to gain the most from participants included in the study. The interview questions allowed the participants to relay their experiences about graduate school to me. Specifically, the majority of the interview questions asked the participants to reflect upon their own doctoral training experience now that they are faculty. The interview questions focused on participants’ training, reasons for choosing to become a faculty member, etc. Participants of this study did not have access to the interview guide prior to or during the interview.

The Interview

The purpose of the interview is to “understand the individual perspectives of participants, probe and clarify data, deepen understanding, generate rich and descriptive data, gather insight into the participant’s thinking and learn more about the context of the participants’ surroundings” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p.180). In keeping those major points as central to the purpose of the interview, I will explain the process for conducting the interviews for this research study. The interviews were scheduled for 60 minutes even though additional time was allotted in the event of some deviation from the interview guide. The process for the interview is explained below:

1. Consent – The signed consent forms were collected and reviewed to ensure that the form was signed and dated by the participant. Participants that did not bring the consent form were given a consent form and asked to read, sign and date the document. The participants were reminded of the voluntary nature of their participation and the confidentiality of the research collected. Participants were also reminded that the interview was taped for future transcription and analysis.
2. Introduction – The tape recorder was started and as indicated on the interview guide, I introduced myself and briefly discussed the nature and purpose of the study. I asked for additional questions and if none were asked the interview began.
3. Interview Questions – At this stage in the interview, the topics and questions listed on the interview guide were discussed and explored. The interview questions listed were presented in order unless a participant made some reference to another topic that needed further exploration. The ability to probe the participant for additional information is also important to the qualitative interview. The interview questions were created to be “open-ended” meaning that they were not “yes” or “no” questions which allowed for greater depth of inquiry (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).
4. Closing – Finally, the interview came to a conclusion when I determined a natural stopping point ensuring that I explored all of the themes and questions related to the study. During this time, I engaged the participant in “member-checking” activities (Miles & Huberman, 1994) which allowed for clarification of issues related to various statements made during the interview. For example, a member-checking statement may start with – “You mentioned that you were not well prepared for the professoriate, is that correct?” By engaging in member-checking while the

participant is in the interview, then the researcher can verify information and possibly solicit additional responses to questions that seemed to require more elaboration (Miles & Huberman, 1994). After member-checking, the participant was reminded of the process of the interview and how the recorded data would be evaluated. A final thank you was extended to the participant and the tape recorder was stopped.

Field Notes

Field notes were used to add a level of depth to the settings of the actual interviews (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The field notes were used as an additional data collection source to provide the researcher with a more detailed look at the context of the interview setting (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). This includes aspects of the interview including mood of the participant, the setting of the interview, non-verbal behavior of the participant, and other observations. I also recorded my thoughts regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the interviews and any other notes that informed a more accurate analysis of the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Transcribing

Data collected was transcribed by a hired transcriptionist. The transcriptionist was familiar with research projects of this type as this individual has completed previous projects for several other researchers from the University of New Orleans. The hired transcriber transcribed the tapes verbatim paying special attention to change in mood and tone of the participant.

Once the interview tape was transcribed, I replayed the tape following along with the transcribed text to be certain of inclusion of all data presented from the participant. At this time, I also inserted my notes taken at the time of the interview. I was careful to make note of any

non-verbal pauses or hesitations during the interview and inserted them appropriately into the final transcribed data. The transcribed data, notes and original tapes were logged and locked in a file cabinet separate from the file cabinet that contained the consent forms. This measure was to ensure that in the event of any disclosure of information regarding this study, the collected data and the consent of the individual could not be matched in order to gain identity of the participants.

Data Analysis

The strength of qualitative data analysis is the ability to be immediately involved in data analysis while the study is taking place (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The tapes were transcribed verbatim and field notes were recorded at the end of each interview as outlined by Miles and Huberman (1994). This method allows for the identification of themes and areas that require deeper inquiry either in follow-up interviews or in subsequent interviews with other participants. The intention is to make decisions regarding the depth of the study earlier in the process than later. Outlined below are the steps that were employed to analyze data for this study.

Coding

Qualitative methodologists recognize the importance and necessity of coding transcribed data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 2003; Huberman & Miles, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Coding refers to the process by which the abstract data is made clear by attaching chunks of the data to a code that makes some logical representation of the chunk being collected (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For example, a code may be developed called “doctoral training – career counseling,” this code may be attached to any data chunk that refers to career counseling the participant received while in doctoral training. Both interview transcripts and field notes were coded in order to maintain consistency

to my research methodology and gain greater insight into the data collected (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

The Matrix Approach for Analyzing Data

The data matrix acts as an organizational tool for the researcher to “see” the data as a combined element instead of various parts and pieces (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The matrix consists of the coded elements and data chunks categorized by the participants’ pseudonym (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Matrices allow the researcher to start viewing the data as a collection rather than separate entities, the goal is to find common themes across the participants and within the interviews. Two or more participants may give the same answer to a question, but those answers may not inform the researcher until the matrix shows where those answers connect with one another (Creswell, 2003).

For my study, the coded data was placed into matrices to consolidate and view the data as a collective unit intended on informing the research question (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Miles and Huberman identify several types of matrices for studies including time-ordered, conceptually ordered and narrative ordered (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The primary matrix for my data analysis was the conceptually ordered matrix or display (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The conceptual matrix acted as a major identifier for arranging the data collected into themes that exist central to and across transcribed data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This matrix allowed for concepts or themes that were not originally evident in the coding process. The concepts within the matrix helped to identify themes to include them in further data collection.

Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that the researcher must create an atmosphere of trustworthiness in order for the reader to determine if the information presented is accurately

portraying the data and is worth reading. The findings of this research are presented within the realm of validity or trustworthiness that Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

In addressing *credibility*, the researcher needs to present information that is accurate and presented by the participant (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To assist in ensuring credibility for this study, the participants were asked to be available for clarification of data once transcribing had been completed. Additionally, field notes were developed into a reflective journal which assisted in accurately portraying the mood, attitude and tone of the participant (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The reflective journal included the notes and other statements collected by the researcher during the interview process. Since the reflective journal also included my personal feelings regarding the interview and the participants, there may be a level of researcher subjectivity discovered in this process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The second area of concern as pointed out by Lincoln and Guba (1985) is the idea of *transferability*. This refers to the ability for the information presented being able to “fit” depending on the situation and its context. I addressed transferability by way of presenting findings that were developed to fit various settings and assist the reader in making that connection. Even though Miles and Huberman (1994) identify that the reader must make transferability decisions on their own, I feel that the identification of transferable contexts is still to some extent the responsibility of the researcher. By promoting the specifics of the individuals involved in the study without revealing their personal attributes, it is possible the reader can see how the participants may mirror their own context, situation or demographic (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In the next chapter, I have presented the data in such a way that the transfer of experiences can be observed within the readers’ own institution.

Thirdly, Lincoln and Guba (1985) identify *dependability* as the next concept in trustworthiness. The purpose of this aspect of trustworthiness is to ensure that the study will continue to “hold up” over a period of time and provide more input to future studies (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Dependability also presumes that the data is true to all aspects of the study including the research questions, conceptual framework, methodology and intent of study. In order to ensure that the data collected and subsequent analysis is aligned with dependability, I utilized a peer debriefer (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The peer-debriefer can include faculty and other students who, though aware of the research, can read and review the results of the data analysis and determine if the interpretation is true to the above mentioned aspects of dependability in research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994). For this study, I enlisted the assistance of a doctoral student in my graduate program as a peer debriefer. In addition, I served as the peer debriefer for my classmate. Together we assisted in each other’s study and provided another level of analysis to confirm dependability of the data collected.

Finally, Lincoln and Guba (1985) identify *confirmability* as their final concept of trustworthiness. Within the idea of confirmability, Miles and Huberman (1994) identify this as a level of “objectivity”. The level of confirmability of the study depends on the “the subjects and conditions of the inquiry” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) rather than the feelings or biases of the researcher. To ensure proper confirmability, I used my field notes as an “audit trail” to detail each step in my study to provide for ease and reliability of simulating the same study in the future. This provided a good record of how any subjective biases were identified in the process of the study and how future researchers can avoid similar areas of influence.

Delimitations

This is a qualitative study and only included interviews of new faculty at urban institutions. It was also delimited to new faculty who had teaching assistantship experience while in graduate school. Another delimiting factor is that this study only investigated new faculty perceptions of their experiences and training for faculty roles. This study did not take into account the actual, verifiable observed preparation techniques enlisted the participants graduate degree granting institutions.

Limitations

Within the qualitative research paradigm, Creswell (2003) suggested that there are limitations to a study that could be considered weaknesses to the overall study design. Although considered a significant aspect of a research study, the recognition of limitations assist in framing the context of the study and how the study was conducted (Creswell, 2003). Likewise, there were several limitations to this study which should be noted when considering implications for additional studies or using the findings in practice.

The small sample size of this study decreases the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the use of the findings for application to another urban college or university may not yield the same results as the experiences of the participants and their perceptions of the doctoral preparation process are unique and singular. However, the findings will add to the growing research and study on the preparation of doctoral students for faculty roles. Additionally, another limitation of the study was that all of the participants were from the same type of institution as opposed to comparing participants from two different types of colleges (e.g. a rural or flagship compared to an urban institution).

Likewise, the participants of this study were selected from a list of faculty provided by

the gate-keeper at each of the selected sites. This may be viewed as a limitation as the researcher did not have full-access to all possible participants that could be included in the study. Although the gate-keeper was cooperative, there is a chance that not all participants who could be eligible for the study were provided for possible contact.

Finally, the online screening survey used in this study does not allow for flexibility as it related to the identification of certain aspects of the participants TA experience. The online screening survey was used as a tool for selection yet the results may be a limitation due to the straightforward nature of the instrument.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceived relationship between new faculty experiences and their experiences as a teaching assistant (TAs) during their doctoral education. This investigation focused on the related tasks and responsibilities that participants had while working as TAs and how those experiences related to their perceptions of their preparation for the faculty role.

The primary research question guiding this study was: How do new faculty perceive their TA experience as a device to prepare them for a career as a faculty member? The secondary research questions were:

1. How does the TA experience influence the attitudes and opinions new faculty have regarding their new role as a faculty member?
2. What development of future faculty takes place while graduate students are in TA roles?
3. Does the TA experience provide an adequate training mechanism for new faculty entering the academy?
4. What opinions and attitudes do new faculty have towards their socialization and integration to the academy?

Overall the data indicates that new faculty are satisfied with their teaching assistantship experience as a device for training them for a faculty career. As data will reveal, new faculty also indicated that they wanted more exposure to the faculty work role while they were in

doctoral training. For example, new faculty did not feel prepared for many of the duties of faculty including advising undergraduates, management of graduate students and development of research agendas.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides detailed information related to the participants of this study including their education and details pertaining to their doctoral degree attainment. Furthermore, this section will identify particulars about their doctoral education and experience as a teaching assistant.

There were many similarities in the experiences of the participants and their time as TAs in their respective doctoral programs. The second section provides descriptive findings related to the participants experiences while in graduate school.

The final section will display the major topical themes that emerged during data analysis. Additionally this section will include experiences participants had with starting their faculty career, stress related to tenure, teaching and advising graduate students, struggling with time allocation and difficulties with creating a research agenda.

Participants

Data were gathered from 14 pre-tenure faculty members during the Spring of 2005. Participants included seven females and seven males at two public, research intensive universities (Carnegie, 2004). For this study, the selected sites will be identified as Suburban University (SU) and Downtown University (DU) to ensure anonymity of the participants and institutions.

SU is 30+ years old with undergraduate, graduate and medical education. SU offers programs and services related to student involvement including an honors program, study

abroad, and other support services. Comparatively, DU was founded in the early 1920's by the state legislature as a junior/community college. By the end of the 1930's, DU was a full-fledged undergraduate institution and later added graduate courses. Today, DU offers doctoral degrees and professional degrees in law, optometry, pharmacy, and social work.

All participants held the rank of assistant professor at the time of data collection and had been employed at either DU or SU for at least one year. Each study participant received a Doctorate of Philosophy from an accredited institution in the United States. Information in Tables 1 and 2 provides a synopsis of the study participants and their appropriate pseudonym. Following each table is a brief sketch of the participants educational experience prior to their current teaching positions.

Table 1
Participants at Suburban University (SU)

Name	PhD Location	Years as TA	Time at SU	Discipline Taught
Warren	Southwest, US	5 years	1 year	Social Sciences
Peter	Northeast, US	4 years	1 year	Business
Amanda	Great Lakes, US	4 years	2 years	Business
Brian	Northeast, US	2 years	3 years	Liberal Arts
Anne	Midwest, US	6 years	4 years	Liberal Arts
Patricia	Great Lakes, US	3 years	3 years	Business
Tom	South Central, US	3 years	2 years	Sciences

Warren completed his first year at SU after completing his PhD at a southwestern university. Warren completed his Masters and PhD at the same institution and was encouraged to serve as a TA as part of his doctoral enrollment which lasted for five years. His primary

academic interest is in the social sciences. As a TA he was primarily responsible for teaching classes, grading papers and supervising student labs when necessary.

Peter, an international scholar from eastern Europe, completed his PhD from a northeastern university in a business discipline. He came to the United States for the first time as a graduate student to begin his PhD program and immediately started his TA position. Peter was a TA for four years prior to starting his job at SU. He had completed one year as a faculty member at the time of the interview.

Amanda attended a doctoral program that required the teaching assistantship as part of enrollment. Her university and doctoral department in the Great Lakes region were well funded. She started her PhD program after working in the corporate environment for several years and left that career because of the uncertainty of her future in corporate industry. She had completed two years as a faculty member at the time of the interview.

Brian received his PhD after working in his primary industry for several years and accomplishing many personal goals. His primary TA responsibility was to develop a departmental activity that had not been in place at the university at the time. Brian also taught several courses and conducted lectures while as a TA. He served as a TA for two years before starting his career at SU. Brian has been a faculty member for three years.

Anne decided on the faculty career early on in her college career as an undergraduate. She was encouraged by many of her college professors to consider the faculty career and decided on doing so because of her intense desire to teach. Anne was a TA for six years because it was a program requirement for both her Master's and PhD program. She was the most experienced participant in this study as she was in the process of completing her fourth year as a faculty member.

Patricia considered the doctoral degree after several years of teaching in high schools and receiving her Master’s degree. She worked in industry for many years and was uncertain about the future and long-hours involved in her primary profession. She entered her doctoral program with a wealth of practical knowledge but not much interest in research or publishing. She had three years experience as a faculty member.

Tom enrolled in his doctoral program after forgoing the rigors of the medical profession. He enjoyed the research aspect of his primary discipline because of the opportunities for discovery and exploration. Tom served in the TA capacity for three years before starting his position with SU. Tom split his TA position with research and teaching responsibilities while in his doctoral program. He has completed two years as a faculty member.

Table 2
Participants at Suburban University (DU)

Name	PhD Location	Years as TA	Time at DU	Discipline Taught
Mike	Northeast, US	9 years	3 years	Sciences
Elizabeth	Northeast, US	6 years	1 year	Liberal Arts
Julian	Northeast, US	5 years	1 year	Liberal Arts
Rebecca	South Central, US	3 years	1 year	Social Sciences
Dawn	West Coast, US	6 years	2 years	Sciences
Edwin	Northwest, US	3 years	1 year	Liberal Arts
Shannon	Midwest, US	3 years	2 years	Business

Mike chose to pursue a doctoral degree after changes in his primary industry were not favorable for employment and growth. During his nine years as a Master’s and Doctoral student, Mike was a TA. As a TA he was primarily responsible for entry level classes yet he works almost exclusively with graduate students now. Mike worked in his primary industry part-time

while in doctoral training and working as a TA. He had the most experience of the faculty members at DU as he had been teaching professionally for three years at the time of the interview.

Elizabeth came from a family of educators and was destined to pursue an educational career almost from birth. Funding for scholarships and grants were very low at her doctoral program so she worked as a TA to pay for her education. She served as a TA for six years before starting her position at DU. She performed most of her TA duties at a community college that allowed TAs from her doctoral program to teach on their campus. She was in the process of completing her first year as a faculty member at the time of the interview.

Julian worked as a high school teacher while receiving his Masters degree and believed that his teaching experience led to the decision by his doctoral program to offer him a teaching assistantship. He was a TA for five years while completing his PhD and was completing his first year as a faculty member at DU. As a TA he was responsible for all duties of the courses, such as grading tests and assigning homework. By the end of his doctoral training he was a TA supervisor for a large section of his academic department.

Rebecca decided to pursue a doctoral degree after many years of working with the public in her primary industry. She worked full-time, attended school full-time and served as a TA during her doctoral training. Her only responsibilities as a TA were teaching several night courses during her doctoral training and meeting with faculty regarding her students' progress. Rebecca maintained a very rigorous schedule for three years as a TA and was in the middle of her first year as a faculty member.

Dawn, an international scholar, was educated in the United States for most of her post-secondary education. During her doctoral training, Dawn served as a teaching assistant to

supplement her income. Dawn chose the faculty career as both an opportunity to stay in the United States and as a career that would allow her to do more research in a well-funded environment. She had completed two years of employment at DU.

Edwin earned his PhD after several years of traveling abroad and learning the culture and history of his chosen discipline. He chose to become a faculty member to pursue additional research opportunities and because of the various travel opportunities involved in his academic area of research. Edwin served as a TA for three years while studying at a Northwest university. He was completing his first year at the time of the interview.

Shannon became a faculty member after being exposed to academia as a corporate trainer. Although she holds an undergraduate degree in a liberal arts discipline, she was attracted to the corporate world for the possibility of a greater salary. The downfall of the dot com industry led her to consider higher education which led to her being involved in research related to her primary discipline. She was a TA for three years after earning that status through a selection process within her doctoral program. She was in the process of completing her second year as a faculty member.

Anticipatory Socialization: Doctoral Training and Teaching Assistantships

Tice et al. (1998) observed that for all of the positive aspects involved in teaching assistantships, the only beneficial outcome were more productive teacher assistants and not better trained future faculty. The participants of this study echoed the Tice et al. finding by indicating that although their TA experience was insightful it was not complete as they experienced some difficulties during their first year(s) as a faculty member. Participants felt that tasks such as research development and commitment to publishing were not developed while

completing their doctoral degree. Specifically, participants indicated that they were only comfortable as teachers when they started their careers.

By observing faculty, doctoral students are able to develop some of the perceptions of faculty life by witnessing some of the day-to-day tasks of faculty members (Bess, 1978). It is possible that although doctoral students who do not serve as TAs are aware of the tasks of the faculty member, they may not be truly prepared unless they have more in-depth exposure to the faculty role (Austin, 2002b; Tice et al., 1998). The exposure to the faculty role for graduate students usually occurs while they serve as teaching assistants (Weimer et al., 1989).

All of the participants of this study were teaching assistants during their doctoral training. The responsibilities of a TA vary, but can be generalized as providing service to the university through assisting with senior faculty research, supporting faculty in and out of the classroom (i.e. teaching or co-teaching) and other administrative tasks within the academic department (Weimer et al., 1989). Even though the purpose of the teaching assistantship is to provide service to the university, many participants felt that they were able to confirm or disprove some of the perceptions they had about the faculty work role.

Although the participants in this study valued their TA experience, they were hesitant to classify the experience as perfect. Furthermore, the participants identified their experiences as TAs as adequate in preparing them for some of the responsibilities inherent in the faculty career and at the same time lacking in some areas related to the faculty career. Specifically in relationship to anticipatory socialization, the experiences of the participants will illustrate the findings of Gaff (2002) that the teaching assistantship has two goals: an exploration of the academic discipline for the TA and, secondly training of the TA for the faculty role. Thus, this

section is framed in those two categories to demonstrate the descriptive findings related to anticipatory socialization.

Choosing the Faculty Career

Ten of the fourteen participants were motivated and drawn to the faculty career because of their intense love of their subject matter and how they could contribute research to their particular discipline. The pursuit of the faculty career for many doctoral students is a result of extreme interest in solving problems related to their academic subject area and a sense of providing an educational service to the community at large (Golde & Dore, 2001).

All of the participants were adamant about their own love of teaching and how that related to their pursuit of the faculty career. In some cases, though the decision to enter the faculty career was by encouragement from others such as Amanda's (2nd year faculty member at SU) professor:

When I was completing [my] Master's degree, I had a faculty member who also liked to play tennis. I was finished by this point and we were playing tennis one day and he told me, "don't you want this life when you are free to play tennis in the afternoon." So I went back to him and said, you know I am really serious about applying to PhD programs, where do you suggest I go. He gave me a list of schools because he knew my interest was in [specific discipline] and he gave me a list of schools that he thought the professors there were really great and that's how I applied.

Anne (4th year faculty member at SU) had a similar experience as she considered the faculty career early in her undergraduate education but did not seriously consider the possibility of such until she was graduating from college:

I went and talked to one of the faculty members and said you know I am really thinking about being a college professor. I like teaching [subject] but I want to teach students that want to be there. And she was so excited and said "Oh it's the greatest job in the world, it's as much fun as sniffing glue" she said. She said eventually it's detrimental to your health but at the time it's a lot of fun. So I decided, and I talked to a few other professors and a couple of other people and decided that was where I wanted to go...so from the time I was a sophomore year at Bachelor's degree, I pretty much knew that I wanted to go on to do the PhD. There were some other things that attracted it to me as well. This was a very stable job. You got tenure and you didn't get laid off. You didn't have to look for work every six months, that appealed to me as well.

Both Dawn and Peter as international scholars chose the faculty career as an opportunity to be employed in the United States. Peter entered the United States for the first time as a graduate student whereas Dawn received all of her degrees from US institutions and saw the faculty career as a way to legally stay in the US. Many international scholars view the faculty career as an opportunity to remain legally in the United States (Thomas, 2002).

Graduate School Environment

The participants' graduate school environment varied based on the academic discipline and the funding for the department. Many of the participants viewed their graduate school environment as supportive and helpful. With regard to the involvement of the participants and their interactions with other TAs, nine of the fourteen participants reflected that they were very collegial with the other TAs in the department and all of the TAs felt somewhat responsible for each others' survival in the process. Edwin (1st year faculty member at DU) experienced a support system that revolved around the interactions with the other TAs within the department:

All the TAs in the department shared this dingy little office. There were 5 tables and 10 TAs in the department so we could never actually all fit in there at the same time. We would normally meet informally as we were grading tests and talking about...I'm afraid to admit this, how bad our students were and just the funny stuff that happened in class. We also would de-stress and complain about senior faculty. It was like we were in the trenches together so we could commiserate and support each other at the same time.

Amanda had a slightly negative experience as she reflected upon a change in her graduate programs' leadership. Her new program chair changed the profile of students entering the department which may have caused differences in the relationship the TAs had with each other:

Then we got a new doctoral director of the program and he wanted to raise the bar academically so he made it tougher to get in, and in doing so, I don't know what this means, we had a lot more Asians coming in, they must be smarter or something. These were brilliant people and they were, but they didn't have the same cultural backgrounds and interests...I mean they would not have gone to a wine tasting. So it really changed to be much more competitive, and people didn't help people out and it was much more cut-throat. We fought to keep that encouraging atmosphere. I mean we shared notes and covered for people when someone was out, it was very supportive. The culture thing, and I am not saying that it was the Asian students fault, but it changed to a more competitive environment.

For example, Rebecca was extremely distant in relationship to the collegial nature of the department and interacting with other doctoral students and TAs. She was employed full-time, enrolled in classes full-time and taught at least one class per semester that met at night. Rebecca also made every effort to stay involved with the department and other TAs both professionally

and socially, yet it was difficult due to her work schedule. The interactions of graduate students and TAs during their doctoral training is beneficial to their overall development as they are able to develop the propensity to perform in a collegial manner and work with other colleagues (Tice et al., 1998).

Entry into Graduate School and TA Positions

The shortage of faculty (Austin, 2002b) and unwillingness of colleges and universities to hire adjunct faculty has created a greater dependence on TAs as primary instructors for many entry-level undergraduate courses (LaPidus, 1997a; Nyquist et al., 1999; Smallwood, 2004b). Universities attracting doctoral students for academic study often use the teaching assistantship as a dual means to an end; the university can save money by employing TAs in desperately needed adjunct positions and the incoming doctoral student can “work off” some of their debt to the university through the TA position (Tice et al., 1998; Weimer et al., 1989). Additionally, many doctoral programs require TA employment from their students to assist in preparing them to become faculty and ensure their availability to faculty who may need assistance for research and teaching responsibilities (Tice et al., 1998). Seven of the fourteen participants were required to serve as TAs in order to be enrolled in their doctoral programs. Peter was required to serve in a TA capacity in order to receive admittance into the doctoral program. The requirement of the teaching assistantship for Peter was also beneficial because he could also earn an income while attending graduate school.

For others the opportunity to serve as a teaching assistant was necessary as they would not have been able to attend graduate school without the financial assistance of the teaching assistantship. Although only four of the fourteen participants admitted that they would not have pursued a doctoral degree without the benefit of the teaching assistantship, many other

participants felt that their decision to attend their doctoral program was influenced by funds earned from the teaching assistantship. Elizabeth (1st year faculty member at DU) attended an institution that offered very few stipends, grants and scholarships but did encourage students to become TAs in order to assist with their tuition and fees:

They didn't have a lot of funding at [graduate school] so most of us paid our way through by teaching either as adjuncts or with teaching fellowships.

Preparation for the TA Role

Only nine of the fourteen participants were required to enroll in some form of workshop, practicum or discussion course that assisted in their preparation for the TA work role. The preparation for the TA work role for many of the participants proved to be beneficial as they were introduced to teaching pedagogy and methods for conducting class lectures, preparing syllabi and grading papers. Interestingly enough though, the range of preparation for the TA work role among participants ranged from university supported training to no training that required the individual to train him/herself. Subsequently, the TA training experiences of the participants are divided into three sections below.

Formal TA training. Among the fourteen participants six indicated that they were involved in a formal program of TA training for their work role. This included workshops, seminars and specific sessions related to the development of their TA training. Anne was involved in a formal training session and valued the experience as it assisted in her understanding of her responsibilities as a teaching assistant:

We had a whole course that prepared us. We had a five week summer course that prepared us to be teachers starting in the fall. So there was a lot of that. And in the first year we worked with a faculty member as a mentor.

Peter also participated in a summer course prior to his first semester as a teaching assistant which allowed him to meet other TAs and discuss his role before classes actually started in the fall semester of his first year in doctoral training. Warren (1st year faculty member at SU) was also enrolled in a workshop that included additional observation by a faculty member:

There was one class that all graduate students had to take, it was a pro-sem [professional seminar] class and we got some exposure on how being a TA would help prepare you for being a teacher later on or prepare you for a faculty position. But that was it. Then we had another class that was a teaching pedagogy class. Learning how to teach. So that class, the faculty member would observe me part of the time, I would prepare some lectures and he would critique me. It was a one hour class and I did that one semester.

Semi-structured TA training. For a few of the participants, the TA training offered was suggested but not required for serving as a TA in the department. Shannon (2nd year faculty member at DU) attended workshops offered by her academic department the semester prior to becoming a TA:

We didn't have a course that was listed in the course catalog, but if you wanted to be a TA, which was the greatest thing in the world at my school because of all the perks that you got, then you met with the professors at their pro-sem [professional seminar] classes once a month, on Thursday evenings for like 3 hours. They would go over materials like developing a syllabus, writing a grade evaluation if a student contested a grade, grade a paper. I was used to correcting corporate memos which needed to be quick, to the point and interesting enough that people would pay attention to it. But when I went to the one

workshop about grading college papers, I was stunned at what professors look at and how they grade the students' papers.

Informal/no TA training. In other cases, some participants related their experiences as a new doctoral student starting their teaching assistantship with no training or preparation by the university before performing in their first class. Many of the participants who shared this experience were left on their own to develop their courses and materials. Tom (2nd year faculty member at SU) felt that he was “thrown into the fire” his first semester as a TA:

That whole first semester was one new experience right after another. They told us to get to campus about a week before classes started to meet with professors and stuff like that. I met with the professor who was the major on the course I was teaching and he was like – “here is last year’s syllabus and here is the instructor’s textbook.” That was it. That was my training. I had a week to develop a course and figure all of that out and this was my first time teaching anything.

Mike (3rd year faculty member at DU) experienced a similar situation during his first semester as he was primarily responsible for a lab that had a teaching component:

There was no preparation at all. It was just...I had been through the course at the same institution so I sort of mimicked the kind of instruction and style of the person who taught me, and that was also a TA. So there was no study or review. There was no direction or leadership except what you got...there was a faculty member who was in charge of the course who would give instruction as to what to do in the lab. There was no pedagogical teaching techniques going on.

Findings of this study correlate with Black and Bonwell's (1991) study which noted that teaching assistants rarely receive adequate training, support and guidance during their first semester serving as a TA in academia.

Stress as a Teaching Assistant

Participants felt that there was a certain amount of pressure involved in being a teaching assistant. Although the pressure is not exactly the same as for faculty, participants indicated that they experienced some stress as they were asked to perform important tasks, primarily teaching, while maintaining their own agendas to complete their own doctoral program. Dawn (2nd year faculty member at DU) explained how she had many responsibilities which she had to manage, especially at the end of the semester:

It was really, really hard during end of semester. We had a lot of paperwork and tests and papers and other exams that had to be completed. We had our own work we had to do, but that was not as important as finishing the students' grading. We always felt like, you know, we had more to do but you felt divided, separated, not sure exact word, still working on some parts of my English after all these years. But we wanted to finish our work for PhD but then we had to turn grades in and meet sometimes with students. It was just hard.

Carroll (1980) found in his research that teaching assistants should have some exposure to the rigors of faculty life prior to and during their employment as a TA in order to develop a better sense of the pressure involved in the position. Many programs that train TAs are unstructured and/or vary from semester to semester as to what information is conveyed to TAs during the course of the training program (Black & Bonwell, 1991; Carroll, 1980). The lack of training may discourage TAs from continuing in that role or becoming faculty after their doctoral

training. Tom pointed directly to a lack of training program for the teaching assistantship as a primary cause of his apprehension and nervousness about his new role as a TA once he started his doctoral program:

It was really challenging at first because we really didn't have any training or seminars. As I said before, the interaction with the professor who was over the course was very informal and short so you were really a fish out of water when you started that first semester. Then it got to be easier as it went along, but that first semester as a TA was like my first semester as a faculty member. You think you are prepared, but then you just aren't.

TA Responsibilities

Participants explained that they were primarily responsible for teaching and teaching related functions during their TA experiences. All of the participants explained that they had some responsibility for developing course content and managing the overall design of the courses they were responsible for. Anne was initially overwhelmed with the amount of work involved in the TA function:

Our responsibilities as TAs were we taught two classes. We were very much on our own. We developed our own curriculums, syllabi, developed our own handouts, chose our textbooks, did everything on our own. So we had full responsibility for two classes each semester.

Many of the participants had additional responsibilities as they progressed in their education. Julian (1st year faculty member at DU) was given responsibility of managing other teaching assistants as he became recognized for his teaching competency:

All of us who taught met on a regular basis, we shared the responsibility of writing the test, of coming up with listening activities. All of those components we had a stake in the development of the materials and we met on a regular basis all throughout the semester. Pretty much every course is like that there. And we met under the guidance of a faculty member. I was able largely due to my prior experience to be a co-coordinator by my second year there. That was a good experience there.

Amanda's experience was unique as she became responsible for several sections of a course and the administration of other TAs in her academic department:

...so my advisor got me a job being the head TA for this multi-course thing, like a 16 section deal. That was hell. That was really not fun, I mean I put in 40 hours a week and I was still working on my dissertation. So actually twice I broke down crying in front of my chair [person] I mean I'm a girl, we cry when we are stressed. I actually quit once, I mean I was like "I can't do this, I wasn't prepared for this and I can't imagine how this will help me". There were people issues. There were other TAs that were unmotivated and I was getting complaints about them from undergraduate students. So that was a bad year.

Other participants indicated that they were also given greater responsibilities as they became more comfortable in their role as a TA.

Discussions of the Faculty Career

As much as the teaching assistantship is a preparation for the faculty career, the discussions that take place among doctoral students who serve as TAs and faculty in the department contribute greatly to positive experiences as the new faculty member enters academia (Austin, 2002a). Only five of the participants indicated that they had in-depth discussions with

faculty about their future and what they should do to prepare for what they may experience in the faculty work role. Some of the participants, such as Elizabeth relied upon other classmates to prepare for making the transition from doctoral student/TA to faculty member:

We talked a lot about that amongst ourselves at [graduate school]. We have a really high placement rate at [graduate school] partly because we all leave graduate school with six years of teaching experience. But also our program is pretty rigorous. So we were always talking about student evaluations and how those would look. We were always talking about collecting samples of student work. We were always talking about getting good letters of observation. Partly because we started with the practicum and that conversation was in place regarding pre-professional practice.

Mike's experience was confined to a once-a-year weekend seminar that included some elements of discussing the faculty career:

The department would have research seminars where you could go off site and to a local state park and they would have maybe for only one or two hours, a weekend retreat, one or two hours devoted towards career preparation. Not a whole lot you could get in a two hour class.

Anne felt that the discussion of the faculty career was much more informal in comparison to the formalized structure of the TA training they were exposed to at the beginning of their doctoral programs:

Compared to the TA workshop seminar in our department, there wasn't anything else that just talked about the faculty career...I don't think I actually remember any thing like - "When you become a faculty member you need to do this". There was just a lot of in the

hall kind of talking. Stuff like...oh keep your mouth shut for the first whole year...don't say anything until you figure out who has what power, etcetera. There wasn't any kind of official kind of workshop like that.

Dawn, Peter, Amanda, Tom and Julian reflected on their experiences and how the discussion of their future as a faculty member occurred primarily with their dissertation advisor, especially regarding what to expect once they joined the faculty ranks. Tom spoke about his relationship with his dissertation advisor as essential to his success so far:

Yeah...I mean it was difficult but I had an amazing dissertation advisor at [graduate school] she was so patient and young too. I was not her first doctoral student but I knew that she hadn't done more than ten or so students because she didn't have tenure yet...I don't think...but she was very beneficial to me. We would talk about some things to expect once I got in and how I should observe what was going on because many of the same personalities I would see again, no matter what university I ended up at and she was right, because they have some...well....let me just say...she was the one that helped the most.

Only seven of the fourteen participants indicated that they discussed the job market with their dissertation advisor. Data analysis revealed that the dissertation advisor appeared to be the strongest link that participants had in preparing for the job search. Patricia (3rd year faculty member at SU) spoke about her interaction with her dissertation advisor and the job market:

We spoke with other faculty probably once a week, but I talked to my dissertation advisor like two or three times a week when I was getting closer to graduation. Since she knew that I wanted to get a job in academia she would always send me tips and information about applying for the job. I remember one time she sent me about five or six job

postings and I was like a year before finishing the dissertation and I was like “Dr. [name], why are you sending me all of these now?” She told me that it was never too early to look at job postings so you know what you are going into. It was good to see what departments were looking for at the time and I think it helped me prepare to search for the job and then get the job here at [name of institution].

Support From Others

Participants indicated that the teaching assistantship in many ways was a group effort as they looked to other students for support and assistance in performing as a TA and finishing their graduate program. Edwin had an informal structure and network of support from other TAs in the department:

There were probably four or five of us that worked together all the time. I mean we were stuck in that one little office we had no choice [laughs]. But there were maybe two of the five that we would always meet and go over stuff together and discuss what was going on with our students, what was going on with our research and we all had classes together. It was funny because even though the department was fairly large, the other professors kind of identified us as one person because we always worked together. I remember thinking being a TA is like being a hall monitor in junior high school, where you had some responsibility that the other students didn't have and they hated you for it...so the only people that could understand you were the other hall monitors...I don't know if that was just me...but I looked at the other TAs as my primary support, really.

For other participants the level of support was more formal in structure. At Anne's graduate program, the graduate students and TAs created a support group to assist in preparing for life as a faculty member:

...a lot of that was kind of self motivated. It seemed to me that we had a fairly strong graduate student body in that department we had [acronym] which was [name of group] and we elected officers for that and did fund-raisers and did kind of service work for that organization. We had one faculty member who was supposed to be the Supervisor of the group and for four years we never saw this person. I mean we just did what we thought we needed to do. And we would have guests, we would host brown-bag lunches for other graduate students and just do stuff that we wanted. So we fell on tradition that we felt like we needed something we just did that for ourselves. And so every year the people that went out on the job market held...got together and did all their job market stuff together. And we had people read letters and re-read letters and vitas and you know we helped each other out preparing their materials for the job market. Much of that was done without any kind of faculty intervention. We just felt that we needed some help with this and we just did it ourselves.

Elizabeth's experience was much more formal in nature as the department provided resources to create a more broad-reaching support network among TAs:

Our situation was relatively unique in that so many of us were doing this that it became a regular conversation we would participate even as graduate students in....pedagogy conferences and such. There was a real conversation at [institution] about our role. There was an adjunct newsletter, an adjunct organization. It was a culture that really thought about your role as an intern quite a bit. So there was a lot of talk about how it prepared you to be a part of a department or how it didn't prepare you to be part of a department.

Tice et al. (1998) suggested that academic departments create opportunities for TAs to interact with each other along with providing faculty mentors for them to facilitate positive TA

development. The exposure of collaboration and working with others in what is often thought of as a solitary profession is key in assisting in the training and development of TAs with faculty aspirations (Nyquist et al., 1989; Tice et al., 1998; Weimer et al., 1989).

Overall TA Experience

When asked to describe the teaching assistantship in levels of benefit to their training and preparation for the faculty role, thirteen of the fourteen participants were in guarded agreement that the TA experience was beneficial. Julian was completely satisfied with his teaching assistantship as a preparation tool for his position as a faculty member. He attributed some of the satisfaction to his experience as a TA while in his Master's program and his experience as a high school teacher prior to attending graduate school:

It was excellent training. I feel that I was exposed to the latest methods and the very effective methods. I had that training. I was familiar with the theory from my Masters and I had practiced those methods to some extent as a high school teacher. But the high school was very grammar oriented and communication was at the service of grammar. So I guess you could say I lacked the confidence in the communicative approach in teaching it myself fully. [Graduate program] enabled me to do that more because that is the way it was done there.

The other thirteen participants were guarded in their analysis of the benefit of the TA experience because they felt that experience was not complete in its preparation for the faculty career. Although many of the participants viewed the TA experience as primarily an opportunity to make money while attending graduate school or fulfill admission requirements of the doctoral program, they also viewed the teaching assistantship as a preparation tool for a faculty career. In

the sub-sections below are the specific areas that the thirteen participants felt that the teaching assistantship did not prepare them for.

Management of students. Mike and Shannon indicated that the teaching assistantship did not prepare them for managing students when they started their faculty careers. Specifically, they were not prepared for the management of graduate students and as the next section will show, the preparation of managing graduate students was a major theme developed from data analysis. In addition Shannon, voiced concerns relative to the management of undergraduate students outside of the classroom environment:

I tell you one thing that I didn't experience as a TA was managing undergraduate students with all of the extra demands of office hours, meetings, departmental clubs and other campus events. I didn't have to do any of that when I was a TA because I still had my own dissertation and classes to work on, so when I became faculty I was bombarded with the additional demands of all of the extra stuff. I want to do everything that the students want me to do but I feel like I can't. It's almost like the undergraduate students see a new young faculty member and they gravitate to them to fill a void...maybe the full faculty don't seem approachable or just say no...I always feel like the undergraduates want and need more.

Exposure to committee responsibilities. Warren and Dawn did not feel particularly prepared for the demands of working on faculty committees and ways to involve that responsibility into their day-to-day responsibilities. Warren viewed the committee responsibilities as important but struggled with how to operationalize that responsibility:

I really had no training at all, I wasn't prepared at all for any of the activities outside of teaching like the committee work and those kind of things because you don't really do

that as a graduate student. You were not participating in faculty committees because you are not faculty yet. So I didn't know anything about how that was going to work or what kind of service activities I was going to have to do.

Scrutiny from senior faculty. Tom, Elizabeth and Anne were most concerned with their lack of training for the “intense scrutiny” they experienced in their first year as faculty. Although they acknowledged that they knew they would be under the microscope, they were not altogether prepared for how to perform under that particular type of pressure. Even though Elizabeth felt much more comfortable in her role as a faculty member, she still felt that she was being judged on everything she did:

I guess there is a little bit less room for error. A lot less room for winging it and running by the seat of your pants. I think your own research demands have to be recalibrated to the amount of time you spend prepping for class or grading papers or so on and so forth. Really and just there is just scrutiny on absolutely everything you do, the grades you give, the rubrics you use, the assignments you design...that everything that you do needs to be ready for review the first time you do it.

Anne felt similarly as she was not at all prepared for the scrutiny:

I felt like I was being evaluated all the time. Someone was looking over my shoulder all the time and in some ways they were. I wasn't really prepared for that feeling of insecurity. I left graduate school feeling pretty capable and sure of myself and maybe that was unrealistic. But graduate school prepared me well to be a good graduate student. So by the time I was done, I was very, very good at that. And I thought of myself like that...and other graduate students came to me for advice. But when I started here, I felt

very fresh and green and a novice. I felt like I was being evaluated all the time, in ways that I just wasn't prepared to feel that way again.

Commitment to research. Patricia and Peter felt that they did not develop a strong commitment to research during the teaching assistantship. Although they recognized the importance of research while serving as a TA, the demands of the position as well as the requirements of their own doctoral programs lessened the amount of time and effort spent on developing new research while in their graduate programs. Patricia wanted to have greater exposure to publishing methodology while serving as a TA:

I knew going in that it would be tough because I was a parent and I had other responsibilities. The TA position was my job while I was in school but I didn't really get the sense that what I was doing was helping me develop any research plans or goals. My field is operational in nature so to come into a research university and be expected to publish for me was scary because I really didn't do that before and I am still struggling with it.

Immediate stress of the faculty role. Many studies have identified feelings of stress experienced by new faculty (e.g. Gates, 2000; Gmelch et al., 1986; Olsen, 1993; Sorcinelli, 1992; Thompson & Dey, 1998), yet it was the immediate feelings of stress that Edwin and Rebecca were not prepared for. The assumption that the completion of the doctoral degree was a temporary end of pressure was experienced specifically by Rebecca:

Ironically I thought that once I got an academic job, life would be free and easy...great I can read books all day. I think that...I value my practitioner experience for the organization and time management to work out the very regimented schedule that I have because as a new faculty member I am finding that self discipline is what will keep me

from day one on my agenda to get tenure to succeed here. The level of stress I would say now is higher than when I was in graduate school.

Immediate publishing requirements. All of the participants indicated that they were extremely concerned with their publishing requirements and felt a great deal of stress related to completing the goals they set for themselves. Brian and Warren did not feel that they had been prepared fully to immediately delve into publishing and research when starting their faculty careers. Warren attributes his experience to receiving bad advice:

I guess I also got some bad advice on how to manage your career. In terms of the publication expectation here, we have quite an ambitious publications expectation. I was a little bit blind-sided by it and I have a lot to do now. I got to get caught up. I wasn't prepared along those lines.

Brian (3rd year faculty member at SU) felt considerable amount of stress regarding his publishing requirements as he has struggled to understand the relationship of publishing to his day-to-day responsibilities:

[Discipline] is very hands-on. You can't teach a student to do this without getting in there and showing them how. We have textbooks and other guides but the industry changes so much that it is always out-dated. I know that I have to publish and I work on it daily, but I can't sacrifice the teaching and training part for the research part when the students expect to be prepared to be a [occupation] when they finish.

Major Themes: TA Training and the Disconnect of Faculty Life

The experiences of new faculty were revealed through eight primary themes that emphasized the relationship between the TA experience and the first year(s) as a faculty member. Themes were divided into two categories: positive aspects of the TA experience and

negative aspects of the TA experience. The positive aspects of the TA experience as a training tool for a future career as faculty were: 1) participants were comfortable in the classroom as a new professor; 2) participants were prepared for many of the classroom related duties of faculty life; and 3) participants were better prepared to cope with the realities of faculty life.

The negative aspects of the participants' TA experience as a training tool for a future career as faculty were: 1) participants had little or no training to advise/teach/manage/support graduate students; 2) participants were overwhelmed with the vagueness of the tenure process; 3) participants' assumptions of the faculty career had changed little until they started their career as a faculty member; 4) participants experienced a lack of direction in the first year of faculty service; and 5) participants were not prepared for the isolation/stress involved in the faculty career.

Positive Aspects of the Teaching Assistant Experience

In relationship to this research study, the positive aspects of the TA training experience for participants seem to benefit the level of comfort and confidence new faculty felt in the classroom. Likewise, the next section explains the descriptive findings related to the participants comfort in the classroom, preparation for classroom related activities and the confidence participants felt as they coped with the realities of faculty life.

Comfort in the Classroom

All of the participants discussed their increased level of comfort as a result of working as a teaching assistant in their doctoral program. Shannon et al. (1998) and Weimer et al. (1989) found that new members of the academy are aware of how important research and publishing are to gaining tenure and they are also aware of how crucial teaching is to their professional

responsibilities as well. Likewise, the participants of this study shared their experiences of being in the classroom. Elizabeth viewed the TA experience as positive in many aspects:

I think there were some things that were much, much easier. It wasn't hard at all to establish my authority. You walk into the room and say "I'm Dr. [name]" and there's silence. So in some ways...and to be able to say that I have taught this for six years, to have that authority is very comfortable. To not have this be the first syllabus that I had created, and not have it be the first class that was entirely my own was incredibly comforting.

Anne was very confident in her abilities to perform some of the teaching functions required of new faculty:

The stuff that I did as a grad student, I can do now with my hands tied behind my back and my eyes closed and blindfolded and in my sleep. I mean I can prepare class syllabi, teach, pick textbooks all that kind of stuff that I did as a grad student that I am great at.

Peter (1st year faculty member at SU) found a level of confidence after completing his teaching assistantship experience and although admittedly was nervous about his English speaking skills, felt much more comfortable in front of the class after completing his first semester as a professor:

You are completely scared and completely terrified. But to some extent the fast exposure to teaching and the teaching experience makes you stronger person because it helps you immediately. Like you may not learn much your first teaching semester because you are getting used to it, but then you start moving along and then you realize that you are learning many things in teaching and how to do things and how to perform. You start

telling yourself that yes I can do it. You start gaining a lot of self confidence in the process. You talk to people more and feel more comfortable.

Shannon relayed how her teaching responsibilities provided solace during her first month of employment:

In the midst of everything going on, I found some comfort in the teaching. That I knew I could control. I am not a dramatic person, but it felt like everything, everything was just out of order. I couldn't get a key to the building so I couldn't come in early, I couldn't get my computer fixed so I was lugging around that old thing [points to laptop computer] and they were still trying to rush my paperwork though during the first week of classes so I could get paid...so the teaching was really an escape and I felt comfortable because of the teaching I did before.

Comfort in Classroom Related Activities

Nine of the fourteen participants were also comfortable with their level of preparation and exposure to some of the additional duties involved in classroom management. Specifically, participants were satisfied that they were able to produce documents for classes and develop meaningful connections to the literature students were reading and the assignments created. Tom was especially proud of some of the comments he received from students regarding his teaching methods and classroom assignments:

One of the things that I think the TA helped me with was really knowing what works and doesn't really work with the students. I can make a handout and do a practice test very easily now because I had the TA experience. So in that area, yeah, I am pretty comfortable. I have had students tell me after class that I explained some things to them

better than what their high school [discipline] teacher explained to them. That makes you feel good that you are having some impact on their lives.

Peter was confident in his teaching methodology but still collected feedback from students during his first year of teaching to make sure he was reaching them:

I would have one-minute papers at the end of the class for them to write down what they think were the most important things in the class and what they think they still had questions about and what things they thought I could do better explaining. Then next class I would start the discussion with things that they wrote on the papers from a week before. And they liked that. I had the feedback and then I could look at it and see what I needed to do better and if my English was getting any better.

Julian was encouraged by the amount of responsibility the faculty member has over the instructional materials he chooses for his classes. He credits the exposure to various types of textbooks while serving as a TA as an additional benefit in his role as a faculty member:

Having control over content. As a teaching assistant, others selected the text that were used, others came up with the syllabus. Sometimes we were involved in the tests and materials that were used but we didn't have control over the course per se. Being a full time faculty member it's a greater responsibility. I have to know what all the texts are and take a look at them and choose what I feel is best for my students but at the same time, I have a lot more control. So that's a big difference.

Better Prepared to Deal with Realities of Faculty Life

For the participants, the teaching assistantship experience proved to assist them in coping with the aspects of the faculty work role that for many new faculty becomes overwhelming (Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998). All of the participants felt that they approached the

position with much more confidence because of their teaching assistantship experience. Patricia noted, “I can’t imagine what this would have been like if I had not been a TA before. I was stressed out, don’t get me wrong, but I would have been a wreck if I hadn’t been a TA.” The participants related their preparation for the realities of the faculty work role in two specific areas: the allocation of time to specific tasks and developing a research agenda as soon as they started their faculty career.

Time allocation. Many new faculty make a direct correlation between time spent on research and writing to the amount of time spent on those tasks (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992). Although the new faculty member may complete their research or edit a journal article for submission, they are more likely to feel successful if they are able to structure their time to complete the project without much interruption and delay (Gates, 2000; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992). For seven of the study participants, the recognition of the importance of trying to develop disciplined time agendas was an aspect first realized while serving as a TA. Shannon knew that developing a system was an important step when entering the academy as a faculty member:

I watched other faculty members when I was in the department and they would all mention “research time” or “writing” but none of them were in the office or even on campus. It wasn’t until I started here that I knew exactly what they meant. Like I knew that I would have to commit time to research when I came here to interview, I mean this is a research institution so that was a given. I still thought that I could do that in the office with the door closed and no one would bother me...wrong...so my research time is off campus.

Elizabeth also knew coming in that time allocated to research and writing was important even though she is still developing a plan to do so:

I'm still working that out. The one thing I have had to do is really segregate my time between teaching days and research days and really dedicate the days when I am not on campus to writing and research and not let anything...and be really ferocious in guarding those days. I have also put little silly high school things in place like homework time where I grade five papers a night instead of waiting to try to do them all the day before they are to be handed back. So again I don't have to dedicate a research day to grading papers. If anybody has that figured out where they have a 2-2 teaching load and not be swamped please tell them to contact me [laughs].

Amanda's experience was quite different than all of the other participants. She had been forewarned to devote time to publishing and research and she negotiated a better contract upon entry to SU:

I negotiated a 3-0 teaching load where I teach three classes in the Fall and none in the Spring. I did that for the first year. Making that my teaching semester was great because when the spring came I had the spring off for research, I got my dissertation out, I got three papers out. Because teaching takes so much away from your research. I love the teaching, but it takes so much away from your research.

Developing a research agenda. Austin (2002b) reported that new faculty are susceptible to developing stress related to gaining tenure, particularly publishing and research requirements. By developing the importance of self-initiated research among doctoral students and those that are TAs, then there is a possibility that the stress of new faculty could be lessened when they enter the academy (Austin, 2002b; Tice et al., 1998). Ten of the fourteen participants indicated that their research agendas were developed due in large part to their teaching assistantship

experiences. Dawn was exposed to research early as she spent a significant amount of her time while a TA developing a research agenda:

It was not difficult starting the research that I was interested in doing. I was much more ready to approach the research because I was doing that while I was TA. The TAs that I worked with would talk about research, what we were doing, what we were going to do when we became faculty. Yeah...we did a lot for the research and working on the research part of what we would do when we became teachers. I think I was ready for that because I really wanted to do the research when I got here. So it was not hard to make transition to that part of my job.

Even though Mike was immediately given five PhD students at the beginning of his faculty job, he was quite aware of his research plans when he started his faculty career:

When I first came here...I had a vision of where my research wanted to go, but it was a high level one but now I have five students, I had to work out how they all fit in this mosaic of a research plan. Now I think I have their individual areas partitioned well so that they can work on their own segment of it and still contribute to the overall research goal. I just needed a year or two to try and figure out how this was going to work with all these students.

Brian and Patricia were most concerned about the research agendas because of the vocational aspects of their disciplines and how they would develop research to satisfy the requirements of the institution. Even though many participants were satisfied that the TA experience helped them understand what tasks were important for new faculty, it did not necessarily translate to the faculty member performing those tasks as soon as they entered academia. Warren related his experience with developing the research agenda:

...from May until August and I am going to research and churn it out, churn it out. I mean I knew coming in that I would need to get on the research track pretty quickly but I just was told the wrong thing that I had plenty of time and I think I faltered in that aspect. There is a lot of disarray in our department so I really can't get caught up in that if I plan to complete my research agenda. I'm just behind right now and I wish I would have put more irons in the fire in terms of publication much earlier.

Overall the participants were satisfied with the outcome of their teaching assistantship as a prelude to their entry into the faculty work role. The preceding themes were essential for the participants success so far in their faculty career. Inasmuch as the teaching assistantship was a benefit for their entry, the participants also questioned the lack of training they received for certain aspects of the faculty career. The next section outlines the unanticipated aspects of the faculty work role by participants in relationship to their TA experiences.

Negative Aspects of TA Training

The negative aspects of TA experiences by participants could be viewed as "missed training opportunities." The TA experience by far was beneficial for all participants of this study. However, there were consistent aspects of the faculty work role that participants felt they should have had more exposure. Whether or not it was a function of the doctoral program or curiosity of the TAs who are now new faculty, the exposure to the five themes below appeared to be important to the participants when relating their experiences as new faculty members. Included in the discussion of unprepared aspects of the faculty role were: 1) participants had little or no training to advise/teach/manage/support graduate students; 2) participants were overwhelmed with the vagueness of the tenure process; 3) participants' assumptions of the faculty career had changed little until they started their career as a faculty member; 4)

participants experienced a lack of direction in the first year of faculty service; and 5) participants were not prepared for the isolation/stress involved in the faculty career.

Lack of Preparation for Graduate Student Management

One of the most startling admissions by all of the participants was the lack of training they received while TAs to perform tasks related to managing graduate students. All of the participants indicated that the hardest aspect of adjusting to their faculty work role was managing and coordinating the activities of graduate students including teaching, course preparation and classroom discussions. Anne was the most vocal about dealing with teaching and advising graduate students:

I am floundering at teaching graduate courses. No one ever prepared me to teach a graduate course. How do you grade graduate students?!? I know how I was graded. None of that kind of stuff...The stuff that I didn't get to do as a graduate student ever got explained to us. And I got here, and I remember saying, how do you grade graduate students? So I asked a faculty member here and they said..."well I just grade them." Well I know but, but when you get to graduate school, the thought is that when you get a C it's a failing grade. So I asked a lot of people, does that hold true here? How do you grade them and stuff? People seemed very flustered by this idea that things might be different... So those kind of, no one ever taught us how to deal with and be faculty members of graduate students.

Julian echoed similar sentiments as he related some difficulty in coping with graduate students that had a different academic motivation:

I was working with a class in the fall that was cross-listed undergraduate and graduate. Undergraduates were advanced students and the graduate students were mostly were

training to be teachers, high school teachers. I was used to working at a very intense pace and was going to cover a broad a range of readings as possible. And I had some of my graduate students balk at the amount of work I was requiring. So I had some personality conflicts I wasn't anticipating. And I considered what they said and I considered some of what they said was reasonable. Perhaps we couldn't do everything...hey...I'm new at this...I had a pie in the sky attitude about everything we could accomplish so we made some adjustments with them, they made some adjustments for me. I was surprised that that came from the graduate students. That is when I came to realize that maybe the graduate students or at least the Master's students just want to get through so they can get the degree and get paid more money.

Warrens' experience with graduate students was an uncomfortable one:

I taught a graduate course last semester and I had never taught a graduate course and that was a big change. I wasn't prepared exactly for a graduate course. The classes I had taught were large lecture classes. I had taught theory, this is the first time I had taught a graduate level course and it was all around different. Different kind of lecture, different kind of papers, different kind of questions, different kind of preparation and readings. I wish I had paid more attention when I was a graduate student in terms of how those classes are managed because I didn't have that perspective at all. But there were some uncomfortable things. I have had some issues already, I have 8 students in the class. One took an incomplete, I haven't heard anything else back from him, so I don't know what they are going to do, if it's just gonna go to an F? So I feel that I need to be more personal with the graduate students but at the same time I feel they have the responsibility of an adult and they should act that way. I had another student who completely plagiarized

their final paper. Then I was in a quandary as to what to do about that. I went to the chair and he was basically decide. I didn't want that answer, I don't want to be the tough guy.

So my first graduate course, I had 8 students, I had three C's and incomplete. And a C in graduate school is an F. So I feel like I am the ogre but just wasn't worthy of graduate level work. What I thought it should be. I have always thought that recently graduated faculty were always more harsh on graduate students. That has been my experience.

Elizabeth admitted that dealing with graduate students has not been as much a struggle due to the involvement of graduate students in her upper-level courses since the beginning. Yet she still related that it was something different to deal with:

It is quite a shift. I found myself kind of in the same position when I first started teaching - "Oh I'm the head of you. I'm in this different position, yet we are probably the same age." Having sort of been in a practicum and talk about that experience for the first time helped me in the switch to being in that position with graduate students. Where it's not because of the degree, it's because of the experience. I have that confidence to say I've done the reading to be a step ahead of you. I have done the writing to be a step ahead of you. It's not that it's a top-down sort of thing. It's just...it's bringing something along. If you are 31 or 32 can be a delicate balance between being the authority figure and being normal....

Additionally, Peter, Mike and Shannon experienced difficulty with trying to tread the fine line between faculty member and friend with many of their own graduate students. They indicated as Elizabeth did that they were too close in age and sometimes younger than some of the students in their classes. The relationship graduate students have with their departmental

faculty is much deeper as the boundaries of teacher-student become stretched (Hartnett & Katz, 1977). For example, Tom shared his experience with dealing with graduate students:

Like I have two graduate students who are starting their PhD's and I am still uncomfortable calling them after the university is closed or on the weekend....which is strange because my dissertation advisor did that to me, but I'm not comfortable with that yet.

Vagueness of the Tenure Process

Participants in this research study relayed similar sentiments as findings from previous studies on the tenure and new faculty. Participants were very concerned about their upcoming tenure review process. For some of the participants, tenure review was as much as five years away, for some it was as little as two years away. Research on new faculty has pointed to the tenure process as one of the most stressful aspects of the faculty career (e.g. Austin, 2002b; Bogler & Kremer-Hayon, 1999; Finklestein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992; Gaff, 2002; Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992).

Overall the participants related their frustration regarding the tenure process and what they would need to do to gain tenure within the timeframe that they had been allotted. Most of them had the typical six year period to apply for tenure. In some cases, faculty may decide to apply for tenure early. Mike felt that his primary research and grant writing would allow him to apply for tenure early:

I talk about that a lot with the chair and the associate chair and even a couple other faculty. Everything tenure. I have a lot of grants and publications that maybe I can push that issue a little earlier. I thought early on that since I was the first one in 14 years that maybe I should get out the gates a little quicker so I wouldn't have any issues with tenure.

I wondered if they would be able to take care of me so I focused on my publications and research as soon as I got here. My main worry was did the department know how to groom someone since they hadn't done that in so long. So yeah, I talked to the department chair a lot about that. I have talked to folks to try and see maybe in a year or two I could go up early. I need to get some more journals.

Mike was the only participant that was vaguely comfortable with his requirements for tenure and the possibility of receiving tenure within or before his contract ended. The other participants echoed Anne's assessment of the tenure process:

This year I am much more stressed out. I go up for tenure at the end of next year. I have like a year and two months to get a whole lot of work done. And I am really stressed. My responsibilities have ramped up, my sense of who I am in the department has just plummeted...I don't know anymore, because I know that evaluation is coming and I'm just feeling more insecure all the time.

When asked whether or not she was prepared in graduate school for the pressure of tenure, Anne was very forthcoming:

I always knew that tenure was a big deal. That whole phrase publish or perish was alive and well when I was in graduate school. The perish doesn't get stuck in there by accident. It is a big deal otherwise it would be publish or hang-out until we tell you to go home. So just continue on with life. So I always knew it was a big deal. So yeah I was prepared for the sense of insecurity. But you never really know...when you are in graduate school, and you get a little responsibility and you are teaching classes and people are around you and your friends are there, it's like, this is no big deal I can handle this, this life is great. Once you get to the other side of the desk so to speak, then it's like, wait I am starting all over

again and what did someone say about getting your publishing...so you feel thrown in immediately but you have so much going on that you don't even have time to question what you are feeling at the time because the teaching part starts well before the worrying about the next five years part. Stress is real.

Warrens' concerns about tenure were related to his lack of feedback regarding his performance thus far as faculty member finishing his first year in the academy:

I feel more concerned. Right now I am at the end of the first year, I wonder if I have taken all the right steps, done all the right things to get to where I want to be in 6 years. I think the decisions for my tenure were made long before the actual deadline. I'm trying to reach out to other faculty, trying to stay busy, trying to give the perception that I am an engaged scholar, and I think that is going well, but I still feel somewhat anxious, about the future, do they like me? No one...we got student evaluations last semester and I looked at mine and they were good to me and I looked at them against the department averages and they are better than that. But no one has come to me and said you did a great job or perhaps you should work on this area or this is another strategy on doing this. I haven't had any of that.

Warren also was confused about his tenure chances in relationship to writing grants and receiving funding. Warren felt that the main factor used by the university to hire him was his ability to gain funding, yet he also feels that the department has not indicated how grant writing will impact or influence tenure decisions:

Because right now external funding is not part of the tenure and promotion track that I see, it's publication. Yet I'm getting the message from the upper echelon that funding is important and that if you get funding then you get tenure...well they are tied together, if

you get funding then you get published and you get tenure, perhaps, maybe, who knows. But the university wants you to get money which is the mixed message that I am getting. I just don't want to get caught in some kind of tenure quagmire that is gonna cause some kind of political situation where a faculty member for some reason is unhappy with that and for some reason hurts my chance of getting tenure.

Edwin discussed the need for more interaction from faculty in his doctoral program to actively prepare him for the demands of preparing for tenure:

Whenever I think about what I did when I was in the doc program it pales in comparison to this now. I thought I was pressured then because I had the research to do and the dissertation and whatever. But now it's like my life can be summed up into six years.

What if I don't pass the tenure review? Do they just kick you out and will I have to move again to try to get tenure again? That stuff they don't talk about while you are a TA...you just do what you are told and shut-up. This tenure [expletive] is what they should have had workshops or seminars on, not how to use APA or something like that.

Rebecca based her tenure pressure on starting a family and the stress of completing tenure requirements before becoming pregnant as a new professor:

I think going into it, I had the mindset that you start from day one. I've heard before people will say "Oh it's your first year and you are getting your teaching thing together." Honestly my goal is to have a family in the future and have children so for me... I think that I have the first three, four years I want to go ahead and reach those tenure goals so that I can feel less pressure to want to have a family and having children.

Amanda's questions about tenure were rooted in the unique teaching schedule she negotiated in the first year of her contract. By not teaching in the spring semester, Amanda was not on campus everyday which raised some questions for her regarding the tenure process:

OK there are still some things that I would like to know better. Like I don't actually know what the value of "face time" is...How much? How often? I mean I do my best research at home...Do they know that? Do they understand that? Do they know that I am actually working? Like I heard a comment once that the Dean was walking around and the faculty offices were all empty and it was in the middle of the day and he, I guess he made the off-handed comment - "We're paying all these high salaries and no one is around?" Which yeah, so how important is that perception, do they know that I am at home actually working really hard and does that matter. Cause if really all that matters is my publication list, I mean I could spend everyday at the beach. Do they....I guess I just don't know what the answer to that is... I wish I did know the answer to that. We have something called the Faculty Club, which I joined, and I don't go to any of the meetings anymore, I mean I went to the first few and then I stopped...But it's people from all throughout the university...but how important is that, how important is it to be involved with...would that time be better spent working on research? Or should I be networking with the general faculty. Is that something that will be brought up at tenure review? I don't know...but I'll know at tenure.

Changed Assumptions of the Faculty Career

The third theme that emerged during data analysis was the assumption participants had of the faculty career had changed from the time they entered the faculty work role. In most cases, the participants assumptions and perceptions were much more positive than what they expressed

during their interviews. Although a certain amount of change is expected, the wholesale changes in perception of the faculty career may have been better anticipated during the TA experience of their doctoral training. Shannon related her faculty assumptions in comparison to working at her favorite restaurant:

I kinda looked at the faculty career as like when I was in college and I wanted to work at my favorite restaurant. I thought if I could work there, I could make money and eat all this great food [describes food]. So I went and applied and they hired me, partly because I already knew the menu. After a week I realized that it wasn't what I thought it was. I still liked it, but I knew what was happening in the kitchen...you know...so...I think that it is a great metaphor for being a faculty member. When I was a college student, I didn't think about or care what my professor did for me to get ready for class...When I was a TA, I was a little aware and had some sympathy when faculty said they were tired and stayed up late doing research...now that it's me, I feel like I really didn't know anything about this before I got into it...that was a real change for me.

Within the “assumptions of the faculty career” theme, there were several sub-themes that emerged during data analysis. Those sub-themes were – time spent on projects, pressure to maintain enrollment numbers, level of scrutiny from other faculty members, and the pressure of publishing.

Time spent on projects. Mike, Dawn, Peter and Rebecca made the most assumptions about the amount of free-time faculty members had during their professional careers. Mike, for example changed his assumption about how much time it takes to manage PhD students:

I knew it was going to be long hours, I just didn't realize how many long hours. I was often working until 2 or 3 in the morning and then waking up at 6 to do it all over again. I

observed people at [graduate school] doing that, but until you do it, that's when it hits you. Well never again will I take on five PhD students at the same time.

Peter also realized that time spent on research and preparing for classes was much more involved than what he had initially realized:

I think I observed faculty back at graduate school and saw that they worked quite hard.

The fact that they teach only for a certain amount of hours in a week and then they spend a certain amount of hours on office hours and spend a certain amount of time research and they might work at home and that doesn't mean anything because the only output for faculty is the number of publications that you have and nobody cares if you write at the office or write at home or write in the middle of the park. They are only concerned about the output and you could work, work, work and then have no result which is very, very discouraging. But you don't get tenure based on the hours you put into project. You get tenure from the publications that come out. You always have to find time, you have undergraduate students, you have graduate students, you have faculty meetings, you have university meetings, you have departmental meetings, so your time is like gold to you and you have to say NO, which sometimes is hard to do. So you actually have less time to devote to research than I thought. When I saw my professors at graduate school I thought they were just very stress free and then when I worked closer and closer as TA, I saw that they were just going all the time.

Pressure to maintain enrollment. Julian and Edwin experienced an unanticipated aspect of the faculty work role which they never thought was a concern of faculty – maintaining minimum enrollment numbers. As more and more colleges and universities feel the effects of a shaky economy and less funding from state and federal programs, student enrollment is

ultimately effected (Paulsen, 2001). Julian was perplexed by the requirements of the university versus the dynamics of a good learning environment:

One thing that I really didn't realize was the pressure I was under to have a certain number of students in each class. So I just thought if I teach a literature class and there is a small number of people in there that's just great because it's a low student to teacher ratio. That's what you want!! Isn't that what everybody says? That's not what the administration wants and that's something that I learned. What the administration wants is at least 15 students per class or you're not carrying your weight. That was news to me. I've been really surprised at the way the numbers are calculated and the way the process is cost driven. If you will. I guess I was just in la la land and did not understand the dynamics. That is something that I am beginning to understand so that was an awakening to me. I also thought...cause I knew a professor of mine that gave independent studies..I thought that I could give some independent studies to two students and they'll pay me for that. No. Independent studies are free, you don't get paid for those.

Intense scrutiny and observation. Three of the participants assumed that the faculty position was akin to working independent of colleagues and others. Yet for Elizabeth, Shannon and Anne, the scrutiny and observation was very much unanticipated as they started their faculty careers. Anne compared her first year to being in a “fish bowl in a restaurant” where everyone is coming by to “tap on the glass” and see what happens to the fish. Anne went on to say:

I really felt that people were watching me. I felt insecure on shaky ground those kinds of metaphors of being watched. Drowning, I felt sometimes I was kind of drowning. Being unstable.

Elizabeth was surprised to learn that everything she created (i.e. tests, quizzes, syllabi, etc.) were part of the official university records:

I didn't realize there was going to be as much scrutiny as there is and I wasn't entirely prepared for that. That may just be the culture of this department but I was not at all used to having every piece of work that I turned out examined....and it is. Maybe obviously I am still getting used to that.

Pressures to publish. Finally, participants did not anticipate the immediacy of pressures to publish. This was particularly true for participants whose discipline is much more vocational in nature. Although they realized that publishing would be an issue, they assumed that in some ways the tenure requirements could be adjusted. Brian especially was of the belief that the publishing would be weighted differently for his academic discipline:

In many ways I wish that the publishing requirements of tenure could be adjusted based on what you are doing. It is a challenge when you have a university that serves the community to try and become a research oriented place in an area that is really not that research driven. That was one of the main issues that I had to adjust to and found out that it was much different than what I had thought about.

Amanda felt similarly as her thoughts of publishing were immediately changed to fit the new landscape of her faculty position:

I don't think I understood how important research was. I mean when you go through your undergrad and your Master's you just see professors as teachers and I didn't see the amount of time and work and effort they put into their research. In the doctoral program I started to see that because I was around them a lot more.

Lack of Direction as a Faculty Member

Participants of this study continually referred to their first semester and in some cases first year as largely unproductive due to a variety of reasons. The most common response from participants was that it was difficult to “get direction” and to make sense of everything happening around them. Whether it was settling into a research agenda or physically moving into their new office or homes, the pressure to be productive (both teaching and publishing) was hampered because the participants were getting adjusted to being a faculty member. Elizabeth and Julian experienced similar situations when moving to their respective campuses.

A lot of what was overwhelming was that I wasn't done with my dissertation. I got hired as ABD. They knew that here. I told my chair that I would be finishing in the Fall. I was working very hard over the summer to accomplish that goal. I felt like we moved...I moved with my family over the summer. I felt like I was living out of boxes and typing on boxes the entire summer. At the same time I was reading books for preparation of the courses that I knew that I would be teaching. (Julian)

[Finding direction was] phenomenally difficult. It was...I think one of the things that people aren't taking into account is that because the job market is what it is, a lot of us are moving in addition to starting a new job. I had moved 1500 miles away from anyone I knew and had a new job. I mean I was still finding the grocery store and I was being expected to turn out really high quality work. And it seems silly but that factor is huge in making the transition. The market the way it is, no matter how much experience you have, no matter how prepared you are, if you go 1500 miles away from anything you recognize and your first year is going to be difficult. And you are going to try to get an

article published and grade three classes worth of papers and find the post office and not get lost on the way home from the grocery store. And try to develop new friendships... I don't think there is very much to officially recognize that at all. Take into account the phenomenally difficult switch that is taking place totally outside the work environment.
(Elizabeth)

Warren found it difficult to gain direction after spending time preparing for his first day on the job:

I had went through the interview process, and I felt excited about getting to a new job and was ambitious about getting here. I had been promised a certain deal in my employment contract but when I got here, things were a little different than what I was expecting. So for example, when you see my office is painted and fixed up nice, when I got here, it wasn't like that. Holes in the wall, ceiling panels falling off. I had to redo all of this...it took me a week. I was doing repairs to my office, there was no furniture, there was no computer. There was no one here to give me key cards, I began to feel really frustrated by the situation. I felt a little bit, put back, put off when I first arrived. My office was in unacceptable shape. I should have said something right then and said you know what kind of show are you running here? It was ridiculous that I had to do that. I spent a week on that and I am not a carpenter!!! I had to redo all these walls, re-plaster all the walls, re-paint them and I had to bring furniture from home and that's absurd, I didn't know anything about that.

Tom had a lack of direction in where to start his research but was comfortable with developing the teaching aspect of his faculty position:

Oh man...I would come here some mornings and just sit at my desk and try to think of where I should begin. I think I was so used to having someone tell you when a paper was due or what needed to be turned in when that you get socialized to this real Pavlovian way of performing. Even as a TA you know what time the class is, where it will meet, what you should teach, when to take breaks...so even for the teaching I did in my first semester that was a bit of a relief because I was comfortable with that. It was the rest of it that I didn't know where to start. Where do I get funding? Do I have to write a proposal? Who reads it? How do I get IRB approval...do I need IRB approval? It was just frustrating, still is actually...

Many other participants were challenged in their first year by getting their research and publishing started even though they were much more comfortable with their teaching tasks. Likewise, many research studies identify that anxiety towards the career by new faculty when entering academia are contributors to the overall anxiety and stress faculty feel when trying to begin their research and develop a professional identity (Austin, 2002b; Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1994). Additionally, Sorcinelli (1994) found that factors such as reasonable course loads, funding for research and other tangible attributes as essential to faculty satisfaction which may lead to new faculty feeling better prepared to start and/or complete research tasks.

Not Prepared for Isolation and Stress

Another theme found across all participants was their feelings of isolation within their first year(s) as a faculty member. Overall they were more concerned that none of their colleagues were acknowledging their hard-work as they attempted to exhibit a sense of belonging within their individual academic departments. The feelings of isolation and the stress caused from that isolation can be linked to the lack of preparation for the faculty role that many new faculty

experience in their first years in the academy (Gaff, 2002; Nyquist et al., 1999; Sorcinelli, 1992).

Anne was most vocal about her isolation within the department during her entry into the academy:

I felt alone most of the time. I felt lonely, it just seemed like I worked pretty hard at developing friendships and things. I think it's just the nature of moving anywhere and being a new face. I also felt, in some ways I remember my faculty advisors telling me when I was a grad student, "oh we are so busy" and you think you are busy you ought to try being a graduate student things have changed from when you were a graduate student. It's gotten really sped up some and so there was a sense that first year that I was just treading water. I wasn't really getting involved in things much, I wasn't really. I was working at developing friendships which was good, but I wasn't really prepared to know that I needed to do that. In ways I felt just isolated from the department in many ways. I remember having time to go to talks on campus and presentations and other fun stuff on campus that I don't have time to do now.

Tom expressed similar feelings of isolation but attributed it to the research demands of most faculty in the department:

I think what I have felt so far is that you are an island in many ways and every now and then you may see someone and talk and then move on by. I don't think that the isolation part of this job is just because of the job, I just think it's the culture of the profession. No one who plans on doing quality writing is going to sit in an office with five other people and write, so you have to go off campus or stay at home so you don't get interrupted. That means you have little contact with others. Is it lonely? Sure, but you have so much to do that it will keep you busy. In my field especially, it may take you a year to see

results of one study which means you can't really write much until you see some evidence of your hypothesis which means you have to keep that research going all the time which means you just don't have a whole lot of time to hang out and have coffee. I wish it were different, but then I wish I had tenure...so go figure...

Patricia imagined dealings with faculty would be more idyllic and collegial than what she has experienced so far:

I was not quite prepared for the "work in a box" type thing where this [looks around office] is your box and every now and then you poke your head out. I have always been very talkative, can't you tell, but I...yeah...I just want to discuss with others what research they are doing and we just don't do that. I always figured that faculty would sit somewhere maybe once a month or something and just have purposeful discourse about scholarly endeavors. I mean, that's what I thought being a college professor was all about. This constant grind of research-publish, research-publish...I guess I didn't realize that so much of it you are doing on your own.

Although participants indicated knowing the propensity of isolation of the faculty career, they were not aware of the extent of the isolation until they started the position. Research indicates that lack of collegiality and minimal peer interaction is one of the major stress-points that causes new faculty to lose interest in the profession and withdraw in some cases from the career altogether (Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1992).

Conclusion

This chapter examined the themes that emerged during data analysis. Experiences of the participants' TA positions assisted in identifying what areas of the faculty role new faculty felt prepared to accomplish and not accomplish. Though all of the participants exhibited positive

attitudes towards their TA position and personal motivation to succeed as a faculty member. The themes developed also illustrated a disconnect between the TA experience and possible topics that should be discussed when preparing graduate students for a faculty career.

New faculty face the challenge of balancing the perceptions of faculty life with the realities of faculty life. Moreover, new faculty attempted to cope with job related expectations and work responsibilities without the necessary introduction to the academic work role. This chapter provided insight into the relationship between TA preparation and its relationship to the experiences of new faculty. Subsequently, the importance of previous experiences as a TA weighed heavily on the development of future faculty.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the relationship between experiences of new faculty entering the academic profession and their preparation as teaching assistants. Fourteen pre-tenure faculty were invited to relate their individual experiences of being a new faculty member and how they made sense of their experiences in relation to their experiences as a teaching assistant. Participants shared their feelings of anxiety and stress over the aspects of faculty life and how it was different from what they had perceived prior to entering the professoriate. Likewise, the overarching query related to this study was whether or not doctoral students who were TAs were being exposed to the work role of faculty life while in graduate school.

Overview of Study

New faculty must learn how to be a professor, a researcher and a mentor to students even though they were recently students themselves (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Added with learning new roles and making sense of new experiences, new faculty may also feel higher levels of stress and work related pressures in attempting to fulfill those roles (Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Wheeler, 1992). Whether the stress is related to managing the activities of graduate students, conducting meaningful research, developing a research agenda, or figuring out how to get started on their many projects, new faculty are exposed to situations that they were often not prepared for while serving as teaching assistants (Austin, 2002b; Golde & Dore, 2001). Although new faculty are prepared to conduct research projects, submit manuscripts for publication and formulate methodology that searches for new knowledge, most graduate programs do little to prepare those who choose to enter the faculty ranks (Austin, 2002a, 2002b; Golde & Dore, 2001; Sorcinelli, 1994; Tice et al., 1998; Wheeler, 1992).

This study explored the relationship between the experiences of new faculty after beginning their career in academia to their experiences while serving as teaching assistants. The conceptual framework for this study identified the theoretical concept of “anticipatory socialization” which describes the process newcomers undergo when entering a new place of employment. Participants in this study were asked to identify their experiences during their anticipatory socialization stage (graduate school) and how those experiences differed or were similar to their experiences entering the academy as a new professor. In order to accomplish the investigation of new faculty, the dominant research question guiding this study was: How do new faculty perceive their TA experience as a device to prepare them for a career as a faculty member? The secondary research questions were:

1. How does the TA experience influence the attitudes and opinions new faculty have regarding their new role as a faculty member?
2. What development of future faculty takes place while graduate students are in TA roles?
3. Does the TA experience provide an adequate training mechanism for new faculty entering the academy?
4. What opinions and attitudes do new faculty have towards their socialization and integration to the academy?

In order to gain insight to the lived experiences of the transitions of new faculty from graduate school to a career in academia, fourteen pre-tenure faculty members from two urban, four-year institutions participated in qualitative interviews. All of the participants shared the following attributes: a) employed as a teaching assistant during their time in graduate school, b)

completed their PhD program no more than four years prior to the beginning of their career as a professor, c) employed at a higher education institution in a tenure-track position, d) had a responsibility for teaching at least one undergraduate course per semester since their hiring. The participants related their experiences as new faculty and the adjustments they made when starting their career after completion of the doctoral degree.

Through the participants shared experiences three positive themes emerged from their experiences as new faculty and their perceptions of the faculty work role developed (or possibly strengthened) from the teaching assistant experience. The positive themes were: new faculty are comfortable in the classroom as a new professor, new faculty are prepared for additional classroom related tasks, and new faculty are better prepared to cope with the realities of faculty life. Unfortunately, five negative or less desirable themes emerged indicating that additional training is needed during the TA experience to better prepare doctoral students for the faculty work role. The negative or less desirable themes that emerged were: new faculty have no training to advise/teach/manage/support graduate students, new faculty are overwhelmed with the vagueness of the tenure process, the assumptions of the faculty career changed little until new faculty are in the actual work role, new faculty experience a lack of direction in their first year, and new faculty are not prepared for the isolation/stress involved in the faculty career.

Positive Aspects of Teaching Assistantship Preparation

The participants of this study were able to relate three positive benefits of their TA experience during their doctoral training. Even though the participants viewed the teaching assistantship as lacking in some areas of training, overall the positive aspects assisted new faculty with their transition into the academy. Relative to the positive experience new faculty had during their initial years in the academy, there is some indication that the TA experience was

an important factor in their development. One could speculate that the transition from the TA role to the faculty career aided in preparation for teaching and classroom related tasks because of the familiarity of the tasks involved in teaching. Another possible reason could be the prior experience new faculty had as TAs with undergraduate students and the subject matter of the coursework. Displayed in the following sections are the major positive themes that emerged from the TA experience relative to new faculty.

New Faculty are Comfortable in the Classroom as a Professor

Much of the research regarding improving the teaching preparation of new faculty entering the academy focused on methods of introducing doctoral students to the teaching task as early and often as possible (Austin, 1992; Boice, 1991; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992; Tice et al., 1998). Yet for participants of this study who were TAs, their exposure to the teaching task proved to be adequate as a training tool for entering the classroom.

Although many of the participants were uncertain of their performance relative to other faculty related tasks such as publishing and research, they felt that teaching was “second nature” to them. Inasmuch as previous research has identified teaching as a difficult task for new faculty to grasp (e.g. Boice, 1991; Sorcinelli, 1988; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996), participants in this study who served as TAs during their doctoral education were much more prepared to teach because of their prior teaching experience. In many ways, the teaching task was much more familiar to new faculty who served as TAs because they did not find it difficult to demand authority in the classroom because they had experience doing so previously. Moreover, many of the new faculty in this study had taught similar courses during their time as TAs which further eased their comfort level in the classroom.

New Faculty are Prepared for Additional Classroom Related Tasks

The additional tasks of faculty such as assignment preparation, syllabus creation and other classroom related activities are not as difficult for new faculty who were TAs while in their doctoral training. Though conceptually simplistic, the more exposure or experience new faculty have to a particular task, the easier it is for them to repeat the task later. Although new faculty will spend a considerable amount of time preparing for class and designing lectures (Boice, 1991), those faculty who performed some of the same functions during their teaching assistantship were much more familiar with those tasks and felt more productive in doing so.

New faculty who were more comfortable with the day-to-day functions of the faculty role were able to focus less on the teaching related tasks and more on research and writing. As many of the participants discussed their ambivalence toward research, publishing and gaining tenure they were at the same time very relieved that teaching was not of primary concern. For example, Elizabeth was comfortable with her teaching acumen due to her experience teaching a similar course she taught which made the teaching process less stressful.

New Faculty are Better Prepared to Cope with the Realities of Faculty Life

The exposure to the faculty work role while serving as TAs seemed to lessen the amount of stress participants felt during their initial entry into the academy as faculty. The issue of faculty stress has been researched by Gaff (200), Gates (200), Sorcinelli (1988, 1989) and others insomuch as faculty entering the academy are not prepared for some of the real work roles involved in the career. However, participants of this study were forewarned of some of the realities of faculty life during their TA experience. The fourteen participants had some anxiety from their immediate feelings of pressure to perform their understood faculty responsibilities. For example, many faculty in this study knew that they must commit time to research and

teaching and were prepared to do so. Yet they were much more concerned with performing their job roles well and meeting expectations necessary for gaining tenure. Particularly, participants knew that tenure was their primary goal when entering the profession and any stress caused from the reality of trying to gain tenure was already apparent to the participants.

Tice (1998) indicated that new faculty are learning new aspects and responsibilities of their role at the same time learning how to find balance with those responsibilities. None of the participants identified that they felt stressed over the individual aspects of the job role rather it was the exposition of such aspects that caused some stress (which will be discussed later in this chapter). Yet overall, faculty felt prepared for the complexities of a career in the professoriate.

Overall the experiences of new faculty who served as TAs while in doctoral training indicates that the experience is a worthwhile endeavor and can be beneficial to the participant. The comfort in the classroom, competency in performing additional teaching related tasks and realizing the often stressful aspects of starting a faculty career seemed to be positive outcomes from the TA experience. Additionally, participants were better prepared to cope with some of the stresses related to beginning a career in academia. Participants in this study were not hesitant to connect the TA experience with their early success in and out of the classroom. Even with the positive aspects of the TA experience, there were several negative outcomes that made the transition into the faculty ranks much more difficult for the participants.

Negative Aspects of the Teaching Assistantship Preparation

The participants also shared five negative experiences of their doctoral training. Although identifying those experiences as “negative” may suggest some degree of dissatisfaction with the teaching assistantship by participants, it should be viewed as areas of preparation that were not discussed during the TA role.

In relationship to the positive experiences provided by the TA experience, the negative experiences were more evident to the participants because they were challenged by aspects of the faculty role that were not included in their doctoral training. Likewise, participants did experience some stress regarding the negative aspects which supported some of the research on new faculty stress factors. For example, Sorcinelli (1994) found that new faculty were often in a state of constant confusion because they were trying to develop the mastery of their subject area (as a knowledgeable source) and perform other departmental tasks such as leadership and working with colleagues. Similarly, participants were confused and challenged by the tasks that were new to them even though they experienced a level of comfort in tasks that they had been exposed to while serving as TAs.

New Faculty Have Little or No Training to Support Graduate Students

The challenges of advising, teaching and mentoring graduate students by the participants indicated that little or no training took place to do so. Some of the concern expressed by participants was related to a lack of understanding the process in which courses are developed, evaluating performance and creating instruction that is meaningful to graduate students who may or may not be motivated by the subject matter. As the current model of higher education requires faculty to direct and develop the research-based training of graduate students, it was apparent that new faculty were not prepared in their teaching assistantship to perform those tasks. Participants had little or no exposure to the direction and teaching of graduate students as TAs and felt unprepared.

Many of the participants were overwhelmed with the reality that they had recently completed their own dissertation and were now responsible for directing and advising students themselves. As Elizabeth explained, she was cognizant of the ages of her students who in some

instances were older than her and expected her to assist them in developing a research agenda for completion of their own doctoral education.

The direction of graduate students both in and out of the classroom is imperative to the vitality of future faculty. As many of the participants realized in their first year as faculty, the challenge of teaching graduate students was much greater than their experiences with undergraduates considering the additional pressure to convey a certain level of competency of the subject matter being taught. Participants were insecure with their teaching of the subject matter because they felt as though graduate students would be more critical of them and assume that they were less than knowledgeable about the subject.

Brems et al. (1994) found that many new faculty experience a feeling of being an “imposter” whereas they were concerned with students believing that the new faculty member was not prepared or knowledgeable of the subject matter. Likewise, participants shared similar feelings that they too were imposters as graduate students would be more likely to find fault in their teaching style and methods. The challenge to teach and advise graduate students for many of the participants was due to the higher-level of responsibility that graduate education represents. For example, Warren was overwhelmed because he knew how to teach undergraduates, yet the lectures, assignments and grading for graduate students were viewed as more important and proved to be a greater challenge.

New Faculty are Overwhelmed with the Vagueness of the Tenure Process

The pressure to publish is constant for new faculty as they desire to establish their own research identity and gain tenure at their institution. The expectation of being productive and teaching for many of the participants was a challenge because they were unsure of how they would be evaluated in relationship to their tenure related activities. Gaining tenure for

participants was of primary concern yet they felt uneducated about the intricate details of the process. Sorcinelli (1988) found that new faculty are completely overwhelmed by the requirements for tenure and how little new faculty know about the tenure process on their own campus. Accordingly, participants felt concerned about tenure both from the perspective of understanding what tenure means to them as an academic and what they must do to gain tenure at their own institution.

The desire to understand the tenure process was a chief concern for all of the participants. Even though Mike felt comfortable with his plans to possibly request consideration to apply for tenure early, he was just as uncomfortable with the thought that he may not have “done the right things” to gain tenure.

The concept of “doing the right things” to gain tenure was a concern of many of the participants. Amanda questioned if she had “shown her face” enough to make connections with other faculty on campus and whether or not by doing so would make a difference in her tenure review. Many other participants felt uneasy with how they would be judged and evaluated based on a tenure plan that was in their estimation less than simple. Olsen and Crawford (1998) confirmed that there was much stress, anxiety and uneasiness by new faculty who were apprehensive about their chances of tenure. Similarly, several faculty who were still new to the professoriate felt that they were trying to “catch up” to their personal goals regarding tenure. Additionally, faculty who still had four or more years until tenure review indicated that they were experiencing even more stress because of the pressure to obtain tenure.

Assumptions of the Faculty Career Changed

Participants in the study understood that the primary responsibilities of faculty include teaching, research and service (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Likewise, the expectations by

participants entering the profession was to perform those tasks during their faculty career. Yet the participants were surprised that much of what they assumed about performing those tasks was incorrect. For example, Brian knew that publishing was a major factor in his successful attainment of tenure, yet he did not realize until he was a faculty member the pressure to immediately becoming productive in publishing. Olsen and Crawford (1998) explained that new faculty need explicit feedback regarding their work performance and expectations so that the faculty member will remain productive and possibly overcome some of the anxiety related to publishing. The perceptions of the faculty career and assumptions of the day-to-day responsibilities were adjusted by many of the participants as they began to negotiate and understand their duties and responsibilities.

Participants in this study relied upon their teaching assistantship experiences as the basis for how they should conduct their professional lives. Similarly, the realization that factors such as time spent on tasks, management of class enrollments, intense scrutiny and pressures to publish were not particular aspects of the faculty career that participants anticipated. Dawn viewed the intense scrutiny from senior faculty as an immediate adjustment as she did not experience the same level of observation when she was a teaching assistant. For Dawn and others the adjustment to some of the “normal” aspects of the faculty role were difficult even though they were aware of some of the pressure when serving as TAs.

Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) charted pre-tenure faculty in a longitudinal study and found that many new faculty had difficulty in dealing with the unrealized aspects or pressures of the faculty work role. New faculty were forced to change their assumptions of the faculty career and in turn to cope with these changes which seemed to cause stress in the early stages of their careers (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992). For example, faculty were not prepared to critically manage

their classes in order to provide maximum occupancy for the university. The expectation of such is not an experience that new faculty are prepared to encounter as their TA experience is focused less on the “business aspect” of university management and more on the teaching aspect of providing educational experiences for students. As Julian pointed out, the pressure to maintain large classes was in direct opposition to the notion of wanting small student-to-teacher ratios for better instruction and classroom discussions.

Many participants were forced to change their perceptions regarding the amount of time faculty have available to spend on tasks. Moreover, many participants perceived that faculty had much more free-time than some other professions. Yet that perception was changed once participants entered the profession. As faculty are allowed to set their own schedules based on institutional responsibilities, there is a higher propensity to either procrastinate when completing tasks or spend too much time working and rarely having time to oneself (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992). Participants in this study expressed their constant struggle with time management and attributed much of the misconceptions they had regarding “free time” of faculty as an incorrect assumption. Even though, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, faculty were aware of the time commitments of the professoriate in relation to research and publishing responsibilities, they were not aware of how much time would be devoted to other tasks which would conflict with accomplishing their research goals. The difficulty in time allocation was also a contributing factor to new faculty experiencing a lack of direction in their first year of employment as a faculty member.

New Faculty Experience a Lack of Direction in their First Year

Some participants related that it was difficult for them to find direction in developing research in their first year of working as a faculty member. The adjustment to the faculty role and

becoming more comfortable with their new institution and surroundings was much more distracting than participants had originally imagined. Several of the participants had to adjust to moves across the country to start their faculty position and had adjustment issues such as finding housing, learning how to drive around their new city and acclimating to a new and challenging professional environment. The added pressure of developing a research agenda and feeling comfortable as an academician was difficult for many participants due to the external pressures and adjustments.

The participants related their apprehension towards their research in their first year as more of a symptom to a larger problem rather than the problem itself. For participants, the lack of direction was directly related to their feelings of being overwhelmed. Olsen (1993) reported that for new faculty the feelings of being overwhelmed and stressed are derived from an unlimited number of small tasks that must be completed and the daily conflicts of life rather than major events that are not as common. As was the case with Tom who knew what he needed to accomplish to start his research yet was unsure of how to manage all of the individual tasks related to making the research a reality.

New Faculty are Not Prepared for the Isolation/Stress

The final theme that emerged from this study was the lack of preparation participants experienced relative to the solitary nature of the faculty career. Teaching assistants to a large extent viewed faculty relationships on campus while faculty were being collegial with one another. New faculty who may expect the same level of community may be surprised to find that the job itself is largely isolated and lonely (Austin, 2002b; Olsen, 1993). Although the participants valued their ability to work alone, uninterrupted for hours at a time, they also felt isolated from activities that were taking place on campus or within the department. For example,

Patricia found the isolation very unsettling as all of her experiences, both professional and in graduate school, were much more collaborative. Other participants recognized the loneliness early on as part of the process of being productive. Yet for some participants, the ability to overcome loneliness and feeling disconnected was very important. Anne mentioned that she took time to attend lectures and other events on campus during her first year as a faculty member so she would not feel as disconnected with the campus. Anne also realized that she was further behind in her research and publishing than she should be because of possibly not embracing the loneliness as a part of the research/publishing process. As Anne and others indicated, the feelings of loneliness were hard to conceptualize when much of their previous experiences as graduate students were performed as groups with immediate feedback and evaluation.

The experiences of new faculty who served as TAs while in doctoral training identifies that there are some aspects of the faculty role that are not being revealed. The lack of preparation to teach graduate students, uneasiness regarding the tenure process, overall assumptions of the faculty career, lack of direction in the first year and feelings of isolation and stress seemed to be unintended negative outcomes from the TA experience. Many of the participants felt that they would be more comfortable with the challenging aspects of the faculty work role if they had been explored during their TA experience. The realization that many of the challenging aspects of the faculty work role were not discovered prior to entry into the profession supports the conceptual framework discussed in chapter 2. Specifically, the framework itself did not need adjustment but rather through the application of the conceptual framework and data collected from this study, implications for policy and practice were derived to better assist in the training of TAs for the faculty role.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Findings of this study have implications for the preparation of teaching assistants to enter into the professoriate as they affect many different aspects of the institutional environment. The rationale for supporting faculty preparation of teaching assistants can become beneficial for the TA who aspires to enter the professoriate and the institution employing the new faculty member.

The continued growth of higher education is dependent upon many variables but none as important as the entry of new faculty into the academy. The support and guidance given to TAs aspiring to enter the professoriate upon completion of their academic program would add a greater level of importance to the training itself. Formal programs could be developed by the institution to support the training of TAs for the academic work role of a professor and not just their academic discipline.

Contextually, the development of required training programs would allow TAs the opportunity to practice some of the work responsibilities that will be expected when they enter the academy. Some of the topics could include college teaching pedagogy, formulating effective evaluation strategies, how to integrate technology into the classroom, how to recognize and cope with the rigors of faculty life, how to develop a research agenda and what is involved in preparing for tenure. The training program would provide TAs with working knowledge of the expected work roles before they become a faculty member. In addition, all of the participants indicated that they had difficulty teaching graduate students because they had no exposure teaching graduate students. Thus, another area that could be included in the TA training would include preparing TAs to teach, evaluate and advise or manage graduate students.

Within the context of a training and development program for aspiring faculty, some of the overlooked aspects of faculty work roles could be instilled into TAs such as what to expect as

a new faculty member and what challenges to be prepared for. Perhaps, new faculty would not feel as overwhelmed when trying to start a research agenda if their research agenda was developed during graduate school. Accordingly, a one semester course could be offered to all doctoral students with faculty aspirations in order to prepare and discuss research agendas as well as other areas that new faculty find challenging.

Furthermore, the planned and constant exposure of TAs to the related roles of faculty could reduce the stress new faculty experience related to completing research and finding direction in their first year of employment. Additionally, the new faculty member who is better prepared and more focused on research tasks may be less likely to develop anxiety over completing projects that will assist in tenure. The new faculty member who is able to focus on tasks related to tenure may develop a greater feeling of accomplishment and support for the institution. Finally, better prepared new faculty are able to be more productive in all of their work related tasks at the beginning of their academic career.

Even though TAs may complete training programs, institutions have a responsibility for providing additional training and development. Employing institutions can assist in the preparation of newly hired faculty by providing orientation sessions and workshops that are related to tenure review (institutional level) and requirements for tenure attainment (departmental level) to incoming faculty. As the findings of this study indicated, the successful attainment of tenure was a major concern for new faculty, yet they were unclear and confused about what was required of tenure at their own institution. A policy requiring all new faculty to create and discuss a tenure plan with their department chair once a year may assist in reducing the stress felt over the requirements of tenure. Additionally, institutions could establish a faculty support group in order to regularly discuss the tenure process and other areas of concern that may make it

difficult for new faculty making the transition into academia. If institutions are committed to the improvement and growth of higher education, then the development of new faculty by institutional leaders will enhance the overall experience of all individuals.

The ability for new faculty to enter the academic department with a greater understanding of advising, mentoring, class preparation and other tasks related to the faculty role may make the internal institutional policies easier to understand. Admittedly, new faculty will not know exactly what to expect when entering the institution regardless of their preparation, yet a better oriented faculty member may be able to provide service to the university immediately as they have been trained to manage their time more effectively and become more valuable to the institution and related community.

Future Research

It is not difficult to identify the impact that the TA experience had on new faculty in this study. Yet there are many avenues for future research that could be developed from the findings of this study.

New faculty without TA experience. By investigating the experiences of new faculty who did not serve as TAs, perhaps more data could be developed that explains the influence that the teaching assistantship has on the socialization of new faculty entering the academy for the first time. The exploration of new faculty experiences related to developing a research agenda, time allocation, negotiating tenure requirements and adjusting to the faculty work role would provide further insight relative to the TA experience on new faculty entering academia.

Institutional and/or discipline restricted factors. Future research could be conducted that investigates the impact of new faculty preparation and the institutional type of both their doctoral granting and employing institution. For example, new faculty at 2-year, liberal arts colleges,

HBCUs, tribal colleges or other institutional types may have different experiences within the context of their employing institution versus a research-intensive institution. The experiences of new faculty at various institutional types may vary based on size, resources and mission of their new institution. Moreover, new faculty at considerably different institutions may have different experiences with class preparation, faculty interactions, student advising interactions or other faculty work role related tasks. Further, the impact of institutional demographics and characteristics could prove to be an important aspect of future studies in relationship to type of institution, location, student-body.

Another inquiry of new faculty experiences could be restricted to certain academic disciplines (e.g. English, chemistry, history, math, business, etc.) to examine whether or not new faculty experiences are specific to one discipline. By investigating the experiences of faculty in a particular discipline or subject matter, the development of themes or patterns in new faculty preparation could better inform further research and implementation of training programs for TAs.

Gender/race specific new faculty experiences. Turner (2002) and Alexander-Snow and Johnson (1999) investigated the experiences of women faculty and faculty of color, respectively. Their findings were important as the experiences of both groups of faculty are substantially different than their white-male counterparts. Hence, future research could specifically investigate the experiences of new faculty with TA experience to isolate the preparation factors relative to whether and how they vary because of gender or race.

Conclusion

By focusing in on the teaching assistantship as a possible training mechanism, the experiences of new faculty were juxtaposed against the preparation for the faculty career while serving as a TA during doctoral training. As indicated by the findings of this study, the impact of the TA experience on the overall preparation of new faculty provided training for teaching. However, the TA experience did not adequately provide exposure in all of the day-to-day responsibilities of faculty. Subsequently, the discovery that new faculty are often challenged by making sense of the perceptions of faculty life versus the realities of faculty life support the need for broad-reaching training opportunities for doctoral students with faculty aspirations. Taken together, the themes discovered from this study not only necessitate the need for future research but also support implementation of training for all TAs who aspire to enter the academy.

REFERENCES

- Alexander-Snow, M., & Johnson, B. J. (1999). Perspectives from Faculty of Color. In R. J. Menges & Associates (Eds.), *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling in, Becoming Established and Building Institutional Support*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- American Association of University Professors. (1974). *Statement of Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work*. Retrieved September 12, 2004, from <http://www.aaup.org/statements/REPORTS/re01fam.htm>
- Applegate, J. L. (2002). Engaged Graduate Education: Seeing with New Eyes. *Preparing Future Faculty Occasional Paper Series*, 1-11.
- Armenti, C. (2004a). May Babies and Posttenure Babies: Maternal Decisions of Women Professors. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(2), 211-231.
- Armenti, C. (2004b). Women Faculty Seeking Tenure and Parenthood: Lessons from Previous Generations. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34(1), 65-83.
- Austin, A. E. (1992). Supporting Junior Faculty through a Teaching Fellows Program. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Vol. 50, pp. 73-86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, A. E. (2002a). Creating a Bridge to the Future: Preparing New Faculty to Face the Changing Expectations in a Shifting Context. *The Review of Higher Education*, 20(2), 119-144.
- Austin, A. E. (2002b). Preparing the Next Generation of Faculty: Graduate School as Socialization to the Academic Career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
- Bargar, R. R., & Mayo-Chamberlain, J. (1983). Advisor and Advisee Issues in Doctoral Education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 54(4), 407-432.
- Bess, J. (1978). Anticipatory Socialization of Graduate Students. *Research in Higher Education*, 8, 289-317.
- Bianco-Mathis, V., & Chalofsky, N. (Eds.). (1999). *The Full-Time Faculty Handbook*. London: Sage Publications.
- Black, B., & Bonwell, C. (1991). The Training of Teaching Assistants in Departments of History. *The History Teacher*, 24(4), 435-444.
- Blackburn, R., Chapman, D., & Cameron, S. (1981). "Cloning" in Academe: Mentorship and Academic Careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 15, 315-327.
- Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An Action Strategy for Increasing Minority Faculty. *Academe*, 75, 8-14.

- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods* (Fourth Edition ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bogler, R., & Kremer-Hayon, L. (1999). The Socialization of Faculty Member to University Culture and Norms. *Journal of further and Higher Education*, 23(1).
- Boice, R. (1991). New Faculty as Teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 62(No. 2), 150-173.
- Boice, R. (1992a). Lessons Learned About Mentoring. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Vol. 50, pp. 51-61). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (1992b). *The New Faculty Member: Supporting and Fostering Professional Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Boice, R. (2000). *Advice for New Faculty Members*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyle, P., & Boice, B. (1998). Best Practices for Enculturation: Collegiality, Mentoring, and Structure. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 101, 87-94.
- Braxton, J. M., & Berger, J. B. (1999). How Disciplinary Consensus Affects Faculty. In R. J. Menges & Associates (Eds.), *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling in, Becoming Established and Building Institutional Support*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brems, C., Baldwin, M. R., Davis, L., & Namyniuk, L. (1994). The Imposter Syndrome as Related to Teaching Evaluations and Advising Relationships of University Faculty Members. *Journal of Higher Education*, 65(2), 183.
- Carnegie. (2004). *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/CIHE2000/defNotes/Definitions.htm>
- Carroll, J. G. (1980). Effects of Training Programs for University Teaching Assistants: A Review of Empirical Research. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 51(2), 167-183.
- Cawyer, C. S., Simonds, C., & Davis, S. (2002). Mentoring to Facilitate Socialization: The Case of the New Faculty Member. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(2), 225-242.
- CGS. (2004). *Graduate Enrollment and Degrees 1986-2001*. Retrieved June 25, 2004, from <http://www.cgsnet.org/pdf/ged2001.pdf>
- Chism, N., Cano, J., & Pruitt, A. (1989a). Teaching in a Diverse Environment: Knowledge and Skills Needed by Ta's. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott & D. H. Wulff (Eds.), *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990's* (pp. 23-36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Chism, N., Cano, J., & Pruitt, A. (1989b). Teaching in a Diverse Environment: Knowledge and Skills Needed by Teachers. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott & D. H. Wulff (Eds.), *Teacher Assistant Training in the 1990's* (Vol. 39, pp. 23-36). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Elliott, P. G. (1994). *The Urban Campus: Educating the New Majority for the New Century*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Exum, W. H., Menges, R. J., Watkins, B., & Berglund, P. (1984). Making It at the Top: Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Labor Market. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 27, 301-324.
- Feldman, D. C. (1976). A Contingency Theory of Socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(3), 433-452.
- Feldman, D. C. (1981). The Multiple Socialization of Organization Members. *The Academy of Management Review*, 6(No. 2), 309-318.
- Fink, L. D. (1984). The First Year of College Teaching. In *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Fink, L. D. (1992). Orientation Programs for New Faculty. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Vol. 50, pp. 39-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Finklestein, M., & LaCelle-Peterson, M. (1992). New and Junior Faculty: A Review of the Literature. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.) (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Freudenthal, N., & DiGiorgio, A. (1989). New Faculty Mentoring: The Institution as Mentor. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 7, 67-71.
- Gaff, J. (2002). The Disconnect between Graduate Education and the Realities of Faculty Work: A Review of Recent Research. *Liberal Education*, Volume 88, Number 3(Summer 2002).
- Gaff, J., & Pruitt-Logan, A. S. (1998). Preparing College Faculty. *New Directions for Higher Education*(101).
- Gates, G. S. (2000). Teaching Related Stress: The Emotional Management of Faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(No. 4), 469-490.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers*. White Plains: Longman.

- Gmelch, W., Wilke, P., & Lovrich, N. (1986). Dimensions of Stress among University Faculty: Factor-Analytic Results from a National Study. *Research in Higher Education*, 24(266-286).
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At Cross Purposes: What the Experiences of Today's Doctoral Students Reveal About Doctoral Education*. Madison: Wisconsin University.
- Goodall, L. (1970). The Urban University: Is There Such a Thing? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 41(1), 44-54.
- Hamilton, K. (2004). Faculty Science Positions Continue to Elude Women of Color. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 21(3).
- Hartnett, R. T., & Katz, J. (1977). The Education of Graduate Students. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 48(No. 6), 646-664.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (2002). *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Jackson, J. (2004). The Story Is Not in the Numbers: Academic Socialization and Diversifying the Faculty. *NWSA Journal*, 16(1).
- Johnson, B., & McCarthy, T. (2000). Graduate Student Organizing at Yale and the Future of the Labor Movement in Higher Education. *Social Policy*, 11-18.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The Common Experiences of "Otherness: Ethnic and Racial Minority Faculty". *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 315-342.
- Julius, D. J., & Gumpert, P. J. (2002). Graduate Student Unionization: Catalysts and Consequences. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 187-216.
- Klotsche, J. M. (1966). *The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lafer, G. (2001). Graduate Student Unions Fight the Corporate University. *Dissent*, 63-70.
- Lafer, G. (2003). Graduate Student Unions: Organizing in a Changed Economy. *Labor Studies Journal*, 28(2), 25-43.
- Lancy, D. F. (1993). *Qualitative Research in Education: An Introduction to the Major Traditions*. White Plains: Longman Publishing.
- LaPidus, J. B. (1997a). Doctoral Education: Preparing* for the Future. *Council of Graduate Schools Report*.
- LaPidus, J. B. (1997b). *Doctoral Education: Preparing* for the Future*.

- Laverty, S. M. (2003). *Hermeneutic Phenomenology and Phenomenology: A Comparison of Historical and Methodological Considerations*. Retrieved June 5, 2004, 2003, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/2_3final/pdf/laverty.pdf
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and Sense Making: What Newcomers Experience in Entering Unfamiliar Organizational Settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(2), 226-251.
- Lovitts, B. E., & Nelson, C. (2000). The Hidden Crisis in Graduate Education: Attrition from PhD Programs. *Academe*, November-December 2000, 44-50.
- Lucas, C., & Murray, J. (2002). *New Faculty: A Practical Guide for Academic Beginners*. New York: Palgrave.
- Lumsden, E. A., Grosslight, J. H., Loveland, E. H., & Williams, J. E. (1988). Preparation of Graduate Students as Classroom Teachers and Supervisors in Applied and Research Settings. *Teaching of Psychology*, 15(1).
- Maher, M. A., Ford, M. E., & Thompson, C. M. (2004). Degree Programs of Women Doctoral Students: Factors That Constrain, Facilitate and Differentiate. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(3), 385-408.
- Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the Progress of Women and Minority Faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 54(2), 123-144.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glenco: The Free Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Mueller, A., Perlman, B., McCann, L., & McFadden, S. (1997). A Faculty Perspective on Teaching Assistant Training. *Human Development Books Revisited*, 24(3).
- Nerad, M. (2003). *The PhD in the Us: Criticisms, Crisis and Remedies*. Retrieved May 2004, from http://www.educ.washington.edu/COEWebSite/Cirge/pdfs%20for%20web/Twente_revised.pdf
- Nyquist, J., Abbott, R., & Wulff, D. (1989). The Challenge of Ta Training in the 1990's. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott & D. H. Wulff (Eds.), *Teacher Assistant Training in the 1990's* (Vol. 39, pp. 7-14). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Nyquist, J., Manning, L., Wulff, D., Austin, A., Sprague, J., Fraser, P., et al. (1999). On the Road to Becoming a Professor: The Graduate Student Experience. *Change*(May/June).
- Oliker, M. P., & Kaufman, N. (1975). The Faculty Unionization Challenge: One Administration's Response. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 46(5), 519-531.

- Olsen, D. (1993). Work Satisfaction and Stress in the First and Third Year of Academic Appointment. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(4), 453-471.
- Olsen, D., & Crawford, L. A. (1998). A Five-Year Study of Junior Faculty Expectations About Their Work. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22.1(1998), 39-54.
- Olsen, D., Maple, S. A., & Stage, F. K. (1995). Women and Minority Faculty Job Satisfaction: Professional Role Interests, Professional Satisfactions, and Institutional Fit. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 66(3), 267-293.
- Olsen, D., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). The Pretenure Years: A Longitudinal Perspective. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Vol. 50, pp. 15-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Paulsen, M. B. (2001). The Economics of Human Capital and Investment in Higher Education. In M. B. Paulsen & G. Rhoades (Eds.), *The Finance of Higher Education: Theory, Research, Policy & Practice*. New York: Agathon Press.
- Perry, R. P., Menec, V., Struthers, C. W., Hecther, F. J., Schonwetter, D. J., & Menges, R. J. (1997). Faculty in Transition: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Role of Perceived Control and Type of Institution in Adjustment to Postsecondary Institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(5).
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, Work, and Personal Factors in Employee Turnover and Absenteeism. *Journal of Management*, 80, 151-176.
- Pruitt, A., & Isaac, P. D. (1985). Discrimination in Recruitment, Admission and Retention of Minority Graduate Students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 54(4), 526-536.
- Reynolds, A. (1992). Charting the Changes in Junior Faculty: Relationships among Socialization, Acculturation, and Gender. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 63(No. 6), 637-652.
- Rhoades, G., & Rhoads, R. (2002). The Public Discourse of U.S. Graduate Employee Unions: Social Movement Identities, Ideologies, and Strategies. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 163-186.
- Rosch, T., & Reich, J. (1996). The Enculturation of New Faculty in Higher Education: A Comparative Investigation of Three Academic Departments. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 115-131.
- Rossmann, G., & Rallis, S. (2003). *Learning in the Field: An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative Interviewing; the Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Schein, E. (1971). The Individual, the Organization, and the Career :A Conceptual Scheme. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 7(4), 401-426.
- Shannon, D. M., Twale, D. J., & Moore, M. S. (1998). Ta Teaching Effectiveness. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69(4), 440-466.
- Smallwood, S. (2004a). Doctor Dropout. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Smallwood, S. (2004b). Unions for Graduate Students Advance in California, New York, and Washington. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1988). Satisfactions and Concerns of New University Faculty. *To Improve the Academy*, 7, 121-133.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and Junior Faculty Stress: Research and Responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli (Ed.), *Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Vol. 50, pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1994). Effective Approaches of New Faculty Development. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72(May/June), 472-479.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (Eds.). (1992). *Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Vol. Number 50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Near, J. P. (1989). Relations between Work and Life Away among University Faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 60(1), 59-81.
- Spaights, E., & Farrell, W. (1986). The Enigma of the Urban University. *Education*, 106(4), 356-362.
- Sprague, J., & Nyquist, J. D. (1989). Ta Supervision. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott & D. H. Wulff (Eds.), *Teacher Assistant Training in the 1990's* (Vol. 39, pp. 37-56). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Stygall, G. (2003). A Report from a Writing Program Director in the Trenches: TAs and Unionization. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition and Culture*, 3(1), 7-19.
- Thomas, J. (2002). *The Experiences of International Faculty on United States Campuses: Understanding Issues of Socialization*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of New Orleans, New Orleans.
- Thompson, C., & Dey, E. (1998). Pushed to the Margins; Sources of Stress for African American College and University Faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 69(3), 324-345.
- Tice, S. L., Gaff, J. G., & Pruitt-Logan, A. S. (1998). Building on TA Development. *Liberal Education*, 84(Winter 98).

- Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational Socialization in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68(1), 1-16.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). *Enhancing Promotion, Tenure, and Beyond: Faculty Socialization as a Cultural Process*. Washington, D. C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 6.
- Trautvetter, L. (1999). Experiences of Women, Experiences of Men. In R. J. Menges (Ed.), *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling in, Becoming Established, and Building Institutional Support*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Turner, C. S. (2002). Women of Color in Academe: Living with Multiple Marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 74-93.
- Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the Beginning: Concerns and Needs of New Faculty. *To Improve the Academy*, 6, 41-55.
- Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking In: Socialization to Work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of Work, Organization, and Society* (pp. 67-130). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Van Maanen, J. (1984). Doing New Things in Old Ways: The Chains of Socialization. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), *College and University Organization: Insights from the Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 211 - 247). New York: New York University Press.
- Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of Doctoral Students to Academic Norms. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(6), 641-656.
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). Socialization of Graduate and Professional Students in Higher Education. *ASHE Higher Education Research Report*, 28(3), 120 pages.
- Weimer, M., Svinicki, M. D., & Bauer, G. (1989). Designing Programs to Prepare Ta's to Teach. In J. D. Nyquist, R. D. Abbott & D. H. Wulff (Eds.), *Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990's* (pp. 57-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Welford, M. R. (1996). Experiences, Reflections and Recommendations of a Teaching Assistant in the USA. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 20(1).
- Wheeler, D. W. (1992). The Role of the Chairperson in Support of Junior Faculty. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning: Developing New and Junior Faculty* (Vol. Number 50, pp. 87-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Whitt, E. (1991). "Hit the Ground Running": Experiences of New Faculty in a School of Education. *Review of Higher Education*, 14, 177-197.

APPENDICES



UNIVERSITY of NEW ORLEANS

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHP,
COUNSELING AND FOUNDATIONS

Appendix A:

Letter to gatekeeper to gain entry to site

[DATE]

Dr. John Class
Provost
Downtown University
2000 Sampler Drive
Any City, Any State 00000

Dear Dr. Class,

My name is Leonard A. Williams and I am conducting a doctoral dissertation on the impact of teaching assistantships on the preparation of new faculty entering the academy. Specifically, I am investigating the transition from graduate school to junior faculty status at an institution of higher education. New faculty are defined as those who made an immediate transition from graduate school to a tenure track faculty position and have been a faculty member for three years or less. I have chosen Downtown University as one of my research sites based on your commitment to undergraduate teaching as defined in your institutions' mission statement.

I am planning to interview a minimum of six faculty members at DU in a one-on-one interview format. I would like to request a list of tenure track faculty who have been employed at DU since 2001. This list would include the name, discipline, phone number and email address of prospective participants who would be eligible for this study. Faculty would be contacted via email to request their participation in the study through one, face-to-face interview held on your campus at a mutually convenient location. I welcome the opportunity to discuss my research interests and the scope of the study with you. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (504) 280-6692 or my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leonard A. Williams
Doctoral Student

Appendix B:
Email to Potential Study Candidates

[DATE]

Dr. Susan Wright
English Department
Downtown University
Sampler Drive
Any City, Any State 00000

Dear Dr. Wright,

My name is Leonard A. Williams and I am conducting a doctoral dissertation on the impact of teaching assistantships on the preparation of new faculty entering the academy. Specifically, I am investigating the transition from graduate school to junior faculty status at an institution of higher education. New faculty are defined as those who made an immediate transition from graduate school to a tenure track faculty position and have been a faculty member for three years or less. A list of all tenure track faculty hired since 2001 was obtained from your institution.

The purpose of this study is to examine the process of doctoral training in relationship to new faculty who were employed as teaching assistants while in graduate school. To do so, I will interview new faculty members and gather their perceptions of their graduate school experiences and attempt to connect those experiences to new faculty. There is very little research on the connection between teaching assistantships and success as a new faculty member so your participation will assist in adding new knowledge to the study of faculty preparation.

In order to identify participants for the study, I am asking your assistance by completing a short (seven question) survey online for that purpose. The link is: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=70507331967>. I welcome the opportunity to discuss my research interests and the scope of the study with you. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (504) 280-6692 or my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448.

Thank you for your time.

Leonard A. Williams
Doctoral Student

Appendix C:
Online Pre-Survey Instrument

New Faculty Experiences [Exit this survey >>](#)

1. Demographic and Professional Information

Thank you for taking time to complete this short survey. The results from this survey will be used to identify individuals willing to participate in a larger study on new faculty transition from graduate school. All information will be confidential and will not be shared with anyone except for my major professor.

* 1. Have you taught as an adjunct, temporary, part-time or instructor level at anytime BEFORE you completed your PhD? 2. Were you at anytime employed as a Teaching Assistant during the period you were working on your PhD?

Yes Yes

No No

3. Please enter the primary discipline or subject that you teach

4. Please enter the year that you received your PhD:

[Next >>](#)

New Faculty Experiences [Exit this survey >>](#)

2. Willingness to Participate

5. Please select the best answer as it relates to your willingness to participate in this study:

Yes, I am willing to participate in this study

No, I am unable and/or unwilling to participate in this study

[<< Prev](#) [Next >>](#)

* If potential participant answers “No, I am unable and/or unwilling to participate in this study”, the survey will not proceed to additional screens.

Appendix C2:
Online Pre-Survey Instrument

New Faculty Experiences

[Exit this survey >>](#)

3. Contact Information

Please enter the information below regarding your personal contact information. All information will be kept confidential.

If you choose to participate in this research, you will be contacted regarding a time to conduct a one-hour interview

6. Please enter the name of your institution.

College/University Name:

7. Please enter the name of your academic department.

Academic Department:

8. Please enter your full name.

First

MI

Last

9. Please enter a phone number and/or an alternate phone number for contacting you

Phone 1

Alternate Phone

10. Please enter your preferred mailing address (including city, state, zip)

Address 1

Address 2

Address 3 (if necessary)

City

State

Zip

11. Please enter a preferred email address (and an alternate or additional email address if available)

E-mail 1:

E-mail 2:

[<< Prev](#) [Next >>](#)

Appendix C3:
Online Pre-Survey Instrument

New Faculty Experiences [Exit this survey >>](#)

4. Thank You for Completing this Survey

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

[<< Prev](#) [Done >>](#)



UNIVERSITY of NEW ORLEANS

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHP,
COUNSELING AND FOUNDATIONS

Appendix D:
Letter to invite selected participants

[DATE]

Dr. Susan Wright
English Department
Downtown University
2000 Sampler Drive
Any City, Any State 00000

Dear Dr. Wright,

Thank you for completing the online survey regarding my dissertation topic that we communicated about a few weeks ago. I am delighted that you are willing to be a participant in this research study. There is very little research on the connection between teaching assistantships and success as a new faculty member so your participation will assist in adding new knowledge to the study of faculty preparation. Attached you will find a consent form for the study.

I will be in (city, state) during the week of (date) and would like to schedule a 60 minute interview during that time if at all possible. I would like to conduct the interview on your campus in a location of your choice that will allow for some privacy and allow you to answer questions regarding your doctoral preparation openly and honestly.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss my research interests and the scope of the study with you. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (504) 280-6692 or my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448.

Sincerely,

Leonard A. Williams
Doctoral Student

Appendix E:
Consent form

1. Title of Research Study

From Student to Faculty Member: The Socialization of Doctoral Completers to Faculty Roles in Academia

2. Project Director

Leonard A. Williams, Doctoral Student

University of New Orleans - Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations

leonard.williams@uno.edu , (504) 280-6692

In partial fulfillment of Dissertation under the supervision of

Barbara J. Johnson, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, University of New Orleans Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations

New Orleans, LA 70148

bjjohnso@uno.edu

(504) 280-6448

3. Purpose of the Research Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the experiences of new faculty members of the academy in relation to their graduate school preparation. This study will explore participants experiences as a teaching assistant and relate those experiences for preparation of a faculty role. This study is intended to provide a better focus on the activities that are existent and non-existent as they relate to the training and transition process of graduate students who choose to teach and join the faculty ranks once they complete their terminal degree.

4. Potential risks or discomforts

Generally, the researcher expects that this project will pose no risk to participants. If you wish to discuss these or any other discomforts you may experience, you may call either Project Director listed in #2 of this form.

5. Potential Benefits to you or others

This project will not provide any direct benefits to you, as participants, but will be used as further research to assist doctoral students considering a career as a faculty member.

6. Alternative Procedures

There are no alternative procedures. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw consent and terminate participation at any time without consequence.

7. Protection of Confidentiality

The information gathered will be strictly confidential. No identifying information will be provided. Consent forms with names of participants, audiotapes and transcripts will be kept in a file cabinet of which only the researcher has the key. Consent forms, audiotapes and transcripts will be destroyed in one (1) year.

8. Signatures and Consent to Participate

Federal and University of New Orleans guidelines require that we obtain signed consent for the conduct of social research and for participation in research projects, which involve human subjects. After this study's purpose, procedures, potential risks/discomforts, and benefits have been explained to you, please indicate your consent by reading and signing the statement below.

I have been fully informed of the above-described procedure with its possible benefits and risks, and I have given my permission to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Name of Participant (print)

Date

Signature of Project Director

Leonard A. Williams

Name of Project Director (print)

Date

Appendix F:
Confirmation of Formal Invitation Letter and Request for Appointment

Dear <<Participant Name>>,

First let me thank you for participating in my study. Your involvement in this study will aid to inform my research questions on perceptions of doctoral training by new tenure track faculty. Please email a date and time that is suitable for us to meet and conduct the individual interview. I plan to be in your city between <<DATE>> and <<DATE>> and will be more than happy to arrange a time that best fits your schedule. I do not anticipate the interview appointment lasting more than 60 minutes.

Once we have decided on a date, time and location to meet for the individual interview, I will send an email to confirm the agreed appointment.

At least two days prior to the interview, I will send an email as well as a reminder call to confirm our scheduled interview.

If you have any questions, or need to reschedule the interview for a more convenient time, please contact me at any of the methods listed below:

Researcher:	Leonard A. Williams
Work Phone:	(504) 280-6692
Mobile Phone:	(504) 481-1923
Email:	leonard.williams@uno.edu

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448 or bjjohnso@uno.edu.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Appendix G:
Confirmation of Individual Interview Appointment

Dear <<Participant Name>>,

Thank you again for your continued support of this study. Your involvement in this study will aid to inform my research questions on perceptions of doctoral training by new tenure track faculty. The purpose for this email is to confirm our scheduled interview according to the agreed information listed below.

Interview Date: <<Date of Interview>>
Location: <<Location of interview>>
Time: <<Time of Interview, starting and ending>>

At least two days prior to the interview, I will send an email as well as a reminder call to confirm our scheduled interview.

If you have any questions, or need to reschedule the interview for a more convenient time, please contact me at any of the methods listed below:

Researcher: Leonard A. Williams
Work Phone: (504) 280-6692
Mobile Phone: (504) 481-1923
Email: leonard.williams@uno.edu

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448 or bjjohnso@uno.edu.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Appendix H:
Reminder Email to Participants – One Day Before (date, time, location)

Dear <<Participant Name>>,

This email is a reminder of our scheduled interview on tomorrow, <<Date of Interview>>. The topic of discussion will be your perceptions of your doctoral training while in graduate school in preparation for the faculty role. We will review the consent form prior to the beginning of the interview to answer any questions that you may have. The interview is scheduled as it appears below:

Interview Date: <<Date of Interview>>
Location: <<Location of interview>>
Time: <<Time of Interview, starting and ending>>


If you have any questions, or need to reschedule the interview for a more convenient time, please contact me at any of the methods listed below:

Researcher: Leonard A. Williams
Work Phone: (504) 280-6692
Mobile Phone: (504) 481-1923
Email: leonard.williams@uno.edu

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448 or bjjohnso@uno.edu.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Appendix I:
Reminder Telephone Call Script



Appendix J:
Interview Guide

Individual Interview

1. Introduction

- Doctoral student at UNO
- Interested in graduate student experiences before they enter the academy and it connected with their professional career.

2. Consent

- Review consent form
- Participation is voluntary
- Your name and institution will not be revealed
- May pass on any question
- May stop interview at any time

3. Interview Questions

Interview Pathology

Section I – Personal Information – Preparing to Enter the Academy

1. Please discuss your background

- a. Educational path
 - i. What was your undergraduate education process like?
 - ii. What sparked you to want to consider graduate school?
- b. Research interests
 - i. What are your research areas and why?
 - ii. What did you hope to accomplish in your research interests in graduate school?
- c. Decision to enter graduate school
 - i. What kind of factors did you consider when choosing to go to graduate school?
 - ii. Who or what were the main influences for you to attend graduate school?
 - iii. What made you make the final decision to attend?
- d. Application process for graduate school
 - i. Explain your application process for graduate school
 - ii. What were some of the immediate issues you found in the application process?
- e. Becoming a professor
 - i. What factors made you want to become a professor?
 - ii. At what point did you decide to pursue the faculty role as a career option?

2. How did you obtain the Teaching Assistant position at your graduate institution

- a. Graduate school experiences
 - i. What type of institution was your graduate school – residential, urban, master's, research I, liberal arts, etc. ?

- ii. Discuss the profile of the graduate students in your department (PT, FT, etc.)
 - iii. How did you feel when discussing faculty careers in class? What was the discussion like?
- b. Application process for TA
 - i. How did you come about gaining a teaching assistantship?
 - ii. What was the process in applying and did that process assist in your decision to attend a certain institution over another?
- c. Financial considerations
 - i. How did the financial reward from the TA position impact your decision to apply?
 - ii. How did the choice to attend or not attend graduate school relate to you gaining a TA position?
 - iii. What kind of questions did you ask yourself before your first day as a TA?

Section II – Graduate School Experiences – Anticipatory Socialization

1. Student Experiences
 - a. Discuss your overall graduate school experience
 - i. Was it easy or hard?
 - ii. Were you overwhelmed or at ease?
 - iii. What did you have to adjust to the most within graduate school?
 - b. Discuss your graduate school experience outside the classroom
 - i. Did you discuss the faculty career with others such as other students?
 - ii. How often did you discuss the faculty career with other faculty members?
 - iii. What types of tasks were offered by the department or institution to prepare for role?
2. Teaching Assistant Experiences – Anticipatory Socialization
 - a. Training
 - i. Discuss how you were trained for the Teaching Assistantship
 - ii. What types of tasks did you have to prepare you for the TA position?
 - iii. What if any seminars or workshops were conducted to assist in training?
 - iv. Discuss how your supervisor assisted in training
 - b. Being on the Job
 - i. Discuss your experiences as a TA in relationship to working with other students (not in the PhD program).
 - ii. What types of tasks did you perform?
 - iii. Did you feel prepared for those tasks?
 - iv. Discuss the level of progression related to the complexity of your TA tasks
 - v. What tasks do you feel were most beneficial and least beneficial to your development as a faculty member now?

Section III – Experiences as a New Faculty member

1. First Year Experiences - Change
 - a. Discuss your first year as a faculty member

- b. What were some of your challenges and accomplishments, if there were any?
 - c. What was the biggest factor to adjust to when entering the academy as a faculty member?
 - d. How did you allocate your time? (Probe: continue to allocate)
 - e. What assisted in making the transition from grad student to faculty member?
 - f. Who did you look to support you in your first year? To provide feedback or gain advice from?
 - g. In one word, conceptualize your first year
2. First Year Experiences and TA Experiences - Contrast
- a. What was the biggest difference between being a faculty member and a TA?
 - b. How did you conceptualize what you saw as a TA in relationship to what it is to be a faculty member and what you experienced as a faculty member?
 - c. Discuss how your TA experience related to your first year as a faculty member
 - d. What knowledge gained from your TA training did you use when you were a first year faculty member?
3. Subsequent Years Experiences - Surprise
- a. Now that it is a few years after your first year, has your view of the faculty career changed?
 - b. How do you think you have benefited personally from working as a faculty member?
 - c. What types of activities or events within the academic environment do you treasure and find important in your profession?
 - d. What assumptions, if any, about the faculty career have changed or been supported over the past few years of working in academia?
 - e. What do you feel more or less confident about as you have worked more years as a faculty member?
 - f. How did your TA experience relate now to your own preparation for faculty?
 - g. If you could do it all over again, what do you wish you knew then that you know now?
4. Closing
- Any questions.
 - Thank the participant again.

Appendix K:
University of New Orleans IRB Approval

*University Committee for the Protection
of Human Subjects in Research
University of New Orleans*

Form Number: 06FEB05
(please refer to this number in all future correspondence concerning this protocol)
Principal Investigator: Barbara J. Johnson, Ph.D. Title: Assistant Professor
Leonard A. Williams Graduate Student
Department: PLCF College: Education
Project Title: From VA to Faculty Member: The Socialization of Doctoral Completers


Dates of Proposed Project Period From 02/01/05 to 02/01/06

Approval Status:

- Full Board Review Approved Date: 1/28/05
 Expedite Deferred Date:
 Exempt Disapproved Date:
 Project requires review more than annually. Review every _____ months.

**approval is for 1 year from approval date only and may be renewed yearly.*

1st continuation Signature of IRB Chair _____ Date: _____
2nd continuation Signature of IRB Chair _____ Date: _____
3rd continuation Signature of IRB Chair _____ Date: _____
4th continuation Signature of IRB Chair _____ Date: _____

Committee Signatures:
 _____
Laura Scaramella, Ph.D. (Chair)

Patricia Jenkins, Ph.D.

Anthony Kontos, Ph.D. (Associate chair)

Richard B. Speaker, Ph.D.

Gary Jardeck, Ph.D.

Kari Walsh

Kathleen Whalen, J.S.W.

L. Allen Witt, Ph.D.

VITA

Leonard A. Williams received his Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts with a concentration in Broadcast Journalism from Northwestern State University in Natchitoches, Louisiana. As an involved campus leader, he was a member and/or officer of several campus organizations including the student newspaper, university yearbook, Student Activities Council, Blue Key National Honor Fraternity, Society of Professional Journalists, National Association of Black Journalists and New Student Orientation (Freshman Connection) staff. He also served as chapter president of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. (Theta Chi chapter).

Leonard earned a Master of Educational Administration degree from the University of New Orleans where he is currently employed. He currently is the Director of the Office of Career Development which assists students and alumni with career related planning and key resources. As a doctoral student, he has maintained his full-time position with the University of New Orleans and completed a book chapter with his major professor and dissertation advisor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson.