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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the socialization process of White faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Specifically, this qualitative study identified influences and barriers in the socialization process of White tenure-line faculty at two HBCUs. Through the participants shared experiences, both positive and negative themes emerged relative to their perceptions of the socialization process. The positive themes were: the provision of clear institutional values and expectations through colleagues and institutional documentation, as well as establishing and maintaining collegial relationships, particularly with senior faculty members. On the other hand, the participants identified the absence of an orientation and the expectation to publish as barriers they perceived that impacted their experience as they sought promotion and tenure. Overall, White faculty perceived their socialization experiences at HBCUs as positive.

The findings of this study assist faculty members and administrators across all institutional types in cultivating a culture that is conducive to the socialization process of all faculty members. Thus, the results not only necessitate the need for future research but also provide recommendations for policy and practice that can be utilized at both Predominantly White Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

How do faculty members from other racial backgrounds, namely White faculty, learn what is needed to assist them in their pursuit of promotion and tenure at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)? Are these faculty members provided with necessary information and resources or are they left to discover the institutional expectations and values on their own? Given the significant percentage of White faculty at HBCUs (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999), it would seem as though inquiries into the environment White faculty encounter might already have been explored. Yet, to date, there has been little empirical research on how White faculty learn what is expected and rewarded at HBCUs. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to explore the socialization experience of White faculty at HBCUs.

The few studies that have focused on White faculty at HBCUs have found that White faculty received lower wages, undertook subordinate roles, and were considered inferior (Jacques, 1980; Smith & Bordgstedt, 1985). Furthermore, many of these faculty members have been noted as encompassing vulnerable tendencies and overly concerned about issues associated with rejection (Smith & Bordgstedt, 1985; Willie, 1981). Warnat (1976) suggested that White faculty at HBCUs were viewed by some as lacking competence, cognitively unaware of Black issues, and existing at these institutions to ease the guilt associated with racism. Still, others have reported positive experiences encountered while teaching at HBCUs (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999). Specifically, Foster, Guyden, and Miller (1999) identified White faculty who believed that they achieved a sense of belonging as a result of the support received from colleagues and
students. Hence, researchers agree that the experiences of White faculty at HBCUs vary widely (Anderson & Lancaster, 1999; Foster & Guyden, 1998; Levy, 1967; Redinger, 1999; Slater, 1993; Smith, 1982; Smith & Bordgstedt, 1985). As such, this study attempted to explore the process of socialization for White faculty at HBCUs, ultimately providing further insight into this phenomenon.

Statement of the Problem

Similar to the lack of research surrounding Black faculty socialization at HBCUs (Johnson & Harvey, 2002), there are few studies referencing White faculty experiences at these institutions. Since their establishment HBCUs have consistently remained leaders in the adoption of faculty diversity. Recent studies indicate that Asian faculty at HBCUs comprise 8 percent of the total faculty, which is double their representation when all colleges and universities are considered (Foster, 2001; Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; New & Views, 1998). At Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs), Black faculty constitute 3.6 percent of the faculty population (Cross & Slater, 2002). Yet, at HBCUs, they account for 59 percent of the faculty (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2001). White faculty, on the other hand, constitute 29 percent of all faculty at HBCUs (Johnson & Harvey, 2002; US Department of Education, 1996) compared to their representation of 84.9 percent at PWIs (News & Views, 1998).

In acknowledgement of the diverse faculty at HBCUs, one would believe that numerous studies exist on the various faculty populations at these institutions. However, this is not the case as the few empirical studies conducted thus far on White faculty experiences at HBCUs, for the most part, were conducted over 20 years ago (Smith & Bordgstedt, 1985; Warnat, 1976). Although Warnat (1976) and Smith and Bordgstedt
(1985) obtained an awareness of the perceptions of White faculty regarding issues of racial inequality, paternalistic behavior and competence their research was conducted in the 1970s and 1980s. However, research within the past two decades on White faculty at HBCUs has been virtually non-existent. Hence, this research study provided a current portrait of the socialization of White faculty at HBCUs while also contributing to the literature on faculty socialization.

Research Questions

The primary research question of this study was: How do White faculty perceive their socialization experiences at HBCUs? The secondary research questions were as follows:

1. What are the perceived influences in the socialization process?
2. What are the perceived barriers in the socialization process?
3. What departmental characteristics assist in the socialization process?

Significance of the Study

Research on HBCUs, in general, is limited and is thus in need of further exploration. A study focusing on the experiences of White faculty provides added insight into the diverse faculty population presently employed at these institutions. Researchers (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; Redinger, 1999; Smith & Borgestedt, 1985) have found that an increasingly tight higher education market has prompted many White professors to seek employment opportunities at Black colleges and universities.

Given this growing trend, it is important to document the experiences of this particular group. However, the literature pertaining to the socialization of White
faculty at HBCUs is limited; thus this research study contributed to filling a void in the literature.

As it stands, information regarding this phenomenon is not only limited, but it is also outdated. Hence, what might have been true of White faculty experiences twenty years ago, might not be true today. Consequently, this study was significant because it gave a voice to a population of faculty members at HBCUs who are rarely heard. Moreover, it provided the reader with current knowledge on the socialization process of White faculty at HBCUs.

This study may also prompt researchers to explore the socialization experiences of other minority populations at HBCUs, namely Asian, Hispanic, and international faculty. By utilizing a framework that describes the socialization experience, the findings of this study could be used to enhance the socialization experiences of faculty across all institutional types, regardless of gender or ethnicity.

There are several groups that could find this study of significance. For example, White graduate students who are considering careers as faculty members could gain insight on issues that they may encounter at HBCUs. In addition, senior faculty members may gain insight into how they can facilitate a successful transition for White faculty upon entry into HBCUs. Finally, administrators (i.e., deans, provosts, presidents, etc.) will find the findings of this study insightful in their attempts to enhance the socialization process of faculty at HBCUs.

Overview of Methodology

Two HBCUs, one private and one state-supported, were selected as sites for this study. Characteristics of faculty participants included the following: a) White (Anglo-
Saxon) descent, b) teaching at an HBCU full-time and, c) in a tenure-line (tenure or untenured) position with a Ph.D. degree.

Through a qualitative data collection approach, information pertaining to the socialization of White faculty at HBCUs was gathered. Twelve participants from the two institutions were interviewed in-person. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim based on the guidelines established by Miles and Huberman (1994). By keeping field notes, the researcher was able to recollect dialog, body language, events, and tones that facilitated the final analysis of the data collected (Glesne, 1999).

Definition of Terms

The key terms listed below were operationalized to provide the reader with knowledge of the researcher’s intended definitions of the terms throughout the study:

Socialization

Socialization is the process whereby individuals become acclimated to the norms, values, and skills of a particular setting (Merton, 1957).

Anticipatory Socialization

This phase is defined as an individual’s beliefs concerning the norms, values, and procedures of an organization prior to his/her entry within the organization (Van Maanen, 1984).

Organizational socialization

This process occurs in the initial stages of one’s employment where the new employee tries to obtain an understanding of the organization’s culture (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).
Culture

Culture is the common belief system, attitudes, and norms that any given group (of faculty members) might hold (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

Norms

These are ‘normal’ day to day occurrences that various college and university departments carry out.

Informal norms

One generally obtains such norms through faculty observation or through conversation (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994).

Tenure

This is the process whereby an individual faculty member is identified and guaranteed lifelong employment as long as the employee follows the institution’s contractual agreement (American Association of University Professors, 1974).

Organization of the Study

Chapter one provided the reader with a brief introduction to the study, the purpose for conducting the study, and its significance. Chapter two extended further, the depths of the researcher’s knowledge of the topic through a brief historical review of White faculty presence at HBCUs, as well as an overview of faculty socialization across institutional types. This was followed by a review of the literature that focused on organizational socialization and the framework which guided this study. In Chapter three of this study, the researcher discussed the methodology of the study.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The primary intent of this study was to examine the perceptions of White faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Specifically, this study explored the process of socialization for White (Anglo-Saxon) faculty at HBCUs. Additionally, the study attempted to identify factors that might enhance the socialization process of faculty, students, and administrators at HBCUs.

Hence, the following literature review will begin with an exploration of the early historical presence of White faculty at some of the first institutions established for the education of colored students. In addition, historical and current data related to Black faculty at both HBCUs and PWIs will be discussed, with the assumption that such information might assist in the reader’s understanding of White faculty experiences at HBCUs (Foster, 2001; Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; Smith and Bordgstedt, 1985; Slater, 1993). Furthermore, literature pertaining to organizational socialization will be explored. The final section of this chapter provides the reader with an overview of the conceptual framework for this study.

White Contributions to the Historical Development of HBCUs

This section provides a historical review of the missionary and philanthropic support of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) from 1866-1960. As such, issues of White and Black denominational missionary support and industrial philanthropy will be explored. Included in the historical development of these institutions were faculty members from various racial backgrounds. Hence, the contributions of Jewish and African American scholars will also be discussed. Consequently, it is the
intent of this section to provide insight on the historical context in which this study is situated.

For over a century, African American students from all walks of life have taken part in the national tradition of attending Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Browning & Williams, 1978). These institutions represent, for many, a time when education for Blacks was virtually unattainable (Browning & Williams, 1978). The earliest contributors to these institutions included missionary groups such as the American Missionary Association (AMA), the Freedmen’s Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the American Baptist Home Missionary Society (ABHMS), the Presbyterian Board of Missions for Freedmen, as well as independent northern missionaries (Anderson, 1988). Encompassing the freedom to learn and pursue academia was at the root of this movement.

According to Anderson (1988), the AMA was responsible for the existence of colleges such as Fisk University, Straight University (Dillard), Tougaloo College, and Talladega College. Clark University, Bennett College, Claflin College, Meharry Medical College, Morgan State University, Philander Smith College, Rust College, and Wiley College were all founded by the Freedmen’s Aid Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Presbyterian Board of Missions for Freedman established Biddle University (now Johnson C. Smith), Knoxville College, Stillman Seminary, and Mary Allen Seminary (Anderson, 1988; Mary Allen College Bulletin, 1970). Other colleges and universities such as Atlanta University, Howard University, and Leland University were established by independent northern missionary boards (Anderson, 1988).
The missionary organizations were instrumental in creating educational opportunities for many African Americans who would otherwise not have been able to attend college. Historically, as noted by Thelin (2004), the philosophy behind denominational missionary interest in Black education was such that there was a strong need for religious influence in the Black communities. In this way, many of the White missionary organizations took it upon themselves to “Christianize and educate the former slave” (Anderson, 1988, p. 457), believing that “without education,…blacks would rapidly degenerate and become a national menace to American civilization” (Heintze, 1999, p. 1).

One of the major issues that caused many citizens within White communities to criticize this new movement of educating Blacks was the issue of curriculum. Most Whites during this period (late nineteenth and early twentieth century) believed that if Blacks were going to be educated, that they should be trained in fields associated with service and industry (Anderson, 1988). However, those who advocated the need to develop Black leadership in African American communities argued that industrial education would not facilitate the leadership that blacks needed to be able to think for themselves and develop their communities (Anderson, 1988). According to the missionaries, this could not be accomplished without a classical liberal education (Thelin, 2004). Anderson (1988) noted that the liberal and dominant philanthropists believed that education for Blacks was intended to develop leadership within the Black communities, as well as to “uplift the black masses from the legacy of slavery and the restraints of the postbellum caste system” (p. 456). Accordingly, the AMA set out to establish institutions of higher education that would be responsible for educating those Black youths who were
considered to be exceptional individuals (Anderson, 1988). These students would in turn, become leaders of their people. In order to accomplish this task, “a higher classical liberal education” was necessary (Anderson, 1988, p. 456).

A classical liberal education differed from that of an industrial education, in that an education rooted in the classics might include such subjects as the ancient languages--Greek and Latin, mathematics, astronomy, music, philosophy, as well as the fine arts and religion (Urban & Wagoner, 2004). This type of education reflected the universal curriculum provided at White institutions of higher education, a curriculum that was intended to develop intellectual thought and leadership (Anderson, 1988). Many Whites were adamantly against this form of learning for the Black student. According to Urban and Wagoner (2004), a large percentage of the White population believed that Blacks were not equipped to handle such an intellectual capacity. Instead, Blacks should be immersed in courses that trained and provided them with vocational skills such as welding, mechanical drawing, carpentry, woodworking, along with a variety of metal working skills (Urban & Wagoner, 2004). These service related fields were intended to keep Blacks in roles that were subservient to Whites (Anderson, 1988).

A transformation in the education of Blacks would prove to be a difficult task, due to the fact that there were some Blacks who felt that an industrial education was important and necessary to explore. One such individual was Booker T. Washington, who was a strong advocate of industrialized education for the masses of uneducated Blacks in America (Anderson, 1988; Thelin, 2004; Urban & Wagoner, 2004). A Hampton Institute graduate, Washington exhibited a great deal of confidence in his famous dictum to the Black masses to “cast down your bucket where you are and create a better life through
Although Washington was an advocate of industrialized education, he also etched away at the mountainous terrain that seemed to prohibit the Black population from making strides in higher education (Urban & Wagoner, 2004). Washington, equipped with the tenets of developing a sense of racial pride, responsible citizenry, and useful service, was famous for his development of a secondary and normal school which eventually became known as Tuskegee University (Urban & Wagoner, 2004). Unlike other Black institutions of higher education, Tuskegee (as well as Hampton) acquired large endowments from numerous White industrial philanthropic organizations.

White organizations that supported industrial education for blacks included “Peabody, Slater, Rosenwald, Andrew Carnegie, and the John D. Rockefellers, Sr. and Jr.” (Urban & Wagoner, 2004, p. 150). These industrial philanthropists had tremendous power and without their support, black colleges had a difficult time retaining their positions as the higher forms of academia for blacks across America (Anderson, 1988). Colleges that continued to provide a classical liberal arts education for black students were among those that had a difficult time sustaining their curriculum, since industrial philanthropists were inclined to support schools that advocated vocational training (Anderson, 1988). According to Anderson (1988), industrial philanthropists were worried that the knowledge obtained by students attending these liberal arts institutions would affect those attending both normal and common schools, causing them to want the same form of education. This would leave no room for models like Hampton and Tuskegee (Anderson, 1988). Their predictions were to some extent true. After World War I, many Blacks began to recognize that in order to obtain a decent position in society,
they would have to obtain a degree from a liberal arts institution of higher education (Anderson 1988). This degree would allow them to enter fields that were less subservient to their White counterparts. Industrial training, on the other hand, was viewed as a continuance of subordination (Anderson, 1988). Hence, eventually many Black colleges and universities began to adopt the liberal arts curriculum (Anderson, 1988).

Not only was the curriculum controversial but the issue of leadership at these institutions was also a highly debated topic (Anderson, 1988). Many Whites did not approve of Blacks being placed in administrative positions (Anderson, 1988). As a result, Whites did not begin to endorse black administrators until the onset of the Great Depression. The Traditions of White Presidents at Black Colleges (1997) asserts that because the Great Depression left many northern missionary organizations with limited funds, their financial support of the Black colleges and universities that they sustained was either reduced or discontinued. It was at this time that many Black colleges began to hire Black college presidents. Some believed, however, that these presidents were set up as “convenient scapegoat[s] if the institutions were to fail” (The Traditions of White Presidents at Black Colleges, 1997, p. 94).

According to the Tradition of White Presidents at Black Colleges (1997), “[t]he White founders and supporters of the black colleges were reluctant to entrust control of the institutions to black people” (p. 93). It was not until 1926 that Mordecai Johnson became the first Black president of Howard University, an HBCU that was established by White northern missionaries (Hoffman, 1996).

Jewish scholars at HBCUs. By the 1930s and 1940s, many of the HBCUs were governed by Black leaders and administrators (Anderson, 1988). They also employed a
predominantly Black faculty population. However, a small White faculty population still remained at these institutions. By the mid 1930s, a percentage of the faculty at HBCUs was comprised of Jewish refugees from Germany (From Swastika to Jim Crow, 2001). According to the PBS documentary, From Swastika to Jim Crow (2001), many of the early White faculty members teaching at HBCUs were scholars who fled Germany during the 1930s when Adolf Hitler’s Nazi Party overtook Germany. In 1933, Germany established a major discrimination law that was established to prevent the overcrowding of German institutions of higher education. Subsequently, Jews were not allowed to attend German institutions (From Swastika to Jim Crow, 2001). Gradually, the regime began the systematic extermination of Jews while in concentration camps. As a result, many scholars began to flee the country. According to From Swastika to Jim Crow (2001), approximately 1,200 scholars fled to the US, including one of the greatest renowned intellectuals, Albert Einstein.

Upon their arrival in the US, a large percentage of the Jews found it difficult to obtain jobs due to the anti-Semitic beliefs of White Americans during this period (From Swastika to Jim Crow, 2001). As a result, many sought jobs with individuals who suffered similar persecution. Ironically, many were able to find solace amongst educated scholars within the Negro communities. HBCUs, in the 1930s and 1940s, welcomed the presence of Jewish scholars on their campuses as they believed that these scholars encompassed the capacity to identify with the oppressive aspects of Jim Crowism which Negroes were experiencing (From Swastika to Jim Crow, 2001) since both groups were ostracized by the White community.
According to From Swastika to Jim Crow (2001), approximately fifty Jewish scholars took positions at nineteen HBCUs. In terms of their socialization experiences with the students, “l[B]ack students were often more trusting of their Jewish professors, as they were not seen as completely White”. Instead, they were presumed to be “some kind of colored folk”. As a result, their was a great deal of respect between the students and the Jewish faculty.

One of the most highly recognized Jewish faculty members of this period was Earnest Borinski, who taught at Tougaloo College from 1948 to 1983. According to Rozman (1999), Dr. Borinski was chairman of the Social Science Division for several years. In the late 1950s, Borinski ignored segregation policies and held integrated social science forums which included the participation of students and faculty from Tougaloo as well as faculty members and students from the all White Millsaps College. Rozman (1999) also posits that before fleeing Germany, Borinski was an attorney and judge. Hence, he also taught law courses at Tougaloo and was responsible for training some of the most prominent attorneys in the state of Mississippi. As a professor at an all Black institution, Borinski thought of himself as an “inside outsider” (p. 98). According to Rozman (1999), Borinski believed that “a [W]hite [person] could not expect to be fully accepted as family”, that:

although he had become an icon and the most positively regarded [W]hite person in memory, he had no illusions about the role he could play. Always the diplomat, he carefully established relationships and acted skillfully to avoid offending the key people at the institution (p. 98).

As such, instead of pushing him away, he was admired by both his colleagues and students at Tougaloo. Like Borinski, many other Jewish refugees found the HBCUs to be receptive to their plight. Among the Jewish were such scholars as: John Hertz of Howard
History of Black Faculty at HBCUs

Though White faculty have had a tremendous impact on the development of HBCUs, Black faculty have also shared in this triumph. Black faculty constitute 59 percent of the faculty population at HBCUs (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2001). As such the participation of Black faculty in the education of the students who attend HBCUs is well regarded throughout the African American community. According to Hedgepeth, Edmonds, and Craig (1978), “[t]he [B]lack college teacher is likely to be viewed as a symbol of success and upward mobility by students and citizens in the community” (p. 177). Hence, African American professionals are valued within the HBCU and the African American community.

Early history of Black faculty attainment recognizes that Black professors were not always allowed to teach outside of Black education which ironically contributed to the growth of Black education (Bowles & Decosta, 1971). According to Bowles and Decosta (1971), the landmark case, *Plessey v. Ferguson* ruled that “separate coach laws [were] not in conflict with the equal protection laws of the fourteenth amendment” proved to be paramount in the separation in the Negro and White races in every facet (Bowles & Decosta, p. 203). In terms of education, Negroes were no longer allowed to attend White institutions, nor were Negroes allowed to teach at White institutions. Prior to this, Bowles and Decosta (1971) posit that during the reconstruction period, “Negroes
[were] receiving baccalaureate and professional degrees from historically White colleges and universities of the South and serving as teachers in these institutions” (p. 33).

One such individual was Richard T. Greener, who is noted as the first Negro to receive his bachelor’s degree from Harvard University (Bowles & Decosta, 1971). In 1873, he became a professor of metaphysics and logic at the predominantly White University of South Carolina (Bowles & Decosta, 1971; Simmons, 1891). Yet, after 1895, all such progression ceased. Instead, Negro faculty found themselves replacing the White professors that had once been the primary educational facilitators within the Negro institutions. Although they were in high demand at these institutions, the lack of state funds and the decrease in funds associated with pupil expenditures meant Negro faculty would receive low wages in exchange for larger classes (Bowles & Decosta, 1971). Yet, regardless of these circumstances, Negro faculty remained vigilant and Negro institutions managed to grow despite their “deplorably weak” conditions (p. 37).

Black Faculty at PWIs

Through the landmark case of Brown v. Board of Education (1954), issues of desegregation were argued and decided upon (Bowles & Decosta, 1971). During the Civil Rights Movement, discrimination was fought; and subsequently Affirmative Action legislation ensured that equitable laws were put in place to facilitate the entry of people of color in higher education (Bowles & Decosta, 1971). Yet, the representation of faculty of color remains disproportionate to their percentage of the population (Thompson & Louque (2005).

According to Cross and Slater (2002), nationwide, African Americans comprised 5 percent of all college faculty in 2002. However, a high percentage (59%) of these same
faculty members were faculty members at HBCUs (Cross & Slater, 2002). Furthermore, Black faculty constitute only 3.6 percent of all faculty at PWIs (Cross & Slater, 2002). The highest percentage of African American faculty at PWIs can be found in the disciplines of religion, sociology, Black studies, urban education, and law (Cross & Slater, 2002).

An important aspect in the development of a faculty member is peer support (Butner, Burley, & Marbley, 2000). According to Hall and Sandler (1983), such support may be difficult for Black faculty members to receive at PWIs, as many White and Black faculty have few common interests. Insofar as research is concerned, “research interests that are not mainstream are sometimes devalued” (Hall & Sandler, 1983, p. 457). Consequently, devalued research can negatively affect possibilities for tenure. Because a great deal of Black faculty research centers on minority issues, mentorship to facilitate such studies is limited. In a study conducted by Blackwell (1989), it was found that one out of every eight Black faculty members has a mentor. Butner, Burley and Marbley (2000) argue that in order for such factors to be reduced, “collaboration, collegiality, and community” collectivism are necessary.

Not only do Black faculty at PWIs deal with the day to day concerns associated with the role of a faculty member, they also encounter issues identified by researchers as cultural insensitivity. Thompson and Louque (2005) found that 84 percent of the Black faculty who responded to their survey proclaimed that cultural insensitivity was a common factor on their campus. Seventy percent of faculty in their study believed that race issues negatively affected their contentment with their jobs, causing them to feel stressed while at work. These same faculty members tended to confront issues of
alienation, isolation, marginalization, and a lack of respect from colleagues, students, and administrators (Butner, Burley, & Marbley, 2000; Fleming, 1984; Thompson & Louque, 2005).

Alexander-Snow and Johnson (1998) assert that stress for Black faculty at White colleges and universities can be stimulated by insufficient forms of guidance with regard to the roles that they are expected to play, as well as in relation to the teaching and research that they are required to do. Similarly, Exum, Menges, Watkins, and Berglund (1984) surmised that a lack of knowledge regarding what is expected of them, causes many Black faculty members at PWIs to experience various forms of isolation which can be detrimental to their chances of gaining promotion and tenure.

Sowell (1975) further suggested that not only is social isolation a factor in the attainment of success for faculty of color, but that the practices established by Affirmative Action policies also affect their access to opportunities at PWIs. According to Banks (1984), both qualified and satisfied Black faculty feel as though their White counterparts implicitly question their abilities as a result of early Affirmative Action policies which based selection of an individual of his/her race. Hence, it is this type of perception that causes faculty of color to continuously overextend themselves to prove that they are worthy of the positions that they were hired to perform (Menges & Exum, 1983; de la luz Reyes & Halcon, 1991; Johnsrud, 1993).

Minority Faculty at PWIs

Given these circumstances, it would be in poor judgment to utilize the experiences of minority faculty at PWIs to surmise what White faculty at HBCUs undergo. While many White faculty members at HBCUs may experience various forms
of inequitable treatment (i.e. lower wages, subordinate roles, inferiority issues), they most likely have never been referred to as “twofers” or being viewed as meeting two classifications (Charting the Differences Among White and African American Faculty, 1997, p.1). This, however, is the case for minorities such as Black women who have the capacity to double an institution’s diversity figures due to their gender and their racial background (Jacques, 1980; Smith & Bordgstedt, 1985; Charting the Differences Among White and African American College Faculty, 1997). Hiring practices like these exist to complete the “number” of under represented minority faculty members at PWIs (Charting the Differences Among White and African American College faculty, 1997, p. 1). Many faculty members who have been hired in this manner report that once they’ve been hired, they are then ignored by their department or institution (Charting the Differences Among White and African American College Faculty, 1997). Such instances suggest that there are various forms of socialization that minority faculty at PWIs may undergo that can not be equated with White faculty experiences at HBCUs.

Current statistics on minority representation in tenure-track positions indicate that the presence of minority faculty remains considerably low. In a study conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (1998), it was found that when all of America’s colleges and universities are taken into account, White full-time faculty members were more likely to receive tenure than minority faculty members in full-time positions. Furthermore, minorities (i.e., African Americans, Hispanics, Alaskan Natives, and American Indians) held positions such as assistant professor, lecturer, instructor, or other faculty positions, while their White, Asian, and Pacific Islander counterparts “were more evenly divided between high and low ranked faculty positions” (National Center for
Researchers attribute these lower statistics (in both Black and White colleges) to not only the lack of recruitment into these institutions, but to the effortless facilitation of senior faculty currently holding tenure track positions at these institutions (Alger, 1998; Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2001; Johnson & Harvey, 2002). According to research, senior faculty at PWIs tend to assist or mentor (informally) “younger versions of themselves when imparting there wisdom and experiences” or to those whom they believe they have a great deal in common (Alger, 1998). Because most often these senior faculty members are White, the younger versions of themselves tend to be White as well (Alger, 1998).

In addition, minority faculty, are often given the task of not only mentoring students within their fields, but also mentoring minority students “regardless of their student’s subject-matter interests” (Alger, 1998, p. 1). Although this form of consultation is helpful, it tends to be an added burden for the few minority faculty members existing at PWIs. Still, while this may be viewed as burdensome to minority faculty members, Thompson (1978) surmised that students who are a product of low status communities often increase their knowledge of middle-class behavior by observing teachers who are of the same racial background.

Furthermore, with tenure remaining the ultimate goal of most faculty members, the experiences that they undergo to achieve such a status is imperative, as ones experiences can largely effect the attainment of such. According to Algers (1998) when institutions limit research to publication in traditional journals, they are slighting “new or emerging areas of scholarship or practical applications of theory to real-life problems” (p.
2). Oftentimes research as well as ethnic courses taught by minority faculty members are not taken seriously and therefore given less merit (Alger, 1998). Consequently, minority faculty may find it more difficult to meet the research expectations of the PWI in the promotion and tenure process (Alger, 1998; Hall & Sandler, 1983).

Another facet that may be inconsistent with what White faculty experience at HBCUs is the tendency of PWIs to forcibly hold minority faculty responsible (on student evaluations) for teaching ethnic courses that may not be related to their research specialization (Alexander-Snow & Johnson, 1998; Alger, 1998). Negative evaluations of this kind can have an effect on their attainment of promotion and tenure.

Collegiality is also a factor for many in their achievement of promotion and tenure. A “vague and subjective” term, it is often used for “favoring candidates with backgrounds, interests, and political and social perspectives similar to” their department’s or institution’s (Alger, 1998, p. 3). Because minority faculty members often challenge these perspectives, they receive yet another strike when evaluated for promotion and tenure.

The *Chronicle of Higher Education* (2006) contends that only half of all young scholars who begin at their institutions go on to achieve tenure at the initial institution. This article noted that achieving tenure at a major research university is “one of the biggest hurdles of a professor’s career” (p. 10). One could surmise that if it is difficult to obtain tenure for White faculty at PWIs, then one can imagine how much more difficult it must be to achieve such a goal for minority faculty members, given the barriers they often encounter.
Faculty Experiences at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

While there is a plethora of literature on the experiences of faculty at PWIs there is sparse research on faculty experiences across other institutional types. Thus, the remainder of this section will examine the few research studies that have explored the experiences of HBCU faculty, specifically Black and White faculty.

Experiences of Black Faculty at HBCUs

Unlike their experiences at PWIs, Black faculty at HBCUs encounter stressors that may affect their socialization process. Yet, based on the research conducted by Roebuck and Murty (1993), Black faculty with a preference to teach at HBCUs do so, in part, because of the family connection extended by the HBCU. Thompson (1978) goes a step further by suggesting that many Black faculty remain at HBCUs “because they are truly dedicated to black youth” and that “[t]eaching is for them a calling in which they find both deep personal and professional satisfaction” (p. 189). Billingsley (1982) surmised that the desire to contribute to the development of a well fortified Black faculty population, as well as to help large numbers of Black students, resulted in many Black faculty members remaining at HBCUs. Additionally, Roebuck and Murty (1993) reported that many African American faculty members prefer to teach at HBCUs to avoid the status ambiguities and racial conflict they may encounter at PWIs. Moreover, Butner, Burley, and Marbley (2000) suggested that a faculty member’s sense of belonging is crucial in their continued employment as a faculty member at an institution. Furthermore, Johnson and Harvey (2002) asserted that clear institutional values and expectations, showing new faculty the ropes, and heavy workloads were factors that influenced the socialization of African American faculty.
Clear institutional values and expectations. In terms of clear institutional values and expectations, previous studies (Johnson, 2000; Johnson & Harvey, 2002) have established that Black faculty at HBCUs obtained information regarding the institution both formally and informally. Informal methods involved receiving such information from colleagues “in a spontaneous and casual manner—at lunch, in the hallway, or in passing conversations” (p. 300).

Formal methods involved ascertaining information through “written publications and annual meetings with the department chair” (p. 301). As such, informal and formal methods of gaining information at the HBCUs in the study facilitated positive socialization amongst the Black faculty members and their peers in the study (Johnson, 2001; Johnson & Harvey, 2002). To this end, researchers agree that:

Formal interaction provides a route for understanding the written rules of the institution. Informal interaction is crucial in understanding and traversing the unwritten rules of the institution and tenure process (Butner, Burley, & Marbley, 2000; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Harnish & Wild, 1994; Turner & Thompson, 1993).

Moreover, Johnson and Harvey’s (2002) study confirmed that “formal and informal colleague support is necessary for the effective socialization of new faculty” (p. 302).

Showing new faculty the ropes. Thompson (1978) surmised that Black faculty differ from institution to institution in terms of their contributions. Yet, according to Johnson (2001), one of the barriers that many of these faculty members experience is a lack of assistance with tasks that are often required of faculty but not of significant value in the promotion and tenure process. Of the four institutions in Johnson and Harvey’s (2002) study, participants in the study indicated that a barrier in the socialization process was senior faculty not showing new faculty the ropes. Showing an individual the ropes...
refers to facilitating faculty members with the process of learning “the culture of the
department and institution, policies and procedures, key introductions to individuals
internal and external to the campus, shortcuts, answers to questions… [etc.]” (Johnson &
Harvey, 2002, p. 302). Although the participants in their study were informed about
values and expectations, senior faculty failed to provide information on the “customs and
norms of academic life” (p. 303). Johnson and Harvey (2002) asserted that in many cases
senior faculty may be oblivious to the fact that junior faculty are unaware of “customary
policies and procedures” (Johnson & Harvey, 2002). Nevertheless, participants in
Johnson and Harvey’s (2002) study were still positive about the socialization process
within their respective institutions.

Heavy work load. Historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) tenure
and deny tenure to more African Americans than other institutions (Fields, 1997). Fields
(1997) further stated that there are perceptions among African American scholars that the
promotion and tenure process at HBCUs may be more difficult than at PWIs. Many
factors affect the pursuit of tenure at HBCUs as faculty are often expected to teach heavy
course loads (often two or four times that of faculty at many predominantly white
institutions), engage in committee work, work with students and publish depending on
the mission of the institution (Fields, 1997).

Confirming Fields (1997) findings is a study conducted by Johnson and Harvey
(2002) of African American faculty at HBCUs which found that heavy work load was a
barrier in the promotion and tenure process. In an earlier study, Thompson (1978)
suggested that for many Black faculty members at HBCUs, teaching is the primary role
that in many circumstances prohibits black faculty from delving into other facets of their
roles. Johnson and Harvey (2002) note that rarely is there adequate time to devote to the research and service components of the faculty role due to the heavy teaching load. Not only is a lack of time considered a barrier to conducting research and engaging in service, but limited financial resources has also been noted as a hindrance (Thompson, 1947).

When institutions place heavy emphasis on research, while at the same time still emphasizing the importance of teaching, there is a tendency for individuals to feel overloaded (Johnson & Harvey, 2002). Likewise, new faculty across all institutional types experience frustration as a result of heavy work loads as well (Blau, 1973; Boice, 1992; Fink 1984).

Experiences of White Faculty at HBCUs

According to Slater (1993), in the past, White faculty members have filed lawsuits against HBCUs for what they term as racist treatment. After accusing the administration of denying him tenure due to his racial background, a White professor at St. Augustine’s College in Raleigh, North Carolina, was awarded a judgment of $745,000 by a federal jury (Slater, 1993). Consequently, a White professor at Lincoln University (an HBCU) in Pennsylvania was noted as stating:

[T]here tends to be an emphasis at [B]lack schools to give weight to the race of teachers. It’s clear that it happens. It depends on the views of the people running the show. There are some that may not want to tenure a [W]hite professor. But there are some for whom the primary factor is how well you do your job (p. 70).

Slater (1993) noted the enthusiasm of a White professor at Spelman College about her views on socialization at the HBCU. The White faculty member perceived that her colleagues treated her with extreme fairness, “both [W]hite and [B]lack” (Slater, 1993, p. 69). In fact, this same faculty member asserted that after having taught at Spelman for
more than 20 years that she has completely forgotten about skin color and noted that differential treatment constitutes awkwardness in the workplace.

According to Foster (2001), the discussion on White presence at HBCUs remains an issue due to the history of White presence on HBCU campuses which has been identified as “paternalistic, controlling, pacifying, and opportunistic” (p. 621). In addition to these characteristics, HBCUs have also been known to advocate Afrocentricism, whereby African American faculty members participate in the promotion of educational activities associated with this ideological form (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999). Subsequently, individuals have debated whether the presence of non-Black faculty has facilitated the development of African American students (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; Johnson, 1971).

An aspect of the mission of HBCUs that remains constant today is the facilitation and advocating of diversity (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999). According to Magner (1993), HBCUs have “always prided themselves on being shelters from racial bias” (p. 12). Hence, Whites have always had the same opportunities as Blacks to become permanent members within the system of Black higher education. To that end, studies suggest that an increasingly tight higher education market has prompted many young White professors to seek employment opportunities with Black institutions of higher education (Foster, Guyden & Miller, 1999; Redinger, 1999; Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). Prior to the lack of employment opportunities, White faculty might have been more inclined to teach at PWIs. Recognizing this circumstance, it is likely that some African Americans at HBCUs might regard their presence and devotion to the institution and its students as suspect (Smith & Borgstedt, 1985).
Nevertheless, similar to factors associated with the adjustment of Black faculty at PWIs; White faculty members must adjust to the novelty of teaching in settings where they become the minority in a predominantly Black majority population. Such experiences can be equated to the experiences of new faculty members, whereby new faculty settling into their positions encounter a great deal of stress. Such tension might be related to one’s inability to identify and implement the culture demonstrated by the organization (Johnson & Harvey, 2002; Tierney & Rholes, 1994). Foster, Guyden and Miller (1999) found that White faculty tend to have good experiences in the classroom which could be attributed to power differential. In essence, professors have a higher stance in the classroom than they do with their peers, making it less difficult to perform their duties.

When considering White faculty socialization at HBCUs, it is necessary to include the perspectives of researcher, Winifred Warnat (1976), whose research focuses on the classification of White faculty upon entry into predominantly Black institutions of higher education. Accordingly, Warnat (1976) based his research on that of Ralph Linton (1939), who espoused the notion that “each individual has a series of roles which come from numerous patterns in which the individual participates” (p. 335). These roles, Warnat (1976) identified as a) the Moron, b) the Martyr, c) the Messiah and, d) the Marginal Man.

**Moron.** The *moron*, according to Warnat (1976), is a role that members of the White majority population equate with White individuals who choose to work in Black higher education. As such, they are perceived to be less educated and lack the proficiency to work amongst their fellow White educators who are employed at PWIs. The reasoning
associated with their tendency to remain faculty members within the confines of HBCUs or such a “negative environment” is often associated with the “fear of rejection and having to face the reality of limited ability” (Warnat, 1976). By working at HBCUs, the White faculty member has the benefit of blaming his/her lack of proficiency on the negative environment where he/she works.

*Martyr.* Warnat (1976) identified the *martyr* as the White faculty member who strives to relinquish his/her guilt through acts congruent with those of a missionary. By taking on tasks considered by other members of the faculty as laborious, he/she believes that he/she is getting what he/she deserves. As such, the individual has no aspirations of achieving higher status levels regardless of whether or not he/she is worthy (Warnat, 1976). It is this faculty member that Black faculty members pity most and thus prefer to work with.

*Messiah.* The Messiah is regarded by Warnat (1976) as the individual who believes that Black educators are in need of his/her guidance due to their lack of proper direction. As such this individual’s mission is to “save the damned” (p. 336). Black faculty members resent the presence of the messiah on HBCU campuses. According to Warnat (1976), “[m]ore than any other element of the White faculty, this one tends to foster mistrust and feelings of alienation and hostility among his colleagues towards him” (p. 336).

*Marginal man.* The *marginal man* represents the White faculty member who lives with the constant conflicts associated with being a member of a majority population, as well as a member of the minority population within the confines of the HBCU for which he/she works. According to Warnat (1976), this individual is both a member of his/her
own community as well as an “alien” in the Black community due to his/her association with the majority population (p. 337). Ultimately, the individual’s view of him/herself is based on two factors espoused by Warnat (1976). These factors include both “the role he assumes in society” and “…the attitudes and opinions which members of the society form of him” (p. 337). As Foster, Guyden, and Miller (1999) asserted, White faculty members can never fully become an insider within a Black majority. However, Warnat (1976) speculates that he/she does have the ability to “pass”, meaning that the individual encompasses the capacity to ascribe to the cultural views and norms of the Black population (p. 337). Yet, total assimilation or “passing” is impossible due to one’s cultural background.

White Faculty and Minority/Majority Socialization

Upon their initial entrance into HBCU educational systems, White faculty are subjected to a type of classification that they would otherwise be denied. No longer part of the majority population, they take part in a membership that has long been associated with people of color inhabiting the US (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999). In essence, White faculty become members of the minority population while on HBCU campuses. As noted earlier, White faculty constitute 29% of all faculty members at HBCUs. Cognizant of the norms, values, and roles associated with the majority population, they encompass a limited understanding of the characteristics most associated with existing as a member of the minority population. According to Ponterotto (2006), as members of the majority, the White population develops its identity through a series of stages. These five stages are identified by Hardiman (1982): lack of social consciousness, acceptance, resistance, redefinition, and internalization.
Hardiman (1982) identified the first stage, *lack of social consciousness* as a point when White individuals lack an awareness of social constructs that relate to their racial background. This stage takes place from birth to approximately age five. Stage two is the *acceptance* of their White identity. In this stage, Whites become socialized by various entities that play a major role in their lives (i.e., mothers and/or fathers, teachers, friends, media, etc.). Through these entities, they learn what is socially acceptable and/or unacceptable as members of their race (Hardiman, 1982; Ponterotto, 2006). According to Ponterotto (2006):

This powerful socialization results the staunch acceptance of behavior and beliefs that support the social codes. The dominant belief system becomes internalized, and no conscious effort is needed to remind the individual what thoughts and actions are socially appropriate (p. 91).

This stage, as noted by Hardiman (1982) can remain part of one’s conscious or subconscious for a lifetime. Stage three, *resistance*, can be both “painful” and “emotionally draining” (Ponterotto, 2006, p. 92). It is at this time that Whites discover and feel to some extent that they have been lied to and as a result are embarrassed at the past beliefs that they held. They begin to understand the anger that many minorities harbor as it relates to their positions in society. Accordingly, Whites resist holding minorities responsible for their own state of affairs and place more emphasis on the condemnation of their own (White) culture’s xenophobic behavior (Hardiman, 1982). This is an important stage because it is during this period that Whites in the resistance stage might attempt to educate themselves properly on other cultures and make a conscious effort to assist in the education of other Whites about racism. Some Whites never reach this stage, according to Hardiman (1982). This may cause emotional drainage, as they may be ostracized by both White and minorities. The fourth stage, *redefinition*, is the point at
which time White individuals become more inclined to redefine their identity, searching for aspects of their culture that is not connected to racism. Included in this redefinition is their ability to view themselves in a non-racist manner and to acknowledge the fact that it is “in Whites’ self-interest to eradicate racism (Ponterotto, 2006, p. 93). By the final stage or the internalization, Whites integrate their new identity into their overall social identity (Ponterotto, 2006, p. 93). As opposed to viewing their culture as a negative part of their identity, it is instead seen as healthy and positive.

It is important to acknowledge the fact that White individuals may not experience all five of these stages. Instead, they might stagnate in a particular stage and never progress to the next level. They might also experience these stages simultaneously or in a different sequence (Hardiman, 1982; Ojha, 2005). Majority identity socialization is important, as it suggests that Whites who perpetuate racism have an incapacity to integrate with other groups and are stuck in the acceptance stage. Accordingly, these individuals lack the knowledge necessary to advance into subsequent stages that might ultimately assist them in acquiring positive professional roles in society as it relates to other racial groups. White faculty who are unquestionably sincere about their work at HBCUs are an example of this. Still, although Whites who experience the last three stages (e.g., resistance, redefinition, and internalization) are able to “establish a sense of pride in their identity” (Ponterotto, 2006), those attempting to integrate into societies where they become minorities must undergo another type of transformation.

Accordingly, White individuals must undergo a transformation experience in order to develop the skills needed to exist on HBCU campuses where they are members
of the minority population. To fully understand such a transformation, one must explore what Martin and Nakayama (2000) term *minority identity*.

When White individuals find themselves in a position where they are members of the minority population (such as becoming faculty members within a predominantly Black institution), they adhere to a different set of stages. In order to accomplish the exacerbating task of assimilation within such an organization or society, White individuals must develop their minority identity. According to Ponterotto and Pederson (1993), through minority development, one can reconstruct his/her identity when he/she is no longer identified as a member of the majority population. Jablin (1982) established four stages that facilitate the process of developing a minority identity. These stages are: *unexamined identity, conformity, resistance and separatism, and integration*.

*Unexamined identity* or stage one suggests that the individual encompasses little information in relation to his/her identity as a member of the minority population (as opposed to their membership in the majority population) (Jablin, 1982). In the second stage, or *conformity* the new minority member begins to associate negative values with his/her own cultural background, recognizing such idiosyncrasies as minority labeling as harsh. *Resistance and separatism* is the stage whereby the individual resists the urge to blame minorities for their situation and instead “blames their own dominant group as a source of racial and ethnic problems” (Martin & Nakayama, 2000, 133). Stage four, *integration*, is similar to stage five of the majority model, whereby the individual gains a strong sense of who he/she is and can henceforth become a positive member within his/her new minority status group (Jablin, 1982). Hence, in this stage instead of linking positive information with their status as members of the majority population, Whites have
to associate positive information with the new minority population where they have become members. As noted earlier, some individuals might experience these stages differently, whether sequential or simultaneously.

These stages are helpful and add insight into the “one area of life” that may affect how individuals assimilate into organizations or institution. According to Ojha (2005), the intercultural aspects of one’s life has a profound affect on how one chooses to make sense of his/her environment. Based on these two models (Hardiman 1982; Martin & Nakayama, 2000), White faculty who undergo the last three stages of the majority model, as well as all of the stages associated with the minority model, have a better chance at integrating into organizations such as HBCUs, where they become members of the minority population.

Black and White Faculty Interaction

It is likely that interactions between Black and White faculty may be “influenced by their racial orientation and experiences within the dominant society” (Johnson, 1999, p. 25). However, the social context of the Black college will significantly influence the interaction among these individuals of different racial groups, which is the opposite of what occurs within the dominant society external to HBCUs. African American faculty at HBCUs interacted frequently with other African American faculty on and off campus and cited the interactions as friendly and cooperative (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). This contrasts with African American and White faculty interactions which for the most part occurred on campus but were characterized as friendly and cooperative. White faculty interacted infrequently with each other partly because they were minorities in the HBCU environment and distributed throughout the institutions in various disciplines which is
similar to what occurs with African American faculty at predominantly White institutions (Roebuck & Murty, 1993).

Smith and Borgstedt’s (1985) study of White faculty at six HBCUs, focused on campus race relations, confirmed that White faculty are astutely conscious of the social and formal climate and govern themselves accordingly or leave. Their study found that sixty-six percent of White faculty at HBCUs reported limited opportunities for advancement, feeling powerless in decision making, distrust by African American faculty some of the time and an authoritarian administration. Jacques’ (1980) research on White faculty at HBCUs cites white faculty perceptions of “lower pay, inferior status and subordinate authority.” Another study confirmed the perceptions of White faculty at HBCUs that the “opportunity structure” was geared to be advantageous to African American faculty (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). This same study found African American faculty at PWIs did not perceive the “opportunity structure to be rewarding” either. Thus, one may conclude that a faculty member within a dominant culture in which they are a member of the minority group may perceive the structure to be unfavorable for members of the minority group.

Smith and Borgstedt (1985) concluded that White faculty at HBCUs were more positive about their perceptions of their minority experience than African American faculty at PWIs. African American faculty felt “effective professional relationships” should be the norm with White colleagues and cited their interactions with White faculty varied in “kind and degree” and noted some racial barriers did exist. White faculty confirmed this and reported “cooperative professional relationships” with African American faculty. However, the level of competition among faculty at HBCUs was less
than that among White faculty at PWIs which may be attributed to the lack of pressure to publish.

New Faculty

Regardless of whether they are Black or White, the initial four years of a new faculty member’s career within an institution is usually a period of time when he/she experiences what might be considered the more stressful events of his/her career due to the demands and responsibilities involved, which is often related to their lack of knowledge of the culture (Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Factors affecting all new faculty include loneliness and intellectual isolation, lack of collegial support, heavy work loads and time constraints (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Confirming these findings is a study by Boice (1992) which found the majority of new faculty reported feeling intellectually under stimulated and lonely.

Several researchers (Austin, 1992; Boice, 2000; Wheeler, 1992; Whitt, 1991) have confirmed that new faculty across all institutional types experience issues associated with isolation. Because they are virtual strangers to their new colleagues and receive very little assistance from these faculty members, they feel as though they are alone in most of the decisions and actions that they carry out (Bogler, & Kremer-Hayden, 1999; Boice, 1991; Olsen, 1993). Consequently, research has found there is often a lack of trust in the type of support that may be provided which often causes many new faculty members to not seek assistance from their senior colleagues (Boice, 1991; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987).

Not only is isolation a prominent feature during this period, but researchers also agree that new faculty members are also concerned with promotion and tenure and how
to attain it (Rosch & Reich, 1996; Whitt, 1991). Because many new faculty members do not receive adequate amounts of feedback on their performance from their department heads annually (Boice, 1991; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987), they are unaware of the types of changes that they need to make in order to yield a positive evaluation that will ultimately assist them in achieving promotion and tenure (Sorcinelli, 1992).

A lack of time has also been cited by researchers (Fink, 1984; 1992; Sorcinelli & Near, 1989; Whitt, 1991) as a stressor amongst new faculty members. Managing one’s time between teaching, research, and service projects is a difficult task to manage in the initial years for new faculty members (Fink, 1984). Moreover, Turner and Boice (1987) argued that new faculty members have been known to experience rather serious health issues, including anxiety attacks, fatigue, and insomnia.

Although there is much research on the experiences of new and junior faculty overall there is even less research on faculty of color at predominantly white institutions. Despite the lack of research on issues affecting minority faculty at predominantly White institutions (PWIs), it is known that they experience severe marginalization (Johnsrud, 1993). Moreover, much of the research on the experiences of faculty of color has focused on Black faculty. Gaining an understanding of the experiences of Black faculty at PWIs could spark questions regarding White faculty at a historically black institution.

Organizational Socialization

The experiences newcomers to the academy encounter is often attributed to their socialization process (Feldman, 1976; 1981; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Van Maanen, 1984). Van Maanen and Schein (1979) posited that socialization within organizations occurs as a result of information and value transferal between members of
the same organization. As such, they identified this process as a cultural form whereby “…models of social etiquette and demeanor, certain customs and rituals suggestive of how members are to relate to colleagues” and “matter-of-fact prejudices” are regarded as culturally specific (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979, p. 210).

Feldman (1976) identified organizational socialization as a process whereby the new member begins the process as an outsider and is transformed into a contributing member to his/her organization. It is to this end that the researcher is interested in understanding the socialization experiences of White faculty members at HBCUs. How are White faculty members able to transform their initial outsider standing to what they perceive as a well-received participating member of their organization? Van Maanen and Schein (1979) suggest that organizational cultural forms can be seen in the day to day experiences of members who have acquired the skills necessary to become insiders and as a result, view their daily interactions as “natural” occurrences. Hence, based on this ideology, White faculty must be aware of the cultural norms and values that exist within the HBCU environment.

In order to become participating members of organizations, newcomers must subscribe to the philosophy of the institution. This is not impossible, as researchers suggest that novice members always encompass the ability to change if necessary (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). However, what tends to cause friction within these cultural settings is the supposition that newcomers enter the organization with a variety of backgrounds and ideas about how to perform their jobs, and possibly “values and ends at odds” with members already working within the organization.
As a result, the socialization process might be viewed by the new employee as disorienting, foreign, “and a kind of sensory overload” (Louis, 1980, p. 230). Louis (1980) cited Hughes (1958) as identifying this process as a form of “reality shock” whereby “the entire organizationally-based physical and social world are changed” (p. 230).

Yet, this condition is eased with an accurate understanding of the culture of the organization and a propensity for change (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Ultimately, the individual develops and begins “to appreciate the values, abilities, expected behaviors, and social edge essential for assuming an organizational role and for participating as an organizational member” (Louis, 1980, p. 230).

**Stages of Socialization Process**

Along with a knowledge of the consequential affects of the socialization process, it is also necessary to recognize that new faculty acquire the norms, values, and skills necessary to be productive in their new organization in three stages (Feldman, 1976; 1981; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Van Maanen, 1984). These stages include: anticipatory socialization, accommodation, and role management stages (Feldman, 1976; 1981; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Van Maanen, 1984).

*Anticipatory socialization.* Merton (1957), Feldman (1976; 1981), Tierney and Bensimon (1996), and Van Maanen (1984) suggest that anticipatory socialization involves the perceptions of an individual regarding what he/she may encounter as a faculty member or a new member of any given organization prior to entry. One of the difficulties associated with establishing such perceptions prior to entry is that the
individual must come to terms with what they anticipate their roles would be like and what actually occurs once they engage in their new faculty roles.

**Accommodation.** When a new faculty member becomes fully engaged in his/her role and begins to acquire an understanding of how the organization works, he/she is experiencing the accommodation stage (Feldman, 1976). As such, they attempt to become acclimated to the culture within their departments and/or institutions while at the same time trying to gain an understanding of the rules that govern their new environment (Feldman, 1976; Louis, 1980; Van Maanen, 1984). Adapting to this new setting involves interacting and becoming acquainted with administrators, faculty members within and outside of their departments, along with the students attending the institution. This process can be a trying time for new faculty, as they are often overwhelmed by the immense responsibilities involved in carrying out their roles (Olsen & Crawford, 1998).

More often then not, new faculty claim that they are provided with little direction in the initial stages of their entry into organizations (Olsen & Crawford, 1998). This causes many faculty members to feel as though their roles are overly ambiguous. Feldman (1981) asserted that during the accommodation stage, new faculty usually attempt to ascertain the expectations of the institution concerning their roles and how these expectations are to be performed. When these expectations are not clear, faculty members often become frustrated (Johnson, 2001; Johnson & Harvey, 2002).

In a study conducted by Olsen (1993), it was found that faculty members often choose their careers in order to fulfill a sense of worth and accomplishment, as well as to engage in a position that allows them to be fairly independent. These same faculty members also cited their need to take part in a career that stimulates their self-esteem and
their ability to grow within their fields. However, these attributes become difficult when they are unable to ascertain or adapt to the culture of the institution (Gaff, 2002; Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998). Moreover, a lack of opportunities associated with faculty development and/or challenges to their roles can cause new faculty to be immensely dissatisfied with their positions. Furthermore, Olsen (1993) suggested that severe dissatisfaction can be the result of low wages, a lack of departmental and/or institutional support, as well as a lack of provisions for rewarding faculty members.

**Role management.** After experiencing the factors associated with the accommodation stage, researchers (Feldman, 1976; 1981; Merton, 1957; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Van Maanen, 1984) suggest that newcomers evolve into a role management stage. This phase is characterized as a period whereby new faculty begin to rationalize their individual roles and work toward eradicating the perplexities associated with both their jobs and their family life (Feldman, 1976). Consequently, this allows faculty members to decipher the extent to which they are content with their current positions (Feldman, 1976).

According to Olsen and Crawford (1998), when faculty members meet the expectations of their jobs, they exhibit greater satisfaction with the role that they are performing. Subsequently, they often experience fewer stress related issues. Rather, stress is most often brought on by an individual’s inability to meet the expectations of his/her job (Johnson, 2001; Johnson & Harvey, 2002; Porter & Steer, 1973; Olsen & Crawford, 1998).
Tactical Dimensions of Organizational Socialization

It is important to discuss the socialization process within the context of academe. As such, Van Maanen (1978) identified six tactical dimensions of organizational socialization. These dimensions are said to be harnessed by organizations inadvertently or through design (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Consequently, these tactics have the potential to affect the roles that new employees ultimately assume (Ashforth & Saks, 1996). The six dimensions are: a) Collective vs. Individual Socialization Processes, b) Formal vs. Informal Socialization Processes, c) Sequential vs. Random Socialization Processes, d) Fixed vs. Variable Socialization Processes, e) Serial vs. Disjunctive Socialization Processes and, f) Investiture vs. Divestiture Socialization Processes. These six dimensions, according to Van Maanen and Schein (1979), are essential to an individual’s understanding of how to maneuver successfully in a new setting. This is accomplished by informing one’s self of the norms that are valued most by the new organization (Tierney, 1997).

Collective vs. individual. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) define collective socialization as a process whereby a group of individuals experience a common event together. Individual socialization, however, occurs in isolation. Yet, insofar as collective socialization is concerned, group members not only obtain the formal data provided by the organization, they also learn various forms of information from other members within the group informally (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Dornbush (1955) postulates that through collective socialization, members are able to experience problems together and find solutions to these problems as a group. This commonality alerts them to the advantages associated with collegiality (Dornbush, 1955).
Formal vs. informal. Formal socialization is a process whereby an individual gains knowledge of how to carry out a common set of goals (Van Maanen & Schien, 1979). On the other hand, informal socialization refers to a way of learning essential goals of an organization through less formal means (i.e., in conversations with other faculty members, etc.).

Sequential vs. random. Sequential steps in organizational socialization involve a specified set of steps that an individual must carry out prior to accomplishing his/her ultimate goal. Random steps, on the other hand, refer to a process dominated by numerous and often ambiguous steps (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Fixed vs. variable. Fixed socialization involves the provision of a set period of time in which one can complete a specific process. Variable socialization occurs when individuals know little about the time span necessary to complete tasks. An inability to ascertain one’s standing in terms of time can sometimes cause individuals to become discontent (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In a fixed socialization process, an individual has more control over his/her future and can in essence “plan innovative activities to fit the timetable” (p. 247).

Serial vs. disjunctive. Serial socialization is a dimension that recognizes senior employees as mentors or guides to newcomers (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). These role models assist new employees in learning how to maneuver within the culture of the organization. Without these senior guides, newcomers are left to fend for themselves, which is referred to as disjunctive socialization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Investiture vs. divestiture. Investiture refers to an organization’s appreciation of the characteristics brought forth by the new employee. In this facet of socialization, the
organization emphasizes the benefits associated with the incorporation of the newcomer (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). This causes the newcomer to feel as though “they are valuable to the organization” (p. 250).

Divestiture occurs when organizations require newcomers to rid themselves of past characteristics and acquaintances in order to become respected members of their new organizations (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Schein (1964) calls this process an up ending process whereby the organization attempts to reconstruct the newcomer into what they deem necessary to become participating members of the organization.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework that will be utilized for this study was developed by Johnson (1999), whose research examined African American faculty socialization at HBCUs. A “variation” of Van Maanen and Schein’s (1979) dimensions, Johnson’s (1999) model operationalized the components of a positive socialization experience for African American faculty at HBCUs. Although Johnson’s (1999) study focused on African American faculty, the framework was utilized to explore what constitutes a positive socialization experience for White faculty at HBCUs.

There are multiple factors that affect the organizational socialization process but they are all impacted by the culture of the institution. Institutional culture affects and is affected by the institutional environment. This impacts all aspects of the institution which in turn affect the socialization experience of new faculty. The culture of an institution affects how faculty acquire the norms and values needed to survive in their institution and consequently their persistence and success in the promotion and tenure process. Institutional size, large, medium or small, as well as the location of the institution, rural
or urban locale, may impact organizational culture thus influencing how faculty perceive their socialization experience.

The first dimension recognized by Johnson (1999) is collective socialization, whereby emphasis is placed on the grouping of faculty members. Under this dimension, *orientation* is suggested as a key factor in the success of new faculty members. According to Johnson (1999), faculty members are introduced to the major issues of importance during this time. Such facets might include the mission of the institution, key individuals (i.e., provost, president), information regarding computer or copy machine usage, etc. The orientation should also provide newcomers with handbooks that include information on the “values and expectations” of the institution (Johnson, 1999, p. 31). By repeating this process from department to department (or college), new faculty members are provided with the chance to meet and establish friendships.

The second dimension in Johnson’s (1999) model is professional development which is related to the formal dimension of socialization. This dimension assists newcomers toward success in their new roles. When colleges and universities sponsor educational seminars, conferences, handbook reviewing, and so forth, they are, ensuring that new faculty are being provided with the necessities needed for future success. Furthermore, conducting meetings that involve senior, junior, and new faculty members whereby issues such as promotion and tenure are discussed in detail, also facilitates future success (Johnson, 1999). This information will be helpful to any new faculty member, regardless of his/her race.

Serial socialization follows as the third dimension, under which, Johnson (1999) cited *colleague support* as a major contributor to new faculty success. Johnson (1999)
emphasized the importance of formal and informal support from colleagues to facilitate the new employee’s knowledge of the culture of the institution.

The fourth dimension, informal socialization, may negatively impact the socialization experience in terms of how promotion and tenure is achieved. However, Johnson (1999) cited informal norms as possible contributors to a successful socialization experience, as unwritten norms can be observed or learned informally.

The final dimension cited in Johnson’s (1999) model is sequential socialization, under which clear expectations are recognized as a primary facilitator of faculty success. Through her study, Johnson (1999) found that through clear expectations, faculty members were able to acquire the values and expectations necessary to achieve success. If gained informally, the best means of obtaining clear expectations was through senior faculty. Formal provision of clear expectations was gained through the faculty handbook, catalogs, or advisement from department chairs. Figure 1 displays the model for a positive faculty socialization process at HBCUs that served as the foundation for exploring the socialization experience of White faculty at HBCUs.
This chapter provided information on the literature as it relates to the socialization of White faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. As such, the reader was provided not only the history associated with White faculty presence at HBCUs, but also literature pertaining to organizational socialization. Because White faculty members have asserted in past research (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; Foster, 2001; Smith and Bordgstedt, 1985; Slater, 1993), views that are similar to those of Black faculty at PWIs, it was necessary to include literature on Black faculty at both HBCUs and PWIs. Ultimately, all of the information presented in the literature review were pertinent factors in the framework utilized for this study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Upon their entry into HBCUs, White faculty are almost immediately confronted with issues that for some are both challenging and intimidating (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999). These issues include their attempts to fit in as a minority in a majority Black population (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999), as well as obtaining a clear understanding of departmental and institutional expectations. According to past research, the experiences that White faculty encounter at HBCUs vary widely from one institution to the next (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; Slater, 1993). Consequently, this study examined the perceptions of White faculty relative to their socialization experience at HBCUs.

Hence, this chapter provides the reader with an understanding of the methods implemented in this study to address the research questions. This chapter also reviews the rationale for qualitative methodology to explore the phenomenon. In addition, the process involved in the collection and analysis of the data is discussed. Finally, this chapter concludes with a discussion on the trustworthiness, delimitations, and limitations of the study.

Research Questions

The primary research question of this study was: How do White faculty perceive their socialization experiences at HBCUs? The secondary research questions were:

1. What are the perceived influences in the socialization process?
2. What are the perceived barriers in the socialization process?
3. What departmental characteristics assist in the socialization process?
Rationale for Utilizing a Qualitative Research Approach

The researcher attempted to answer the research questions for this study through a qualitative research approach. According to Creswell (1998), the qualitative approach allows the researcher to find meaning in the occurrences described by the participants in the study. Through participant observation and interviews, data is collected and researchers gain insightful information about the experiences of the participants (Huberman & Miles, 2002). As such, my goal was to explore the socialization process of White faculty at HBCUs from a qualitative research perspective to gain in-depth knowledge of this phenomenon for which little is known. Through conversations and interviews with the participants, I gained an understanding of how White faculty perceive their experiences at HBCUs. A qualitative approach as opposed to a quantitative approach was more appropriate for this type of study because it seeks information from the perspective of the participants. In contrast, a quantitative approach starts with a hypothesis and does not occur naturally while producing numerical data such as rates and measures.

In conducting a qualitative research study, Bogdan and Biklen (2003) suggest the researcher utilize five important characteristics. The first characteristic is that research should be carried out in a natural setting, where data such as the participant’s environment or location can be captured (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Creswell, 2003). In settings like this, the events that the researcher seeks out tend to occur naturally (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). In the current study, the intent was to conduct interviews in the offices of faculty members, or in settings where daily operations occur. By conducting the study
in this manner, the researcher was able to obtain the data from the participant as well as a
description of the participant’s daily surroundings.

The second characteristic that Bogdan and Biklen (2003) suggest for qualitative
research is the use of *description*. Through field notes, informal conversations,
interviews, etc., the researcher is better equipped to apply these collected data forms to
the context of the research topic (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). In the current study, the
compilation of these data forms was intended to facilitate my understanding of why
certain events were perceived in the manner that they were by the participants. The
researcher also hoped that through in-depth field notes and transcriptions, as well as
through the participant’s non-verbal reactions that a greater understanding of the
perceptions of White faculty about their experiences at HBCUs might be attained.

The next feature that adds to qualitative research is a cognizance of *process*
(Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). This feature requires the researcher to ascertain a clear
understanding of the stages that the participants experience, which might facilitate
answering the research questions. My intent for this study was to identify specific
occurrences or processes that White faculty have experienced that may assist in my
understanding of their perceptions of the socialization experience.

It is also important that qualitative research be conducted *inductively* (Bogdan &
Biklen, 2003). This means the researcher does not begin the process with a specific
hypothesis in mind. Instead, the researcher collects data and interviews participants in
order to obtain an adequate understanding of the study (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998).
“Theory developed this way emerges from the bottom up (rather then the top down) from
many disparate pieces of collected evidence that are interconnected” (Bogdan & Biklen,
1998, p. 6). In the current study, the researcher analyzed the data looking for common themes in order to adequately inform the questions developed for this study.

The fifth feature that Bogdan and Biklen (1998) advise researchers to use in qualitative research is meaning. According to Lincoln and Denzin (1994), researchers should attempt to “make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 2). Bogdan and Biklen (1998) cite Erickson (1986) and Dobbert (1982) as positing that:

Meaning is of essential concern to the qualitative approach. Researchers are interested in how different people make sense of their lives. In other words, qualitative researchers are concerned with what are called participant perspectives (p. 7).

Because the experiences of White faculty vary from one HBCU to the next (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999), I was interested in making sense of the different ways in which White faculty experience socialization at HBCUs.

Phenomenological Approach

After establishing the research questions that I felt were most pertinent to this study, it was clear that the type of methodological approach needed for this study was a phenomenology. According to Creswell (1998), research that utilizes phenomenology to facilitate a study focuses on describing “lived experiences for several individuals about a concept or the phenomenon” (p. 51). This process is not an objective one, rather it is subjective (Creswell, 1998) whereby researchers do not ascertain the same understanding of the experiences that they observe. Instead, the results or views of researchers might postulate numerous dichotomies. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) cite Greene (1978) as asserting:

Phenomenologists believe that multiple ways of interpreting experiences
are available to each of us through interacting with others, and that it is the meaning of our experiences that constitutes reality (p. 24).

Hence, to gain an in-depth understanding of the perceived socialization experiences of White faculty at HBCUs, it was necessary to explore themes and statements of the participants (Creswell, 1998). In order to acquire this information, the researcher must enter into his/her subject’s conceptualized view of the world (Geertz, 1973). According to Psathas (1973), silence should be the initial stage of a phenomenologist’s research. This assists in the researcher’s ability to understand what he or she is studying. This silence in turn should facilitate the acquisition of obtaining meaning in the themes and statements of the participants. To this end, as noted by Berger and Luckmann (1967), the researcher’s view of the subject’s world is socially constructed. In essence, the researcher constructs or gives meaning to what he/she has observed.

In choosing to undertake a phenomenological approach to this study, I contemplated the aspects of the study that were phenomenological. Consequently, I recognized that each point of interest evolved around the organizational sociological paradigm. Hence, the phenomenon was rooted in the way the participants viewed their socialization process as White faculty at HBCUs.

The Role of the Researcher

A novice researcher, I sought to determine what my role was in terms of shaping my study. Rossman and Rallis (2003) lay out the characteristics for researchers interested in establishing good research practices. A review of these five characteristics made me aware of the extent to which I was to prepare for the study I was embarking upon. These principles of good practice suggest that the researcher: views the world holistically,
systematically reflects on who he/she is, is sensitive to personal biography, recognizes subjectivity, and uses complex reasoning.

*Views the World Holistically*

Through collection and interpretation of data, the researcher is able to make sense of the information that he/she has obtained and is thus viewed as providing reflexive data (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Consequently, the holistic researcher is attempting to understand how the participant handles the world through these bits and pieces of data that collaborate together. Lincoln and Guba (1994) suggests that a holistic view allows the researcher to describe and understand the phenomenon as a whole. For the current study, I gathered independent pieces of data that came together as a whole, ultimately making sense of the phenomenon being explored as it was perceived by White faculty at HBCUs.

*Systematically Reflects on who he/she is*

According to Rossman and Rallis (2003), a researcher’s background and past experiences can affect how he/she views the data that has been collected. This includes the researcher’s race, age, ethnicity, family and financial background, and religious beliefs (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Being able to reflect on my own personal experiences and background may impact how I view the data collected. As the researcher of this study, I was aware of how my experiences as an African American female could potentially affect a study of this nature negatively if not handled properly. Past experiences have taught me to be cognizant of not drawing conclusions that are unfounded.
Prior to beginning research on this topic, I was more inclined to believe that few inequalities, if any, existed at HBCUs relative to White faculty. Because the population that this study is focused on are members of the majority population in the US, it is easy to believe that they do not suffer or encounter unwelcoming environments as experienced by minority faculty members at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs).

As a graduate of an HBCU, the only bias that I recall having about White faculty was that they were not as strict as the Black faculty members. Consequently, in a study such as this one, it was necessary to “put aside personal feelings and preconception” so as not to exhibit bias in the research (Ahern, 1999, p. 408). As such, my goal was to utilize what researchers (Ahern, 1999; Porter, 1993) refer to as reflexive bracketing to minimize the biases in the current study. According to Porter (1993) this process involves the “honest examination of the values and interests that may impinge upon research work” (As cited in Ahern, 1999, p. 408). By identifying feelings that may cause a “lack of neutrality”, clarifying values that can cause subjectivity, and recognizing roles that may cause potential conflicts, I hoped to minimize the possibility of incorporating biases into the current study (Ahern, 1999, p. 409).

Is Sensitive to Personal Biography

When researchers interpret their participants’ personal biographies, it is best to present biographical data in an objective manner (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Ahern (1999) posited that although it is not “humanly possible” to exhibit total objectivity in one’s research due to individual value systems, it is, however, “expected that researchers will make sincere efforts to put aside their values in order to more accurately describe respondents’ life experiences” (p. 407). The researcher of the current study intended to
utilize reflexive bracketing to facilitate this process as well. According to Porter (1993) “[t]he advantage of this process is that the researcher’s energies are spent more productively in trying to understand the effects of one’s experience rather than engaging in futile attempts to eliminate them” (As cited in Ahern, 1999, p. 408).

Recognizes Subjectivity

Rossman and Rallis (2003) posit that the progression of a study is partly determined by the characteristics of the researcher. Likewise, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) surmise that “the goal is to become more reflective and conscious about how who you are [shapes] and enrich[es] what you do, not eliminate it” (p. 34). Hence, my intent was to shape my study based on the data provided by the participants while also recognizing that I recognized my subjectivity as the researcher.

Uses Complex Reasoning

As opposed to formulating hypotheses as is practiced in quantitative studies, this study utilized a framework to guide the researcher, which is common in qualitative research studies (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Complex reasoning in qualitative research can occur when a researcher is in the process of applying the data to the framework and deciphering its meaning. The framework for the current study provided me with the fundamental base of how to shape the design of the study. This allowed me to link the socialization process of White faculty to the experiences of new faculty entering higher education.
Ethical Considerations

According to Creswell (1998) researchers have a responsibility to protect the privacy and identity of their participants. In order to accomplish this task, researchers must adhere to the ethical guidelines established by a university or an organization (Creswell, 2003; Glesne, 1999; Huberman & Miles, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rossman & Rallis, 2003). When considering research and how ethics applies to it, the ultimate goal is for each facet of the research to be conducted in an ethical manner.

Accordingly, I provided each participant with a consent form, which was reviewed and signed before the interview began. In addition, pseudonyms/aliases were given to each participant and institution to further protect against any harm or risks. As well, no personal information will be revealed in any written reports; no report will be provided to either university; data will be shredded; and access to data will be restricted to the project director and supervising faculty.

Site and Sample Selection

This section of the study focuses on the site and sample selection process. According to Creswell (1998), part of the data collection process involves the location of sites and individuals participating in the study. Hence, this section explored the characteristics of each site and the rationale for their selection.

Site Selection

The two sites selected for this study, Mane State University (MSU) and Privateer University (PU), were chosen primarily for their characteristics and their faculty composition. Creswell (1998) asserts that “in a phenomenological study, the participants
may be located at a single site, although they need not be” (p. 111). Consequently, I chose to use multiple participants from each site in hopes of obtaining various perspectives regarding their experiences within the HBCU where they were employed.

In order to ensure that a wide range of perspectives were incorporated into the study in terms of identifying White faculty perceptions at HBCUs, it was necessary to ascertain the classification of both institutions. Mane State University is an urban institution that is classified under Master’s Colleges and Universities I (The Carnegie Foundation, 2005). As such, they offer a significant number of baccalaureate programs, as well as graduate education through their master’s degree programs. Whereas, Privateer University is a rural institution which is classified under Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts (The Carnegie Foundation, 2005). Accordingly, this institution places major emphasis on its baccalaureate programs. In choosing these two institutions, I believed that I would reach a diverse group of participants with different perspectives on their organizational socialization. According to researchers, faculty teaching in urban institutions are most often attracted to diverse atmospheres, whereby students are derived from a mixture of backgrounds and the environment itself has a metropolitan feel. Likewise, the faculty members themselves are diverse in terms of their backgrounds and experiences (Elliott, 1994; Goodall, 1970; Spaights & Ferrell, 1986). Rural faculty and students, on the other hand, tend to be less diverse (Spaights & Ferrell, 1986).

Site Profile: Mane State University (MSU). Mane State University is a four-year, public, historically Black university that offers bachelors and master’s degrees, as well as post-master’s certificates. Located in an urban community, Mane State University offers 47 degree programs. Total enrollment at MSU is just under 5,500 students; 42 percent of
whom are male and 58 percent are female. In terms of the racial make-up of the student body, 89 percent are Black, eight percent are White and three percent are Asian. There are 228 full-time faculty members at MSU with a 24:1 student to faculty ratio. While there are 155 (67%) Black faculty members at MSU (including African faculty who have established residency in the US), there are 59 (26%) White faculty, 2 (less than 1%) American Indian faculty, and 11 (6%) Asian faculty members at the institution.

*Site Profile: Privateer University (PU).* Privateer University is a four-year, private, historically Black university that offers 20 baccalaureate degree programs. Located in a rural community, Privateer has an enrollment of less than 500 students. In terms of the faculty composition, there are 33 full-time faculty at the institution, 19 (58%) of whom are Black, 9 (27%) are White and 5 (15%) are from other racial backgrounds.

*Gaining Access*

Creswell (2003) asserts that in order to gain access into an institution, the researcher must establish a relationship with administrators of the institution who are in a position to provide access to the researcher. I sought access to both universities through the institutions’ Vice President of Academic Affairs (VP). Hence, as the gatekeeper of the institution, the VP was responsible for providing me with the authorization that I needed to conduct the study. A letter (Appendix A) specifying the nature of my research, as well as a request for a list of faculty members of White descent was sent via U.S. mail to the VP at each institution. After the letter of support was received from each institution, I submitted the appropriate materials to the institutional review board at the University of New Orleans for an expedited review process. Once the list of White
faculty members at each institution was provided I began the process of participant selection.

Selection of Participants

The criteria for selecting the participants for this study were established as a result of the ideology behind purposive sampling. According to Wilmot (2005), in a purposive non-random sample, “the number of people interviewed is less important than the criteria used to select them… [T]he characteristics of individuals are used as the basis of selection…(p. 3)”. In order to achieve a variety of perspectives in terms of how White faculty perceive their socialization experience at HBCUs, it was not only necessary to include faculty members from different institutional types (i.e., urban and rural), it was necessary to locate participants who exhibited some similarities. According to Glesne (1999), regardless of their differences, it is important to identify shared characteristics that may facilitate the study.

Consequently, the three criteria necessary for inclusion as a participant in this study included: a) White (Anglo-Saxon) descent, b) teaching full-time at an HBCU, c) in a tenure-line (tenure or untenured) position with a Ph.D. degree. To this end, I sent a letter via U.S. mail to all prospective participants on the list provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. The letter invited potential participants to participate in the study (Appendix B) with criteria for inclusion noted in the letter. The invitation letter (Appendix B) to all potential participants included information on the topic being explored as well a request for their participation in the study.

As indicated in the invitation letter, I contacted participants via telephone within one week (Appendix C) of mailing the letters. During this telephone call, I confirmed
receipt of the letter, requested their participation in the study and if scheduled the time, date, and location of their interview for the study if willing to participate. Consequently, twelve participants (six per institution) chose to participate in this study. Following the follow-up telephone call, I sent a letter of agreement (Appendix D) via U.S. mail thanking each participant for agreeing to participate. This confirmation letter also included confirmation of the date, time, and meeting place for the interview (Appendix D). In addition, the consent form (Appendix E) was included with the confirmation letter for participants to review prior to the interview. In order to reassure all participants of their safety, the consent form provided information regarding the disposal of the data following the completion of the study. Approximately two days before the scheduled interview, I contacted each participant by telephone to remind them of our appointment (Appendix F).

Interviews

Interviews are conversations whereby researchers have the opportunity to recover much needed data through a question and answer process between the participant and the researcher (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). According to Creswell (1998), researchers conducting phenomenological studies usually collect data primarily through “in-depth interviews” (p. 122).

I gathered an adequate interpretation of the participants’ perceptions through not only the stories that they told while answering questions, but through such nonverbal forms as body language and tone of voice. Still in order to conduct a thorough interview, it was necessary to devise an interview guide to ensure a smooth interview.
Interview Guide

The interview guide (Appendix G) for this study was created to assist the researcher during the interview process. Accordingly, Creswell (2003) suggests that researchers design such guides to remain focused on the topic throughout the interview. The ultimate goal, however, is to configure questions so as to facilitate answering the research questions for this study.

The themes and subject areas explored in the interview (Appendix G) for this study surrounded issues that contribute to addressing the research questions for this study. Such issues included the acquisition of expectations in terms of their roles as faculty members, as well as how participants were able to obtain and understand the values of the department. In addition, it was also necessary for the interview questions to explore White faculty perceptions regarding the promotion and tenure process at their individual institutions.

The Interview

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) suggest that “the interview is used to gather descriptive data in the subjects’ own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how subjects interpret some piece of the world” (p. 94). In order to understand a piece of the world that each participant provides, it was necessary to conduct interviews for this study. As such, each interview was approximately one hour in duration. In the event that faculty members required more time to address specific aspects of the discussion, extra time was arranged accordingly. The manner in which the interviews were conducted is as follows:
Consent. Prior to commencement of the interview, consent forms were reviewed with each participant. I brought additional consent forms with me in case participants did not bring their consent form. Next, participants were asked if they had any questions or concerns that were not specified on the consent form. I asked each participant to sign and date two consent forms, one for my file and one for their file.

Introduction. I began the interview after establishing that the audio-cassette player was working properly and began recording. I first introduced myself as the researcher of the study, followed by a brief overview of the topic to be discussed.

Interview questions. In order to ensure that a broad range of responses were provided by the participants, I established interview questions that were open-ended so as to circumvent yes/no answers (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As such, each question was asked as it was displayed on the interview guide.

Closing. Once I was certain that all of the questions on the interview guide were answered, I brought the interview to a close by asking the participant to clarify any points that might be in need of further explanation. Following this reassurance, I thanked the participant and once again alerted him/her to the fact that the data collected would be transcribed, analyzed and incorporated into the research study. The audio-cassette player was then turned off.

Field Notes

Field notes occur in most cases following observations or interviews. Within these notes the researcher “renders a description of people, objects, places, events, activities and conversations” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 121). As such, Bogdan and Biklen (1998)
surmise that there are two types of data that emerge out of a researcher’s field notes. The
first is *description* and the other form is *reflection*.

In terms of *description*, the researcher should be concerned with providing a
detailed write-up of his/her observations as opposed to a summary or an evaluation
(Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). As part of this description, the researcher should attempt to
capture 6 aspects: (1) portraits of the subject; (2) reconstruction of dialogue; (3)
description of physical setting; (4) accounts of particular events; (5) depiction of
activities; and (6) the observer’s behavior (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The identification of
such data provides researchers with a true depiction of the occurrences taking place
throughout the study.

Reflective field notes, on the other hand, emphasize the researcher’s
“speculations, feelings, problems, ideas, hunches, impressions, and prejudices” (Bogdan
& Biklen, 1998, p. 123). The researcher of this study utilized both field note forms in
hopes that it would assist in interpreting the data as objectively as possible.

*Transcribing*

Transcribing data refers to the process of listening to tape recorded interviews or
observations and writing down what is heard verbatim (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The
researcher for this study transcribed each interview verbatim according to the guidelines
established by Bogdan and Biklen (1998).

*Data Analysis*

Data analysis in a phenomenological study is a process whereby researchers take
specific steps to analyze data obtained through field notes and transcripts (Bogdan &
Biklen, 1998). Miles and Huberman (1994) assert that a researcher’s involvement in the
analysis of the data while the study is in progress can add to the depth of the study. This method assists the researcher in identifying themes and observations that may require deeper thought. It also allows the researcher to consider the depth of the research early on. The steps that follow facilitated the data analysis process.

Coding

For the qualitative researcher, the coding process is a serious aspect of data analysis. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) assert that “[d]eveloping a list of coding categories after the data have been collected” is “a crucial step in data analysis” (p. 171). Miles and Huberman (1994) define the process as the compilation of various abstract pieces of data into homogeneous groups that are then attached to a code that might be tied to a specific theme. Following this ideology, I created thematic codes that were used to facilitate both the organization and the reoccurring patterns that were present throughout my field notes and transcripts.

The Matrix Approach for Analyzing Data

Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest the use of matrices to facilitate a visual depiction of the data collected. Such displays include flowcharts, conceptual maps, narrative-ordered and conceptual-ordered matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Ideally, these displays are meant to facilitate data reduction, identify differences, illustrate themes, patterns, and trends (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

In order to assist my understanding of the data that I collected, I utilized the conceptual-ordered matrix. As such, the research questions for this study were clustered in order to obtain meaning more readily. The rows and columns of the matrix were arranged to assist in bringing items together that had the same “overarching theme” (p.
This display did not only facilitate me in reducing the data that I had collected, but it also identified themes that were difficult to ascertain prior to establishing displays of this kind. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), this type of matrix allows the researcher to arrange collected data into themes that are central to the study.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness refers to the “worth” of a researcher’s queries and findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290). In order to find out whether a researcher’s study is “worthy of paying attention to”, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest determining such through the evaluation of four facets: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility is established through the assurance that one’s research adequately depicts the data acquired from the participants within the study. Transferability, on the other hand, refers to the study’s capacity to be used as a data source for other forms of research. In essence, can the data be transferred to other studies? Dependability, on the other hand, is the process of evaluating one’s own field notes, the analysis of the data, and the theories generated as a result. How well was this information compiled and fused together? And finally, confirmability establishes the extent to which the data collected supports the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In determining the trustworthiness of this study, I chose to utilize the four criteria established by Lincoln and Guba (1985). In order to ensure that credibility was established, I conducted interviews with participants who had experienced the phenomenon. I also asked participants to clarify any lingering questions if I had questions once I began data analysis. Moreover, all field notes were reviewed and reflected on in a
Within the journal, I kept track of my perceptions of the participants’ attitudes and tones (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This journal also included various statements from the participants that I believed to be of importance.

In terms of the transferability of this study, I presented the findings in a manner that allowed the reader to make a judgment to their applicability to their particular context. Thus, the reader of this study should be able to make the connection between his/her own context and the current study by acknowledging both the specifics of the individuals involved in the study as well as the circumstances surrounding the topic of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the research of a dependable study will last over time and will add depth to future research studies. Dependability also ensures that all sectors of the study are truthful (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) advises researchers to incorporate a trail that is auditable to ensure dependability. Hence, in order to ensure that the current study was dependable, the researcher incorporated day-to-day occurrences, a personal log of events, methodological transformations, and notes on the researcher’s intellectual evolvement in relation to the study. Lincoln and Guba (1985) surmise that this will assist the others, such as the dissertation chair, in confirming the study’s level of dependability.

It is also suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) that a researcher establish confirmability when conducting a study. Miles and Huberman (1994) identify this facet of trustworthiness as incorporating a level of objectivity. The researcher of this study established confirmability in the same manner that dependability was established, through an audit trail. This provided verification of the process that was undertaken by
the researcher. This process emphasized the data collection process in the interpretations that were made by the researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Delimitations

There were some delimitations of this study that the reader must be made aware. One delimitation was that this study only used qualitative research methods to address the research questions posed. Furthermore, this study focused only on faculty members of White Anglo-American descent employed at two Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the South. Other delimitations included utilization of full-time, tenure-line faculty members who hold a Ph.D. degree.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is that only twelve faculty members from two institutions were selected which could make it difficult to generalize the findings. However, the use of two institutional types (i.e., urban/public and rural/private institutions of higher education) has the potential to provide insight into the experiences of White faculty members at two distinct institutional types. Furthermore, full-time faculty members who were in tenure-track positions may not have wanted to participate in this study for fear of negative implications later in the promotion and tenure process. A related limitation is that potential participants who may not have perceived their experiences as positive may not have chosen to volunteer for this research study. However, the researcher minimized these limitations by assuring participants that information that could identify the institution and/or the individual would be concealed.

A possible limitation of the study may have been the race of the researcher. As an African-American interviewing White faculty about their experiences, it is plausible that
faculty may have not been as forthcoming with information pertaining to the role of race in their socialization experience. Nonetheless, the researcher did attempt to gain the participants’ trust by establishing rapport with the participants.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceived experiences of White faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Specifically, this investigation focused on the socialization process of White faculty. The primary research question guiding this study was: How do White faculty perceive their socialization experiences at HBCUs? The secondary research questions were as follows:

1. What are the perceived influences in the socialization process?
2. What are the perceived barriers in the socialization process?
3. What departmental characteristics assist in the socialization process?

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides detailed information regarding the participants in this study, specifically their education, length of employment at HBCU and previous experiences. Common themes related to the research questions are presented in the second section. The final section explores themes that emerged during data analysis that do not address the research questions of this study but nonetheless may be beneficial in understanding the experiences of White faculty at HBCUs.

Participants

Two four-year institutions were selected as sites for this study. The selected sites were identified as Privateer University (PU) and Mane State University (MSU). Privateer University, a private institution located in a rural area, is classified as a Baccalaureate College—Liberal Arts. Mane State University (MSU), a public institution located in an urban locale, is classified as a Master’s Colleges and Universities 1.
Twelve tenure-line faculty members, six per institution, chose to participate in this study. Of the twelve participants, five were females and seven were males. Eight were tenured and four were tenure-track. As such, faculty members represented various disciplines and held positions as assistant professor, associate professor and professor. Each participant in the study retained their Ph.D. from an institution of higher education in the United States. Tables 1 and 2 provide an overview of the faculty members who participated in the study at PU and MSU, respectively. Each table is followed by a brief description of the institution and an annotated narrative that introduces the participant’s and provides information on their background and experience.

*Privateer University*

Table I
Participants at Privateer University (PU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>TENURE STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAY</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>TENURE-TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELL</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>TENURE-TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>TENURE-TRACK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Privateer University (PU) is a co-educational, four-year liberal arts, historically Black institution situated on over forty acres of land in a rural, yet mildly populated sector of town. Initially the institution was established to assist in the education of the black student population following slavery. It would eventually become an institution of higher
education, as well as a major contributor to the advancement of the city’s Black inhabitants. Far from modern in its appearance, the institution is comprised of historic landmark buildings that stand as faint memories of the institution’s early inception.

Six faculty members were interviewed at PU. Three were tenured (three males) and three were tenure-track (two females and one male). Most of the faculty members who were interviewed at PU had been teaching at the institution for over 10 years. Many of them discussed their involvement in the civil rights movement and their desire to assist in the struggle through the educational arena. Faculty members at PU who chose to be interviewed for this study were assigned a pseudonym and thus it is appropriate to introduce each participant.

Ray, a full professor at PU, has taught at the institution for over twenty years. His previous teaching experience included serving as a teaching assistant while in graduate school and six years at a university in another state. In the 1960s, while a fellow, he conducted a study that focused on Blacks in the United States. He contended that the findings of his study provided him with further insight into leadership and power as it related to the Black populous. It also provided him with an understanding of how Black institutions ‘tended to operate’. In referencing his early years at the institution, he indicated that he did not realize that he was embarking on a great opportunity to meet some of the civil rights leaders whom he had always wanted to meet.

Prior to his employment at PU, Bill taught at three historically black colleges, as well as another minority serving institution. He learned of the available faculty position at PU through an advertisement in the Chronicle of Higher Education. Currently, he holds the rank of associate professor at PU. According to Bill, he has always been
fascinated with African American culture and noted that it was through speeches, activities, and preparations for debates that he learned about the Civil Rights Movement. Consequently, he has been involved in issues related to Black Americans for over forty years.

Joe had never taught at an HBCU before joining the faculty at PU. However, his association with Black education came as a result of his involvement in the Civil Rights Movement during the early 1960s. His alliance with the Black community resulted in his being ostracized by his family and he believes that this made him become even more spiritually and sympathetic to the ‘Black cause’. His education included a teaching fellowship at a local university where he received his doctoral degree. Later, he would go on to teach at several predominantly White colleges and universities. After retiring from a religious based profession, he began teaching at PU where he has been employed for over a decade and a half. He was initially hired as an associate professor and later was promoted to full professor. Joe became head of his department in the same year of his promotion to full professorship. He believes that when he came to PU it was like coming home.

Before coming to PU, Nell taught at the same institution where she completed her graduate work and eventually received the PhD. At her graduate institution, she tutored students in her field of expertise. She also completed a four year post doctorate program on the West Coast. While in the program, she was an assistant instructor. Eventually she accepted a position as a research assistant in the same state as PU. Subsequently, she taught for two years at a junior college and one year at a community college before accepting a position as an assistant instructor at PU. Currently, she holds the rank of
associate professor. She believes that her experiences at the two-year institutions made her aware of the wide range of preparation and abilities of minority students. Still, her major concern when coming to PU was that she, as a White woman, might somehow impair the learning experiences of her students. However, she would eventually come to the conclusion that this hypothesis was invalid.

Harold is originally from the Northern United States and had never taught at an HBCU prior to teaching at PU. He had, however, taught for seven years at a Predominantly White Institution and traveled extensively while conducting research in other countries. Fascinated with cross-cultural issues and people from varied cultural backgrounds, he believes that people are all basically the same. Furthermore, he indicated that his reasoning behind applying to PU was not based on the fact that the institution was an HBCU. Instead, it was due in most part to a desire to move to a state with a warmer climate. He began at PU as an assistant professor but is now a tenured full professor.

Prior to receiving her PhD, Carol was a high school instructor. While working on her Master’s degree, she was an assistant instructor as part of a practicum at her graduate institution. Immediately following the completion of her Master’s degree, she began working on her PhD. Once she completed her doctorate, she learned of the open position for an assistant professor in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. She is now an associate professor on the tenure-track with intentions of applying for tenure next year. Carol noted that she loves the student population at PU and upon her acceptance of the position that she believed that she would be able to learn a great deal from the institution’s constituency.
Mane State University

Table 2

Participants at Mane State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>TENURE STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KRUSE</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUDETTE</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSS</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANEY</td>
<td>PROFESSOR</td>
<td>TENURED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURA</td>
<td>ASSISTANT</td>
<td>TENURE-TRACK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mane State University (MSU) is a medium-size, urban institution situated near a busy metropolitan area. Surrounded by a residential area that was primarily established to provide housing for low income families, MSU has been in existence for over a century. Established shortly after the abolition of slavery, MSU has undergone major changes over the years. In the late 1800s, MSU relocated from another city to its current location. Shortly after relocating the institution’s main hall was burned down. Today, although the institution is one of the oldest HBCUs to exist, its appearance is fairly modern.

Most of the White faculty that agreed to participate in the study at MSU were tenured with only one tenure-track faculty member agreeing to participate. During their interviews, some of the faculty members indicated that they chose to teach at MSU because they knew someone who had taught at MSU which facilitated them in obtaining an interview with the institution. Others noted that they answered an advertisement
placed by the institution in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Faculty members at MSU who chose to be interviewed for this study were assigned a pseudonym and thus it is appropriate to introduce each participant.

Kruse came to MSU as a doctoral student with all but his dissertation (ABD) completed. Prior to teaching at MSU, he had never taught full time, nor had he taught at an HBCU. While in graduate school, he was a teaching assistant which gave him the experience he needed to teach full time. After responding to an advertisement in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, he chose to accept the position as an instructor at MSU primarily because of its location. Seven years ago, he was granted tenure and today, he is a full professor. He believes that his ‘upbringing’, which emphasized diversity and tolerance, provided him with a liberal personification that he believes is apparent to all those he comes in contact with. Claudette came to MSU as an ABD doctoral student who had been working as a teaching assistant while in graduate school. She also had teaching experience as an adjunct instructor. An advertisement in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* was how she learned of the position at MSU. Claudette applied for a faculty position at MSU and a Hispanic Serving Institution because she has always been fascinated with culture and believes that it is essential that people learn about their culture as well as other people’s culture. MSU was the first institution to make an offer and by the time the other institution made an offer she had already accepted the position at MSU. She was excited about accepting the position because she wanted to find out more about what HBCUs did and how she could “participate in the journey”. Claudette noted that during her tenure at MSU she has also served as an upper level administrator.
Ross had no teaching experience prior to beginning his employment at MSU. Instead, he worked as a post-doctorate fellow at his graduate institution. An aspiring academic, he chose to pursue a fellowship to provide him with marketable skills. His decision to apply at MSU was not based on institutional type but was the result of an unfocused job search because he “simply” wanted to get a permanent job. Consequently, he came to the institution as an assistant professor and became an associate professor four years later. The following year he was granted tenure status. In three years, he hopes to become a full professor.

Guss began his teaching career as a high school instructor. While in graduate school he served as a graduate assistant and teaching assistant and worked in administration. Upon graduation with his doctorate, he taught at three religious-affiliated institutions of higher education; the last of which he taught at for six years. Guss contends that he was not looking for a particular institution type when he applied to MSU. Instead, he equated his reasons for accepting a position at MSU with financial difficulties that his previous institution was having. With both MSU and his previous institution in the same city, it was convenient for him to interview for a position at MSU. Guss has been with MSU for over fifteen years and has held tenure status for over twelve years. He now holds the rank of professor.

Janey taught at a number of institutions before accepting her current position at MSU. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, she taught as a teaching assistant while working on her Master’s degree. From there she went on to teach at both a junior high and high school. Subsequently, she began working on her doctoral degree. Once Janey completed her doctorate, she taught for seven year at a small Christian institution of higher
education. The primary reason that she chose to come to MSU was because her former institution was having financial difficulties and faculty members were not being paid on time. As a single mother with children and no other financial means, she began inquiring about positions at other institutions. After a meeting with a faculty member at a nearby institution she found out that MSU was hiring. Subsequently, she was introduced to a key individual at MSU by her mutual friend and was eventually hired as an assistant professor. She gained tenure after six years and is now a full professor.

Prior to teaching at MSU, Laura taught courses outside of the United States at an institution for higher education. There she worked with students from an array of ethnic backgrounds. After teaching at this institution for eight years, she moved back to the United States. She chose to apply for a position at MSU because she liked the institution’s mission statement, as well as believed that it was more important to develop people who graduate and want to assist other people as opposed to developing people who are simply interested in becoming financially well off. Now an assistant professor at MSU, she is working at becoming acclimated to the HBCU “system of teaching”. She has been employed in a tenure-track position at MSU for one year.

Influences and Barriers in the Socialization Process

In my analysis of the interviews with participants at both PU and MSU, I discovered information that provided insight into the experiences that White faculty may encounter while working on HBCU campuses. An analysis of the data resulted in the emergence of themes that were common to faculty at both institutions. As such, it was revealed that White faculty members believed there were two primary influencing factors that assisted them in the socialization process, i.e., having clear institutional/departmental
values and expectations and establishing and maintaining collegial relationships or comradery with senior faculty members. White faculty members in this study identified two barriers they encountered at HBCUs relative to their socialization as they sought promotion and tenure. The absence of an orientation was noted as a barrier in the socialization process. A barrier cited in the promotion and tenure process was the expectation to publish while teaching four courses per semester. Based on the themes of influences and barriers, a portrait of White faculty socialization at two HBCUs is presented.

Perceptions of Influences in the Socialization Process

White faculty at HBCUs in this study perceived that the major influences on their socialization process were clear departmental values and expectations and establishing and maintaining collegial relationships with senior faculty members. Most of the participants in the study cited a variety of ways in which values and expectations were learned. Ultimately, faculty at both institutions obtained this information informally and formally.

Informal acquisition of values and expectations most often occurred through junior faculty listening to the conversations of senior faculty, as well as through observations of day to day occurrences within their departments. Participants also cited that they were able to grasp this information through informal conversations with senior faculty members as well. In addition, participants gained insight into the values and expectations of the institution through formal written publications. Written publications included the university catalog, the faculty handbook, and contractual agreements. Moreover, department chairs provided insight on what was expected.
Clear Institutional Values and Expectations

Tenure-line faculty must be aware of what the institution values and expects in order to be successful in their promotion and tenure process. White faculty perceived that they learned institutional values and expectations informally and formally which was confirmed by Johnson’s (2000) findings relative to the socialization of Black faculty at HBCUs. Though some participants in the present study did not equate written publications and chair advisement as formal provisions, they believed that the information on expectations and values was clearly relayed to faculty members through informal or formal methods.

Informal Methods

One of the methods in which White faculty in this study reported learning the institutional expectations and values was through informal interaction. More often than not, participants cited listening, observing and conversations as a way of understanding values and expectations. For example, White faculty noted overhearing conversations that dealt with the promotion and tenure process. Laura, an assistant professor at MSU, recalled observing senior faculty: “I learned informally and made assumptions based on what I saw going on”. Likewise, another faculty member at MSU, Ross (an associate professor) noted how he learned what was expected:

I did so informally, by keeping my eyes and ears open or listening to senior faculty…people who’ve already been where I’m trying to go…

Nell, an associate professor at PU, suggested this in her interpretation of how she learned what was valued and expected:
I learned what was valued informally. Every conversation we have is about how can we help these students. You know I’ve clearly learned that, you know, research is also valued. But again it was through informal conversations, nothing formal… I had no orientation. I was given the necessary information by my chair. Carol, an associate professor at PU, also made a similar reference:

Initially I learned what was valued informally through conversations with senior faculty members, my mentor, and just… by reading the faculty handbook. It was very clear.

Ray (tenured faculty member at PU) echoed that he “learned about the value placed on teaching through listening to other teachers, to the students, and so on”. A tenured professor at PU, Joe also gained information informally:

I learned what was valued through informal conversations with other faculty members which assisted me in recognizing that there were certain expectations that the umm academic administration sought their professors to meet in terms of standards and performance and so on.

Like many of the faculty members, Kruse (tenured professor at MSU) learned what was valued and expected both formally and informally. He briefly discussed how he learned what was valued and expected informally: “…The second way I was able to learn what was valued and expected was informally through general interaction with my colleagues”. Likewise, Claudette (tenured professor at MSU) recalled that initially she learned information formally but noted that in recent years she had gained information informally. As such, Claudette expressed how she learned informally: “When we need to
know something, we just kind of talk to each other informally, but we don’t get together formally anymore”.

**Formal Methods**

White faculty in this study also perceived that they learned values and expectations through written publications such as the university catalog and faculty handbooks. In addition to these written forms, they gained information through the contractual agreement which identified the functions for which they were responsible for as faculty members. They also acquired information about institutional values and expectations during the recruitment process while being interviewed by the department chair.

*Written sources.* Johnson’s (2001) study found that Black faculty at HBCUs identified catalogs, faculty handbooks, and annual reports as the formal sources that facilitated their understanding of the promotion and tenure process. Similarly, in the current study, White faculty perceived that they gained this information through the faculty handbook, university catalogs and contractual agreements. Guss, a full professor at MSU, espoused on the written documentation that assisted him and other junior faculty members: “I learned it by reading the handbook. As a tradition, when it became time for my partner to seek tenure, we made sure he had a handbook….”

Some faculty members identified university catalogs as a way of gaining insight into the promotion and tenure process. Joe, a full professor who teaches at PU, described how he obtained this information initially:
When I first came here, I made a point of informing myself by going to the catalog and learning essentially what was the nature of the statement or what was expected of the teachers and the students.

Other faculty members related how the annual contract informed them of institutional expectations. For example, Claudette, a full professor at MSU, provided detailed information regarding her institution’s contractual agreements and how it assisted her knowledge base:

And of course in writing, you know, every year we fill out paperwork that indicates the umm number of hours you’re teaching, then you have to put in, you know umm things like publications. Are you going to be doing any publications this year? And you have to give it a percentage weight. Out of a hundred percent, what percentage do you want weighed and this is going to be used in your evaluation at the end of the year.

Harold, a tenured professor at PU, recounted the specific written methods he utilized to learn what was expected:

I found out what was expected of me by reviewing my contract and observing everybody else. There were times when I would refer to the catalog because I wasn’t clear on something.

Along with written documentation, participants also identified the department chair as having a role in their acquisition of departmental and institutional values and expectations.

*Department chairs.* Participants in the study emphasized the important role that their department chairs had on their careers, citing their guidance and facilitation as an
intricate part of their development. Likewise, Black faculty at HBCUs in Johnson and Harvey’s (2002) study identified annual meetings with the department chair as a formal method that assisted them in confirming the information they obtained informally. Carol, an associate professor at PU, credited her department chair for informing her of what was expected of a faculty member at PU: “When I interviewed for this position, the chair made everything clear, in terms of what I had to do to be successful at this institution”. This was also exemplified in Kruse’s (a tenured professor at MSU) interpretation: “The chair makes you aware of what’s expected when you get to campus”.

Once faculty arrived on campus, they noted how the department chair informed them of what was valued at the institution. A faculty member at PU, Bill (an associate professor) identified how significant he found his department chair to be: “I learned what was expected of me through attending faculty meetings and meeting with the chair to clarify what the expectations were”. Likewise, Harold, a full professor at PU, acknowledged the information relayed by his department chair: “The department chair and senior faculty members of administration told me that I would be rewarded for certain things…”. According to the findings, White faculty perceived the chair of their department as being helpful, especially in the initial stages of entry.

Collegial Relationships

In addition to learning the values and expectations of the institution, White faculty also identified maintaining collegial relationships or comradery as an influence in their socialization process. Supportive faculty interaction, mentoring and supportive departmental leadership were all cited as relevant in establishing and maintaining collegial relationships. Nell, a tenure-track associate professor at PU, depicted the views
of most of the participants in the study: “I think it’s a very friendly, warm, affectionate culture that African Americans have. I didn’t realize that until I worked here”. Many participants utilized this perception as a basis for the belief that there were no differences in their experiences as White faculty at HBCUs and their past experience at PWIs. In addition, many participants characterized their departmental leaders as supportive and cooperative as well. Harold, a tenured professor, provided insight into collegial relations at PU:

In order to obtain promotion and tenure, I had to first and foremost, maintain good relations with people that would probably be judging you. I’m astute enough to realize that there’s that part of it.

Several faculty members reported that they were able to establish positive relationships with faculty members external to their own departments. Although Claudette, a tenured professor at MSU, was not able to establish friendships in her department, she did however establish relationships with colleagues in other departments:

I feel more valued when I spend time with my colleagues… I have friends in other departments. I have friends in the literature department.

I have friends in the communications department. But not in my department.

While emphasizing her frustration regarding the lack of comradery in her department, Claudette was certain to suggest that she did not believe her race was the reason that she was feeling a lack of comradery.

The only expectation that I had was that I would have comradery. I had it in graduate school. We’d go to lunch together. We’d go to parties together
and that doesn’t happen here. I thought it was because I was White when I first got here. But no one does it. So, it’s not a matter of race.

Ray, a tenured professor at PU, emphasized that he really did not socialize a great deal with a lot of faculty members. “Really, I socialize with two faculty members in two different departments”. This was not unusual, however, since most of the departments at PU were made up of between one and four faculty members. On the other hand, Kruse, a tenured professor at MSU, provided his interpretation of faculty interaction within his department:

In the department, the emphasis is on collegiality and again there’s this mutual respect and mutual inclusiveness. So that as much as possible, we try to do things that way…

Ultimately, White faculty saw collegial relationships as conducive to their socialization process. To assist White faculty members in this process, they recognized the importance of supportive faculty interactions.

*Supportive faculty interaction.* Unlike Black faculty at PWIs (Blackwell, 1989; Butner, Burley, & Marbley, 2000; Hall & Sandler, 1983), most of the White faculty members in this study perceived their experiences with senior faculty at HBCUs as “cooperative, supportive, and helpful”. Bill, an associate professor at PU, noted “Generally, other faculty members are supportive”. This was reiterated by Laura, an assistant professor at MSU, regarding the extent to which her colleagues assisted her:
When there’s things that I don’t really understand, being fairly new. They explain the way things work. Everybody seems to be willing to pitch in to do things that need to be done.

Harold, a tenured professor at PU, associated the size of the institution with his experiences with other faculty members. “Everybody knows everybody…So everyone’s pretty supportive. It’s so small”. Kruse, a tenured professor at MSU, provided an example of what it meant to be supportive in his department.

When a colleague says ‘Can you help me out with something?’ It can be as simple as ‘Can you post a note on my door? I’m not going to be in today. I’m sick.’ If colleagues need some kind of help, you know, be friendly and supportive.

Nell, an associate professor at PU, also believed this to be true of the faculty members in her department.

Everyone’s very supportive. Especially during difficult times, it seems to bring us together. We’ll tell each other how to deal with certain people that we’re having a problem with and so forth.

Participants revealed that while their junior and senior colleagues were supportive that they often had to initiate inquiries with senior faculty members who rarely offered unsolicited advice. Joe, a tenured full professor at PU, acknowledged this in his explanation of other senior faculty, as well as his position on assisting junior faculty members as a senior faculty member:

For the most part senior faculty are willing to provide guidance to junior faculty if they are queried about a particular subject. I think sometimes there is a distance
between junior faculty and senior faculty. Now I’m finding myself of being in the position of a senior faculty member, I probably am more likely to quite frankly to wait for a junior faculty member to approach me for advice before I would actually extend to them. Not that I’m unwilling to give it, I just simply allow them the space to feel out whatever or whomever they feel like would be able to give them the best advice.

Claudette, a tenured professor at MSU, also confirmed the fact that senior faculty rarely offer advice without inquiry: “If they ask, I’ll give them suggestions. Rarely do people ask. It’s kind of like don’t ask. Don’t tell…”

While senior colleagues were supportive, participants noted that tenure-track faculty members did have to initiate conversations if they had questions about some aspect of their job. Participants did not report that their inquiries appeared to exasperate senior faculty members. Instead, most of the participants expressed that they had no problems with obtaining answers from senior faculty members when queried.

Faculty mentorship. The majority of the faculty members who had already attained promotion and tenure in this study attributed their success to the informal mentorship of senior faculty members within or outside their departments. Participants’ indicated they were able to learn the norms and culture of the institution from mentors. Harold, Claudette, and Janey were content with the mentorship they received upon entry into the institution:

There was a guy that took me under his wings and he was a senior member and in fact he chaired the tenure committee and basically paved the way for me to get tenure in a record amount of time. He was quite a mentor for me. He was African
American. He wasn’t in my division at all, a guy that took a liking to me and I took a liking to him…helped out a lot. He introduced me to Monday night poker and football. So I got to know some folks off the campus. And then lots of parties. I mean the first year I was here …well any how. I was right on the scene. I was into it all. (Harold at PU)

Not only did Harold receive assistance on the values and expectations of PU, he also socialized externally with his mentor and other colleagues as well. Claudette, a tenured professor at MSU, reiterated similar thoughts about her mentor:

What assisted me most was the chair at the time. He had become area coordinator and I still write with him. I have lunch with him. He’s my mentor…Very amiable man, extremely sharp. I think he’s in his 80’s… shares his experiences. I still go to him when I have problems and concerns. He was the person who did help me the most. With him, I did have comradery. He is an older Black gentleman.

Janey (a tenured professor at MSU) identified her mentoring experience as “informal mentorship”:

I certainly feel that I was umm…at least informally mentored. I spoke of certainly Dr.---, anyone could profit by trying to follow in her footsteps. Also the teacher that I spoke of that was here several years before I was, you know, she would be classified as a mentor. She was very good, extremely well qualified. It’s just their attitude. It’s almost like we were in a war, you’re all in the trenches together…when it gets down to it, most soldiers say they’re fighting for their buddies.
According to the participants, through the assistance of their mentors, they were able to acquaint themselves with various facets of their new environment that otherwise would not have come so easily. Not only were they new to their institutions, they were in some cases new to the city or state. Hence, according to them, guidance from individuals who were familiar with the environment as a whole was of extreme importance. Most of the faculty members who undertook mentorship roles for the participants held leadership positions such as department chair or committee chair.

*Supportive departmental leadership.* Department chairs were described by the majority of the White faculty members as “cooperative” leaders. Joe, who was also chair of his department at PU, characterized himself in a similar fashion:

> As leader of this department, I have tried to take the edge off of my ego. I’m probably mellowed in terms of trying to understand their particular circumstances. I try to be cooperative. And even try in many cases to go the extra mile.

Guss, a tenured full professor at MSU, provided his views on how he perceived his chair person upon entry:

> I had a very supportive chair person…She would answer questions, offer assistance if there was something I didn’t know how to do, connect me to someone who had been successful. I looked at their portfolio. It was really a positive experience.

Throughout the study, White faculty reported that the department chair assisted them in not only becoming acquainted with their new settings, but also in developing comradery between themselves and their fellow colleagues. Nell, an associate professor at PU, discussed how she viewed the assistance of her department chair in his attempt to
mediate what she believes was a clash in personalities between herself and a fellow senior faculty member within her department:

The chair of the department appeals to me …. He thrives on the dynamics between people and he’s just very sensitive and thinks a lot about how to work with people. He’s been very helpful.

Faculty members also spoke of recurring events such as Christmas parties, departmental workshops, and faculty meetings as events within the department that facilitated “built-in comradery”.

In contrast, Claudette, discussed the non-existent interaction of faculty members and suggested how the department chair could have facilitated collegiality:

I think the chair could have helped. It used to be better. It could have been facilitated if we had more faculty meetings. We don’t have any reason to come together because we don’t even have that. But a lot of the faculty members are just individually oriented, and yes, I think the chair could have encouraged us to write together, to work together, to share together. So, but even without having the leadership, the faculty could have still made that decision on their own. But there doesn’t seem to be interest.

For the most part, the participants viewed the department chair as a facilitator of the collegial relationships that they established at their respective institutions. Rarely, however, did participants associate the lack of comradery in their departments with their department chairs. Although Claudette associated her department’s inability to work together with her department chair, she did not believe that the department chair was
entirely responsible for the lack of collegiality as she noted that “there were limited opportunities for faculty to interact”.

Perceptions of Barriers

There were two barriers White faculty members perceived they encountered at HBCUs. These barriers related to their socialization process as faculty pursued promotion and tenure. A barrier in the socialization process was the absence of an orientation. The expectation to publish in an institution where teaching is highly valued served as a barrier in the promotion and tenure process.

Barrier in the Socialization Process: Absence of an Orientation

Faculty members at both PU and MSU noted that institutional values and expectations were clear relative to what was expected for promotion and tenure. However, acquiring an understanding of what was valued and rewarded was made more difficult when the faculty member was not provided with an orientation. In general, institutions conduct orientations to provide new faculty members with an understanding of the inner workings or culture of the institution (Fink, 1992). Without a formal orientation faculty members have to rely on others to provide information about the institution. In the current study only four faculty members at MSU attended a university-wide orientation while the smaller university, PU, did not provide an orientation of any type for newcomers.

According to the Academic Affairs office at MSU, new faculty members are asked to attend a “faculty conference” sponsored by Academic Affairs. This ‘conference’ provides newcomers with information on the various “ins and outs” of the institution. Ross and Janey at MSU recollected the orientation process at MSU.
Yeah, we had a university-wide conference. I know that promotion and tenure was included. After that, I think we had some more general orientations at the university level, where they bring in new faculty members, sit them down, talk to them about how it is. (Ross at MSU)

It was so long ago. I believe it was university wide. I just remember asking questions and the faculty who were assisting, being very helpful. (Janey at MSU)

Although faculty members at PU did not have a formal orientation, they indicated that they obtained the knowledge needed to understand the expectations for the promotion and tenure process primarily from the department chair. Ray, a tenured professor at PU, confirmed that over twenty years ago when he initially entered the institution what information was provided and by whom:

No, we didn’t have any formal orientation. However, the dean at the time sort of told me about the college transportation.

Similarly, Nell (associate professor at PU) noted “I had no orientation. I was given the necessary information by my chair.” Bill was unsure as to why PU did not offer an orientation:

I didn’t have to attend an orientation. I guess they just basically assumed that I knew what to do because of my previous experiences… I learned what was expected of me through attending faculty meetings and meeting with the academic chair to clarify what the expectations were.

Although Kruse, a tenured faculty member at MSU, did not attend the institution’s formal orientation, he indicated that by taking part in another faculty gathering, he was able to gain insightful information.
I don’t recall having an orientation. But I sat in on something similar. Something that was very helpful. Some of the faculty in education hosted a workshop and I attended it.

Claudette (tenured professor at MSU) did not recall attending an orientation upon her entry to MSU and related how she learned necessary information:

I understand there is an orientation for new faculty. But for some reason, I did not attend an orientation. I don’t think I knew about it. But I think immediately the following year, I started hearing about these orientations that other people were involved in. I could sit down with the chair and ask him anything, a one on one. I had to seek it. It was not provided.

Participants at PU and two faculty members who did not attend an orientation at MSU (Claudette and Kruse) expressed concern about the problems they encountered having not been required to attend an orientation upon entry. Nell, an associate professor at PU, was particularly angered by what she felt was an unnecessary experience to undergo:

In two years, I had applied to the tenure committee for tenure. At the time I was an assistant professor. I also thought you just automatically apply for a promotion at the same time. Anyway, I was rejected because I was an assistant professor. I didn’t understand it. But I just gave my letter of resignation that day. I said I’ll be here till the end of the year. Well that’s how I understood it. I thought that if I was denied that meant that I had to resign. But that’s not what they meant. They meant that I just needed to wait until I became associate professor and then reapply then…It was just such a difficult task that I haven’t attempted to do so again…I
went to the chair of the tenure committee and she didn’t help me out. In my opinion, they shouldn’t have voted on it. She should have come to me and said “you can’t apply for tenure because you’re an assistant professor. You need to do things differently”. But they didn’t. They voted. And that was unfortunate. But I guess I should have gone to the chair and found out what the process was. Because of his lack of information about the process, Kruse (tenured full professor at MSU) recounted a similar experience:

It wound up taking me two years to become an assistant professor. I thought this was naïve on my part, not realistic. I didn’t think I needed it in writing, that once I got the PhD, I’d be a professor and have a salary commensurate with that. They told me the reason I was hired as an instructor was because I didn’t have a PhD. But they would not change it. They wouldn’t even put me on tenure. I had to go through a promotion process in my second year in order to get promoted to assistant professor.

Laura, a tenure-track assistant professor at MSU, identified the problem that she had with not attending a formal orientation:

One of the problems was that I started in the summer. Our program starts in the summer and the university doesn’t have their orientation for new faculty until the fall. So, I was trying to figure things out without having gone to orientation.

Although none of the faculty at PU attended a formal orientation, most of the participants were eventually provided with the information necessary to gain promotion and tenure through the guidance of senior colleagues. Still, the absence of an orientation
was perceived as a barrier in the socialization process of the White faculty who participated in this study.

*Barrier in the Promotion and Tenure Process: Expectation to Publish*

Prior to discussing the expectation to publish as a barrier in the promotion and tenure process, it is important to understand the teaching obligations of faculty at HBCUs in this study. Awareness of the teaching expectations situates this section within the appropriate context for added insight into understanding this barrier.

Faculty at both PU and MSU discussed teaching loads of four courses per term. Joe (tenured professor) discussed the course load for faculty members within his department at PU:

… faculty members are required to teach four courses per semester. In some cases junior faculty who come into our institution as an assistant instructor or professor, they have been required to teach five courses.

Janey, a tenured professor, described her course load the first year that she taught at MSU:

…The numbers overwhelmed me. We had an unusually large number the first year I was here and we were asked to teach five composition classes. That was a baptism in fire!

She noted that a teaching load of a minimum of four courses was the ‘norm’ at MSU. Knowledge of the teaching expectations at PU and MSU provides a context for reviewing the findings on publishing as a barrier in the promotion and tenure process.

When asked about the barriers associated with the socialization process relative to the tenure and promotion process, tenure-line faculty members in this study identified the
expectation to publish as a barrier. An impediment to publishing mentioned specifically by several participants at PU was the lack of a sabbatical program. Participants in this study indicated that they taught an average of four courses per semester.

Several of the participants believed that without publications, it would have been more difficult to gain promotion and tenure. Ross, a tenured associate professor at MSU, related the importance placed on research in his department:

Research is a criterion by which I’m judged by pretty heavily for promotion and tenure. It’s an absolute requirement. Had I not produced research after I got here, I in all likelihood would have been denied promotion and tenure. It’s a requirement. You don’t produce, you don’t stay.

A tenured professor at PU, Joe, expressed how a major publication assisted him in being promoted in a short period of time:

I went from associate professor to full professor and head of the department in about two years… I think a lot of that had to do with the publication of my [work] which is recognized generally in the academic world as being significant. That sounds egotistical. To my regret, I think that I am the only professor on campus that has published a major [work].

Although Harold, a tenured professor at PU, said that he believed his institution was not extremely concerned about the research component, he felt that it was necessary to safeguard himself with research when he became eligible for promotion and tenure:

I was involved in not so much research but in writing several novels early on and umm, I know that when I got prepared for my analysis or the promotion and tenure committee that I had a stack of stuff that they had to look at. And I made
sure that stack was pretty high. And I rather feel that probably none of them looked at it. But there’s a lot of stuff I could say I’d been doing…

The unwavering requirement of publications for promotion and tenure at MSU was discussed by Claudette (tenured professor):

…When it’s time for promotion and tenure, they scurry around to find someone to write with and they immediately publish so they get it… Generally you have to have at least one publication in a refereed journal. The main thing is like I said, we have an emphasis on teaching here. But they have been moving in the direction of more emphasis on academic and so we do have requirements. That’s one thing they will not waive. We have some older faculty members that keep trying to buck the system, that they do not want to do the publications. They feel they were hired for teaching...That part is pretty clear cut at the university. Some universities don’t tell you that you have to have this many publications. You just find out at the end of the year when you come up for promotion and tenure. Here, they’re very clear. It’s all in writing… If you haven’t done any publications, you should not be surprised that you did not receive it.

Laura, an assistant tenure-track professor, described the point system used at MSU for publications:

You have to do research. I can’t quote exactly, but you have to publish articles in journals. You get points… a published article, they have a whole scale of different things…
Nonetheless, Kruse, a tenured professor at MSU, attempted to impart how upset some of his tenure-track colleagues are about the changing emphasis on research and publications:

But they’re about to make research and publication more stringent… [T]hey’ve gotten feedback from me as well as from other faculty members. Many of the faculty members who have not yet gained promotions and tenure have told the committees who are planning to enforce stringent research and publications requirement: “What do you think you’re doing. This is one of the best things at this institution. Why are you trying to pull up the ladder behind you?”… If we go by these guidelines…You were never expected to do all of this…and you you’re going to leave us with this!”

The role of the department chair in relaying the importance of research and publication in the tenure process was relayed by Carol, an associate professor at PU:

Early on, the chair of my department told me that I needed to begin working on a research topic that I might like to publish, that it would look good on my record when I came up for tenure.

Faculty at both PU and MSU related the importance of publications in the promotion and tenure process. Their responses indicate that it may become more difficult for tenure-track faculty members to obtain promotion and tenure. Perhaps, the need for a sabbatical program could facilitate faculty in fulfilling the expectation to publish as they seek promotion and tenure.

No sabbatical programs. The expectation to conduct research and publish was a barrier that several participants at PU suggested could be remedied with the
implementation of a sabbatical program. Claudette emphasized the importance of faculty using their own time to do research since the institution did not provide time off to do research:

We don’t get sabbaticals or time off to do research. We still have to teach our four classes regardless. And so you have to decide, am I going to work on the weekends or am I going to stay late at night… You have to be self motivated. You have to use your nights, weekends. You don’t get relief time.

Carol, an associate tenure-track faculty member at PU, shared Claudette’s perspective about the lack of time that PU provided for research opportunities:

The institution does not provide us with sabbatical time to do the research that they are now requiring us to do. So a lot of faculty members may not be able to produce a sufficient number of publications because they’re not given extra time to do so.

Joe associated the problem with the publishing expectation with obtaining a terminal degree:

The lack of a sabbatical program here, I think is a dampening on faculty who want to complete terminal degree work or whatever…so if the school was able at some point in the future to come up with a sabbatical program which is a clearly stated policy I think it would be more useful for the future of academic development of the faculty…To my knowledge, in the 19 years that I’ve been here they’ve never had an organized sabbatical program. On most college campuses, after you’ve been on a campus for seven years, you
are given the option for sabbatical, one year off in terms of either completing your, for research, or working on a book or whatever. My book was pretty much finished when I got here so I never really had to ask for a sabbatical. But it does seem to me that perhaps one of the greatest flaws we have here in term of faculty development is the lack of a sabbatical program.

Though faculty members at MSU did not discuss a sabbatical specifically they did express, in earlier comments on the promotion and tenure process, that their institution’s expanding emphasis on research might cause fewer faculty members to gain promotion and tenure. As noted previously, the teaching load may contribute to the perception of faculty that publishing is a barrier in their pursuit of promotion and tenure.

*Other Emergent Themes*

While themes within this section do not directly address the research questions relative to the socialization process they assist in providing further insight into the experiences of White faculty at HBCUs. Two themes discussed by White faculty were dissatisfaction with institutional leadership and the perception that their advancement within the institution was limited because of their race.

*Authoritarian Institutional Leadership*

In terms of the leadership within the participants’ institutions, data analysis revealed that almost all of the participants were satisfied with their experiences with leadership on the departmental level. However, a majority of the participants acknowledged their relationships with upper level administrators, such as the vice president of academic affairs, and presidents, as paternalistic and/or authoritarian (along
Guss, a tenured full professor at MSU had this to say:

The prior administration was very much authoritarian. They were military retirees prior to coming to this institution. So they believed in what we called, quality control. Our handbook had a lot of language within it that suggested that our administrators had been associated with the military. For example, they included charts in the handbook that looked a lot like what you might see in the military. Quality control also made it a point to read every syllabus before approving it. These people were very powerful in the decision making process. Now that we have a new administration, you see a shift moving away from the military mentality. However, this new administration seems to be somewhat heavy-handed as well.

Kruse, a tenured full professor at MSU also expressed frustration with his institution’s upper level administration:

This is a very top down school. Here the faculty take a whole lot of orders. They get transmitted down through the chain of command and we’re just the bottom link in the chain of command sometimes…I make no secret. I’ve been quite outspoken about some of this top down stuff. But it’s a big issue at this university, dealing with this administration…I still have resistance and resentment at how top down it is. The university leadership is just paternalistic…
Laura, a 2nd year assistant professor who is on the tenure track at MSU, simply stated that the current administration at MSU was “totally dictatorial” and imposed “a lot of micro-management”.

Participants at PU shared similar views of their administration. Although Nell saw her institution’s president in a positive light, she viewed the vice president of the institution as an authoritarian.

I don’t have a lot of contact with the president. But the vice-president and I initially had a fairly good relationship. However, as our relationship progresses, there seems to be an element of criticism and an underlying hostility present when he speaks to me. So I think he is an authoritarian. By authoritarian I mean he is very power oriented. I am the person in charge and you’re the lowly teacher. He seems to believe in micro-management…

Although Bill, an associate professor at PU, did not specify which individuals in upper level administration he viewed negatively. Instead, he believed that the upper level administration lacked quality administrators in general.

I think to some degree there has been a certain diminishing to the quality of upper administration because their restricting themselves only to the Black administrators, at least in certain roles.

Ray, a long time tenured full professor at PU, felt as though his institution’s president should have utilized him to assist with the financial problems that the institution was having since he had been at the institution for a long period of time and believed he knew how to facilitate the problem.
I believe that the president is somewhat paternalistic. He never bothers to ask me to participate in anything that would put us more or less on even footing. He has never asked me to assist him with the problems that this institution has been having. When I first came to this institution, I told the president at that time that I was interested in assisting with a civil rights project and he said ‘why don’t you just head the project’. This president has never said anything like that to me. He’s more concerned with the idea that control is being taken away from his hands…

Although most of the White faculty who participated in this study had positive experiences relative to how they learned institutional values and expectations, many still expressed their disappointment with their institution’s leadership.

*Limited Advancement Opportunities Because of Race*

Over half of the participants at PU discussed limitations in terms of their race on advancement opportunities for administrative positions. In contrast, only one participant referenced this limitation at MSU. Joe, a tenured full professor at PU, adequately expressed the sentiments of other faculty at PU who expressed an interest in advancing to an upper level position in administration.

I’ve had other European American friends to say that it is highly unlikely to ever become president of an HBCU. It may be unlikely of ever becoming academic vice president. Although in one case, one friend of mine did hold that position for a number of years at another institution. But I would like to entertain the possibility if the option was available, a higher administrative role. I think I might have some ideas that I could share
that might help in terms of the administration. I’ve seen some rather
dismal decision making here in the last few years.

Claudette, a tenured professor at MSU with previous experience as an upper level
administrator at MSU, expounded on problematic experiences that she encountered as an
administrator that she felt were the result of her racial background:

I did not like it. I don’t know if it was sexism or racism or what it was, but
it was not smooth sailing... When I would go to meetings, I would have a
hard time getting listened to, getting attention paid to me, I don’t know…
most of them would be men. Usually there was one White male---and then
all the rest would be Black and some Black females. I felt a lot of times both
in those meetings that the things that I would discuss with the students or
would put in documentation would be viewed as being racist because I
was White. I would write things like, in order for you to continue in the
graduate school, you would need to get your information in by the time
you completed twelve credit hours. I would have students complaining to
the vice-president that that was racist. Now there was nothing racist about
that. That was held for Black students, White students, red students, Hispanic
students, anybody…doesn’t matter, green, yellow. But, because I was White
and they were Black, it was viewed as being racist. And so that was one of
the reasons I went back to teaching. I don’t have a problem in classrooms
with that. I don’t have students saying you’re picking on me because I’m
Black. But for some reason, I did at the administrative level.
While faculty noted the limitations their race had on their advancement to upper level administrative positions, they also indicated that Black leadership was better for HBCUs. For example, Claudette, a tenured professor at MSU, related her position on the leadership of HBCUs:

Well I’ve already been [in an upper level position], and the goal to me is to get as high as you can…I think that our top leadership is always going to be black and I think that’s appropriate. It was formed for particular purposes, so I think it’s appropriate that it have black leadership.

Nell, an associate tenure-track professor at PU, discussed why she believed Whites would have a problem with taking on the role of college president or vice president at an HBCU.

I definitely would not like to be in upper administration. It’s more challenging in a place that doesn’t have money. I know a lot of Whites who if they had to deal with the financial issues that these Black administrators deal with on a day to day basis, would have thrown their hands up a long time ago. So, I really can see the advantage of having a Black president and vice president. Having cultural knowledge is also very important to conduct these roles properly. I would be very reluctant to having a White president. I think you can only go so far as the dean’s level anyway.

Bill, an associate tenure-track professor at PU, provided his opinion as to why HBCUs continue to hire only Black faculty for upper level positions in administration.

…But the unique thing about Black colleges is that it took them a long time to get their autonomy. The first Black president was in the 1950s and so as
a result, I think there has been an effort to focus on keeping Black administrators…

Most of the participants viewed their institutional leadership as paternalistic and/or authoritarian. Several faculty members at PU voiced aspirations to advance into upper level administration but perceived that it was an unlikely probability that they would lead a Black institution because of their race. Perhaps, the dissatisfaction with the institutional leadership served as a catalyst for their desire to seek upper level administrative positions. On the other hand, the perception that their racial background limits their upward mobility to administrative positions could also influence their perception of the institutional leadership.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the themes that emerged as a result of data collection and analysis. Experiences of the participants assisted in identifying the influences and barriers in the socialization process of White faculty at HBCUs. Though participants discussed instances where they experienced barriers in their socialization process and promotion and tenure process, overall, the influences outweighed the barriers. Thus, the socialization of White faculty members on HBCU campuses can be viewed as a positive experience.
This study investigated the faculty socialization process at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Twelve tenure-line White faculty members were invited to share their experiences in making sense of their socialization process on HBCU campuses. As such, participants discussed their perceptions of how they gained knowledge concerning the values, norms, and skills necessary to function at an HBCU. In addition, barriers that they encountered were identified as well as characteristics that facilitated their socialization process.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section discusses the major influences and barriers that participants identified as having an impact on their socialization process. The second section of this chapter explores the framework that was used to guide this study and suggests a revision to Johnson’s (1999) model for positive faculty socialization. Implications for policy and practice are discussed in the third section and the final section emphasizes suggestions for future research.

Overview of Study

White faculty at HBCUs have to interact in a setting in which they are no longer members of the majority population. As newcomers to the institution and ‘minorities’ within the HBCU environment, they must learn the institutional values and norms necessary to obtain promotion and tenure. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) found that faculty exhibit substantial satisfaction and progress when they experience a positive socialization. Hence, a focus of this study was to gain insight into the aspects of a positive socialization experience for White faculty at HBCUs.
Previous research suggests that White faculty who teach at HBCUs undergo an array of experiences (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999; Smith & Bordgestedt, 1985; Warnat, 1976). In research conducted three decades ago, Warnat (1976) found that White faculty at HBCUs were viewed negatively by their Black counterparts when they entered Black institutions of higher education. Smith and Bordgestedt (1985) emphasized subordination, low wages, and issues surrounding White inferiority on HBCU campuses. Still, others have introduced the positive experiences of White faculty at HBCUs. For example, Foster, Guyden and Miller (1999) emphasized the importance that faculty diversity brings to HBCUs. Because of the dated empirical research on White faculty at HBCUs, an exploration of the current socialization experiences of White faculty at HBCUs was necessary.

Thus, this research study explored the perceptions of White faculty regarding their socialization experiences at HBCUs. The primary research question guiding this study was: How do White faculty perceive their socialization experiences at HBCUs? The secondary research questions were as follows:

1. What are the perceived influences in the socialization process?
2. What are the perceived barriers in the socialization process?
3. What departmental characteristics assist in the socialization process?

In order to gain insight into the socialization process of White faculty at HBCUs, twelve tenure-line faculty members at two four-year institutions participated in one in-person interview. The two institutions were, Privateer University (PU), a private institution in a rural location, and Mane State University (MSU), a state supported institution in an urban location. All of the participants shared the following attributes: a)
White (Anglo-Saxon) descent, b) teaching at an HBCU full-time and, c) in a tenure-line (tenure or tenure-track) position with a Ph.D. degree.

Through the participants shared experiences, both positive and negative themes emerged relative to their perceptions of the socialization process. The positive themes were: the provision of clear institutional values and expectations through colleagues and institutional documentation, as well as establishing and maintaining collegial relationships, particularly with senior faculty members. On the other hand, the participants identified the absence of an orientation and the expectation to publish as barriers they perceived that impacted their experience as they sought promotion and tenure.

Positive Influences on White Faculty Socialization at HBCUs

The participants of this study were able to relate two positive influences on their socialization experiences while teaching at HBCUs. These influences were clear values and expectations and establishing maintaining collegial relationships. According to the participants, they were able to learn the values and expectations of the institution through informal and formal methods relayed by senior colleagues on campus and documentation provided by the institution. Although the participants encountered various negative facets that had a subtle affect on the socialization process, overall the positive experiences that they encountered assisted most of them in gaining promotion and tenure.

Clear Institutional Values and Expectations Learned Informally and Formally

Participants identified three informal components that facilitated their socialization process. Through listening, observing, and conversation, participants learned the values and expectations of the institution. Specifically, faculty members
revealed they observed what senior faculty were doing, listened to conversations they overheard and engaged in conversations with senior faculty. Findings of this study correlate with Johnson’s (2000) conclusion that institutional values and expectations were relayed to Black tenure-line faculty at HBCUs in a casual and spontaneous manner.

Although informal socialization is commonly viewed as substantially more tedious and difficult than formal socialization (Baldwin, 1979; Mager & Myers, 1982), this study recognizes that it can be beneficial to individuals as well. Most of the participants in the study did not express dissatisfaction with the informal manner in which they learned the institutional expectations and values. According to Johnson (2000), good comradery amongst faculty members correlates with the provision of helpful information in conversations, while passing in hallways, and/or at lunch. However, researchers (Blackwell, 1989; Butner, Burley, & Marbley, 2000; Hall & Sandler, 1983) report that this is often not the case for Black faculty members at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) who complain that they are provided with little information and lack the necessary support of their colleagues. In contrast, White faculty in this study indicated that the values and expectations of the institution were clear and learned through informal methods.

All of the participants in the study reported that they were able to obtain clear information regarding institutional values and expectations through formal methods of documentation provided by the institution or in meetings with their department chair. The written sources that participants reported as being helpful to their development were sources such as the faculty handbook, the catalog, and their contract. These documents provided realistic information pertaining to what was expected and valued at the
institution relative to the promotion and tenure process. Moreover, participants in this study described that they received a clear understanding of the institution’s values and expectations when meeting with the department chair during their initial interview, as well as when they required assistance. The assistance that White faculty members received from their department chairs during their initial entry to the institution provided them with valuable information relative to institutional expectations as they pursued promotion and tenure.

Findings of this study indicate that White faculty at HBCUs learn what the values, expectations and norms of the institution are through two formal methods. Written documentation such as faculty handbooks, institutional catalogs and annual contracts provided tangible information to support what faculty learned informally. Moreover, the department chair, as a representative of the institution, informed faculty of what the institutional expectations were. The results of this study support Johnson and Harvey’s (2002) findings that Black faculty at HBCUs learn what is expected through formal mechanisms that complement what they learn informally. In contrast, Black faculty at PWIs have a difficult time receiving a clear understanding of what is expected in the promotion and tenure process (Exum at al., 1984).

Collegial Relationships

Participants in this study indicated relationships that they established and maintained with their colleagues facilitated their socialization experience. For example, faculty discussed ways in which they felt supported and how their colleagues provided that support. To the contrary, numerous studies indicate all new faculty at PWIs often
complain about the lack of collegial support (Boice, 1991, 1992; Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1992).

While participants in this study noted their interactions with senior colleagues were supportive, they also indicated that senior faculty members did not provide unsolicited advice. However, participants acknowledged that when they asked senior faculty members questions that they willingly responded to their questions. Earlier research (Johnson, 1999; Johnson, 2001) that Black faculty at HBCUs felt senior colleagues provided them with information about the promotion and tenure process but failed to show them the ropes of the institution correlate with these findings.

Faculty members in this study described the department chair as cooperative or supportive. According to Johnson and Harvey’s (2002) study, Black faculty at HBCUs reported that department chairs were an important part of their socialization process. Most notably, they facilitated a positive socialization process amongst faculty members and their peers (Johnson, 2001; Johnson & Harvey, 2002). Sorcinelli (1999) also asserted that department chairs are a “critical source of socialization for new faculty” (p. 1). Likewise, White faculty discussed how the department chair assisted them in not only becoming acquainted with their new settings, but also in developing comradery between themselves and their fellow colleagues within and external to the department.

In the current study, most of the faculty members cited department chairs or other senior faculty members as colleagues who mentored them. The literature regarding new faculty socialization contends that senior faculty are most often viewed by junior faculty members as role models who nurture and guide new faculty members (Boice, 1992; Creswell, 1998; Tierney and Bensimon, 1996). Likewise, results of this study reveal that
participants had mentors who helped guide them at their new institution. However, results of this study contradict Johnson’s (2000) findings that senior faculty at HBCUs were not “serving as effective role models for new [Black] faculty members” (p. 11).

The experience of White faculty at HBCUs does not correlate with earlier research that reported only one out of eight Black faculty at PWIs had a mentor (Blackwell, 1989). Furthermore, Alexander-Snow and Johnson (1998) noted the frustration of Black faculty members at PWIs with the limited amount of mentorship they received. Consequently, analysis of the data indicated that White faculty at HBCUs may be more likely to have a mentor than Black faculty at HBCUs or PWIs.

Perceptions of Barriers

In recollecting their socialization experiences at their respective institutions, data analysis revealed participants were positive about their socialization experience but they did encounter barriers. These barriers included the absence of orientation and the expectation to publish. Although participants encountered barriers, they were not dissatisfied enough to constitute their withdrawal from the institution. According to Johnson and Harvey (2002), faculty members are more likely to leave an institution when they experience dissatisfaction and lack progression.

**Barrier in Socialization Due to Absence of Orientation**

Fink (1992) surmised that orientations provide new faculty members with an understanding of the culture of their institution and a “head start” relative to what the institution expects and values. Four out of twelve faculty members in the current study attended an orientation. Specifically, none of the six participants at PU attended a formal
orientation because the university did not offer an orientation. Instead, participants at PU as well as two faculty members at MSU who did not attend an orientation, recalled they gained most of the information they needed, such as promotion and tenure requirements, from senior faculty and department chairs. However, faculty members at both institutions related examples of how their lack of knowledge about institutional expectations, specifically promotion and tenure procedures, may have been avoided had there been an orientation. In essence, faculty members who did not have an opportunity to attend an orientation did not understand the inner workings or culture of the institution (Fink, 1992). While participants did not mention an orientation specifically for faculty new to the institution, it is an orientation specifically for new faculty that would provide information about institutional expectations, especially those relative to the promotion and tenure criteria.

Johnson’s (1999) study of Black faculty at HBCUs found that participants at urban institutions attended university-wide orientations, whereas, faculty at rural institutions also attended orientations specifically for new faculty. Consequently, the participants in Johnson’s (1999) study believed that although a university-wide orientation was necessary, that an orientation specifically for faculty was necessary to inform them of the norm, culture, expectations and policies relative to faculty. However, this study refutes Johnson’s (1999) findings relative to faculty members at rural institutions. Perhaps, because PU is so small, institutional leadership did not believe that a formal orientation of any type was necessary.
Barrier in Promotion and Tenure Due to Expectation to Publish

While PU and MSU are teaching-oriented and value teaching, these institutions also expect faculty to publish. However, the teaching load of four courses per semester contributes to the perception that publishing is a barrier in the pursuit of promotion and tenure. According to Thompson (1978), one of the primary reasons why faculty at HBCUs do not conduct research and publish is because of the lack of time. Likewise, new faculty across all institutional types cite time constraints which limit the amount of time they are able to devote to research and publishing (Tierney & Rhoads, 1994). Accordingly, participants at PU suggested that the implementation of sabbaticals could assist faculty in engaging in scholarly activity. Moreover, Sorcinelli (1999) contended that institutions have a responsibility to facilitate the scholarship of developing faculty members. Although faculty members at MSU did not discuss a sabbatical specifically they did express that their institution’s expanding emphasis on research might cause fewer faculty members to successfully obtain promotion and tenure. Since their inception, HBCUs have focused primarily on teaching, as opposed to research and writing (Thompson, 1978). Hence, most of the participants in this study were aware that their institutions valued good teaching and they focused more on this function while also attempting to fulfill the expectation to publish within limited time constraints.

Other Emergent Themes

Aside from the major themes related to the process of socialization for White faculty at HBCUs, two additional themes that provided insight into their experiences emerged. These themes were authoritarian institutional leadership and limited advancement opportunities because of race.
In terms of the institutional leadership at both PU and MSU, the majority of White faculty members believed that their institutional leadership was either paternalistic or authoritarian. In addition, participants discussed how they were not involved in institutional decisions. Correspondingly, in an earlier study, Smith and Borgstedt (1985) reported that sixty-six percent of White faculty at HBCUs reported authoritarian leadership and feeling powerless in decision making.

According to Johnson (1971), the early leadership of Black colleges was predominantly White males, many of whom exemplified paternalistic or authoritarian leadership characteristics. Consequently, this leadership style was often adopted by succeeding HBCU presidents (Johnson, 1971). Hence, the history of White presence at HBCUs has resulted in authoritarian and/or paternalistic leadership at these institutions today (Foster, 2001) which may result in less than optimal leadership being exhibited.

Furthermore, several participants at PU perceived that because of their racial background, they were limited in terms of advancement opportunities within administration at HBCUs. Likewise, Roebuck and Murty’s (1993) findings confirm that White faculty at HBCUs perceive that the “opportunity structure” was favorable toward African-Americans. Another earlier study by Smith and Borgstedt (1985) found that White faculty at HBCUs reported limited opportunities for advancement. Perhaps, the dissatisfaction with the institutional leadership served as a catalyst for faculty at PU to seek upper level administrative positions. On the other hand, the perception that their race limits their upward mobility to administrative positions could also influence their perception of institutional leaders.
Revised Model for Positive Faculty Socialization

Findings of this study discussed several influences that contributed to a positive socialization experience for White faculty members at HBCUs. However, the barriers noted by faculty provided additional insight into what may constitute a positive socialization experience for HBCU faculty. When participants referred to their interactions with colleagues, they used terms such as “cooperative, helpful, and supportive”. In addition, participants articulated how colleagues demonstrated support or collegiality which contributed to their feeling of appreciation at the institution.

According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979), when newcomers feel valued by their institution, they experience the investiture dimension of the *Tactical Dimensions of Organizational Socialization*. Given the findings of the study, a component focusing on appreciation or valuing of characteristics that a new faculty member brings to the institution should be incorporated into the model of positive socialization for White faculty at HBCUs. Although this dimension was not identified in the model for a positive socialization process of Black faculty members at HBCUs (Johnson, 1999), its inclusion is warranted as a component in the model for a positive socialization process of HBCU faculty.
Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study have numerous implications related to policy and practice for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. These implications may be beneficial to current and future HBCU administration and faculty members. Moreover, PWIs could use these implications to facilitate a positive socialization experience for their faculty members.
Administrators and department chairs could institute policies and programs that emphasize “built in comradery”. Events that occur monthly, quarterly, twice-yearly or annually, such as faculty meetings, departmental conferences, and Christmas parties, ensure that faculty members interact and engage in collegial relationships throughout the year.

In terms of the acculturation to the institution, faculty members are more likely to encounter problems or learn information too late when they do not participate in orientations (Exum et al., 1984), as noted by faculty in this study. According to Sorcinelli (1999), early integration into one’s department is made possible through orientation programs. Hence, faculty and administrators must recognize the importance of including mandatory orientations in their repertoire of faculty requisites. Some of the faculty in the study were not sure whether or not they were required to attend a formal orientation. HBCU leadership could offer a university-wide orientation that serves all new employees but also offer an orientation specifically for faculty to discuss information pertinent to faculty. Information about both orientations could be noted in the offer letter to the new faculty member. A well organized orientation program might continue by encouraging senior faculty and/or administrators to join new faculty for lunch after the faculty orientation according to discipline. Subsequently, throughout the year faculty members could engage in conversations facilitated by senior faculty relative to teaching, research and publications, programs on campus. Moreover, information that pertains to such necessities as department keys, copy machine codes, and technical equipment for classrooms could be relayed to faculty in departmental orientations.
In recounting the barriers that affected their socialization process, White faculty members in the study asserted that the expectation to publish was a barrier in their acquiring promotion and tenure. As suggested by Johnson (2000), HBCUs should consider modifying the requirements for promotion and tenure to reflect actual faculty responsibilities. This modification involves establishing a system whereby faculty members have the ability to emphasize teaching or research as having the most weight in the promotion and tenure process. Hence, faculty members would not be evaluated by the same standards but academic administration could ensure a level of equity by conducting workload assessments to ensure faculty are not being penalized for focusing on research versus teaching and vice versa.

In terms of leadership and how faculty populations view them, leaders at HBCUs might consider establishing policies whereby leaders take steps to appear less paternalistic or authoritarian. This might be accomplished through the acquisition of information from their faculty populations in relation to what characteristics they closely associate with paternalistic and authoritarian behavior. Subsequently, leaders might circumvent this type of behavior through their awareness of the views of their faculty members. Furthermore one faculty member stated that she had “little contact” with her president. Another said that he was unhappy because the president never asked him to assist him with problematic issues. Issues of “top-down” behaviors were also discussed. This data suggests that White faculty in this study have an interest in establishing a relationship with the leaders of their institutions. As such, leaders could implement various events whereby faculty members can interact with them in their role as leaders of the institution. Preferably, these events should not have a stress factor attached to them,
such as faculty meetings which would be less desirable to vice presidents and presidents of institutions if they are forced to deal with financial or problematic issues. Instead, presidents, for example, might consider inviting new faculty members to their homes, which tend to be located on the HBCU campus, to welcome them to the institution. This can take place each semester or quarterly, for new faculty members and annually for senior faculty members. This would give both the president/vice president and the faculty members a chance to interact in a more social and less stressful environment. Thus, an environment where both faculty and administration might see one another in a more positive manner could be cultivated thereby helping build faculty commitment and loyalty to the institution.

Because White faculty in the study perceived they did not have the opportunity to advance into upper level administrative positions at HBCUs, leaders within these institutions should ensure they are not unknowingly practicing subtle discrimination. Leaders at HBCUs could serve as advocates for diversity by ensuring that administrators at all levels represent individuals who come from various racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds.

Future Research

This study generated numerous implications for future research which are discussed within this section. While this study provided insight about the socialization process of White faculty at two institutions, there is a need to explore the experiences of White faculty across all HBCUs. Hence, further qualitative and quantitative study of this population would provide empirical research on the socialization experience of White faculty at HBCUs.
The findings of this study provided information on the influences and barriers that White faculty identified in their socialization process at HBCUs. Because HBCUs also employ a diverse group of faculty (i.e., Asians, Hispanics, Native Americans, and international faculty) further inquiry is warranted relative to the socialization process members of these groups encounter. Such information would assist researchers in determining whether or not the socialization experience may differ across ethnic groups. Moreover, research on the socialization process of the diverse faculty at HBCUs could prove insightful for PWIs.

Additional research is necessary to ascertain if the component that was added to the model for positive faculty socialization at HBCUs (figure 2) would be found in further study with Black faculty as well as members of other ethnic groups. Moreover, inquiry into what constitutes a positive socialization experience at PWIs for White and Black faculty could help further refine the model.

Although this study focused on the socialization process of White faculty, it did not focus on the stress faculty may have experienced as a member of the ‘minority’ population at HBCUs. Perhaps, greater insight would be gained from a qualitative study that focused on the stress associated with transitioning from one’s majority status to that of minority status within the HBCU environment.

Achieving an understanding of the socialization of senior faculty to their role relative to junior faculty. In addition, researchers might explore the transition from junior faculty to senior faculty and how this transition affects the interaction between senior faculty and junior faculty.
Research that delves into the various characteristics associated with HBCU leadership, i.e., paternalistic, authoritarian, and cooperative leaders would provide current leaders of institutions with a portrait of how these characteristics developed and what actions are necessary to establish a more positive role. Further research on this topic could prove invaluable in facilitating a change in the way leaders manage their institutions.

Finally, an in-depth study on HBCU leadership and the perceptions that exist among faculty relative to their perceptions of their advancement to administration and leadership roles is necessary. A study of this focus would provide insight as to whether perceptions of White faculty members and HBCU leadership can be substantiated while also providing an understanding of environments that espouse a culture of nurturing and caring.

Conclusion

This study on the socialization experiences of White faculty at HBCUs provided insight on the experiences of a group of faculty members who are rarely heard. Participants discussed influences in the socialization process. However, there were some barriers that were identified that participants encountered during their socialization process as they pursued promotion and tenure. Analysis of the findings suggests that White faculty perceived their overall socialization process to be positive.

The methods White faculty utilized to make sense of the norms, values and skills needed at HBCUs can assist in facilitating faculty members and administrators at all institutional types in cultivating a culture that is conducive for a positive faculty socialization process. Findings of this study not only necessitate the need for future
research but also provide recommendations for policy and practice that can be utilized at both HBCUs and PWIs.
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Appendix A:
Letter to Gatekeeper to Gain Entry to Site

[DATE]

Dr. William Spear
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Privateer University
116 Park Drive
Little City, Big State 0000

Dear Dr. Spear:

My name is Kimya M. Dawson-Smith and I am a doctoral student at the University of New Orleans in Louisiana. I am conducting my doctoral dissertation research on the socialization process of White faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). There is little research on HBCU faculty as a whole and there is even less research that focuses specifically on White faculty. Thus, I have chosen to examine the perceptions of White faculty regarding how they acclimate to the norms, values and skills of the institution. My research study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at UNO (IRB# 01jun06). If you have questions relative to the approval process, you may contact Dr. Laura Scaramella at 504-280-7481 or lscarame@uno.edu.

Information collected for this study will be used to fulfill the requirements of completing an original research project. As this study will examine similarities in the socialization process of White faculty at HBCUs it will contribute to filling a void in the literature on faculty socialization at HBCUs, specifically White faculty. Additionally, this study may benefit administrators and current and prospective faculty across all institutional types relative to how the socialization experiences of all faculty can be enhanced.

I am requesting a letter of support and a list with contact information for faculty who meet the following criteria: a) White descent, b) full-time, faculty members who hold a PhD, c) in tenure-line (tenure-track or tenured) positions at Privateer University. Contact information should include: name, department, campus mailing address and campus telephone number of each faculty member that meets the criteria for inclusion in the study.

Based on the list you provide, I will send faculty members a letter of invitation via U.S. mail to seek their voluntary participation in this study. I anticipate conducting individual in-person interviews with six faculty members for approximately 60 minutes in duration. The institution and the faculty members will be assigned pseudonyms to protect their rights to privacy. Please note that I will not be able to reveal any information provided by the participants.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss my research interests and the scope of my study with you. If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at kmdawson@uno.edu or (504) 280-
6661 or my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson, at (504) 280-6448 or bjjohnso@uno.edu. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kimya M. Dawson-Smith
Doctoral Candidate
Appendix B:  
Invitation Letter to Potential Study Candidates

[DATE]

Dr. Claudette Hurd  
Genealogy Department  
Privateer University  
111 Park Drive  
Little City, Big State, 0000

Dear Dr. Hurd:

My name is Kimya M. Dawson-Smith and I am a doctoral student at the University of New Orleans in Louisiana. I am conducting research for my doctoral dissertation on the experiences of White faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). I am specifically interested in White faculty perceptions regarding how they acclimate to the norms, values and skills of the institution. Privateer University was selected as a site for this study as a result of the demographic make up of its students and its diverse faculty population. I obtained a list of full-time, White, tenure-line faculty members with a Ph.D. from the academic affairs office of your institution.

Information collected for this study will be used to fulfill the requirements of completing an original research project. Currently, there is little data concerning this topic which is why your participation will be extremely helpful in the development of literature pertaining to White faculty experiences at HBCUs. By participating in a study of this nature, new insight into the experiences of White faculty at HBCUs will be gained. Hence, this study will contribute to filling a void in the literature on faculty socialization at HBCUs, specifically White faculty. Additionally, this study may benefit administrators and current and prospective faculty across all institutional types relative to how the socialization experiences of all faculty can be enhanced.

I plan to conduct individual in-person interviews with faculty members employed at Privateer University. It is anticipated that the interview will be 60 minutes in duration. The institution and the faculty members will be assigned pseudonyms to protect their rights to privacy. In addition, none of the personal information provided will be revealed in any written report and no report will be provided to your employing institution. Moreover, only the Project Director and supervising faculty member will have access to data relative to this study.

It is my hope that you would like to share your experiences and are willing to participate in this important research study. I will contact you within one week of the mailing of this letter to confirm receipt of the letter, respond to any questions you may have and to request your willingness to participate in this study. You may also contact me to discuss the topic of this study further at (504) 280-6661 or kmdawson@uno.edu. In addition, you may contact my major
professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448 or bjjohnson@uno.edu. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kimya M. Dawson-Smith
Doctoral Candidate
Appendix C:
Follow-Up Telephone Call to Potential Study Candidates

Project Director = PD
Participant = P

PD: Hi, This is Kimya Dawson Smith, a doctoral candidate at the University of New Orleans. I am calling to confirm that you have received a letter about my dissertation study on the experiences of white faculty at HBCUs.

**Participant Has Not Received Invitation Letter**
P: No, I have not received a letter from you.
PD: Oh, I am sorry to hear that. Would you please provide me with your campus mailing address so that I can send a letter about this study?
P: [Provides address]
PD: I will mail you a letter tomorrow about this research project and will call you within a week to follow-up to see if you have questions. Thank you and have a good day!

**Participant Has Received Letter**
P: Yes, I did.
PD: Great! Do you have any questions about my dissertation study?
P: [Participant will respond by saying yes or no and asking question and PD will address]
PD: I hope that I have answered all of your questions and hope that you are willing to participate in my research study?
P: No, not at this time.
PD: Okay, thank you for your time. Have a good day!

**Participant Agrees to Participate in Study**
P: Great! I would like to schedule a time during [designated week] for the interview. How does your schedule look during that week?
[Interview will be scheduled on a mutually convenient day, time and place for P and PD]
PD: In a few days, I will send you a confirmation letter that confirms your agreement to participate as well as our scheduled interview. In addition, you will receive a consent form for your review prior to the interview. Do you have any questions for me at this time?
[Participant will say yes or no and PD will respond accordingly]
PD: I look forward to seeing you in a few weeks! Thank you for your willingness to assist me in completing my dissertation research.
Appendix D:
Confirmation Letter of Agreement to Participate and Scheduled Interview

Dear <<Participant Name>>,

I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. As a participant in this study, your contributions will assist me in answering the research questions that I have established for this study pertaining to the experiences of White faculty at HBCUs.

Your interview is scheduled:

- **Interview Date:** <<Date of Interview>>
- **Location:** <<Location of Interview>>
- **Time:** <<Time of Interview>>

I will contact you approximately two days before the interview to confirm our appointment.

Also included with this letter is a consent form for your review. The consent form outlines the purpose of the study, explains any risks associated with participation in the study and emphasizes the voluntary and confidential nature of the research study. Prior to the beginning of the interview, we will review the consent form and I will address any questions you may have. Once all of your questions have been answered both you and I will sign two copies of the consent form, one for your records and one for my records.

Should you have any questions concerning this research study or in the event that you need to reschedule the interview, please contact me at your convenience at either of the methods listed below:

- **Researcher:** Kimya M. Dawson-Smith  
  Telephone: (504) 280-6448 or (334) 320-0401 (mobile phone)  
  Email: kmdawson@uno.edu

You may also contact my major professor, Dr. Barbara J. Johnson at (504) 280-6448 or bjohnso@uno.edu, if there are questions. Thank you for assisting me in completing this research study.

Sincerely,

Kimya Dawson-Smith  
Doctoral Candidate
Appendix E:  
Consent Form

1. Title of Research Study
The Socialization of White Faculty at HBCUs

2. Project Director
Kimya M. Dawson-Smith, Doctoral Candidate, Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana 70148. (504) 280-6661 or 334-320-0401 (mobile). Email: kmdawson@uno.edu

This research project is in partial fulfillment of course requirements, and under the supervision of Dr. Barbara J. Johnson, associate professor in the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling, and Foundations, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana 70148. Office (504) 280-6661 or (504) 280-6448. E-mail: bjjohnso@uno.edu.

3. Purpose of the Research Study
The purpose of this dissertation research project is to explore the experiences of White faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Specifically, I am interested in the perceptions of White faculty regarding how they acclimate to the norms, values and skills of the institution. As there is sparse research on the experiences of faculty at HBCUs, this important study will contribute to filling a void in the literature on faculty socialization at HBCUs, specifically White faculty. Additionally, this study may benefit administrators across all institutional types relative to how the socialization experiences of all faculty can be enhanced.

4. Procedures for this Research
The Project Director will interview 12 full-time, White, tenure-line (tenure-track or tenured) faculty with a Ph.D. at historically black institutions. Each participant will complete the interview alone and the interview should last about 1 hour. Participants will be audiotaped in order to collect verbatim their experiences regarding their experiences in learning the norms and values of the institution.

5. Potential Risks or Discomforts
There may be some potential loss of personal time being given up in order to participate in this study. There is also the possibility that participants may become fatigued during the interview. Participants will be allowed to take breaks if needed and will be offered an opportunity to debrief issues brought up over the course of interviewing. In addition, participants in the process of seeking tenure may not feel comfortable discussing sensitive topics. All aspects of participation are voluntary and the participant may choose to conclude the interview at any time or to decline to answer any question without penalty. Participants who would like to discuss these or other potential discomforts may contact the Project Director listed in #2 of this form.
6. Potential Benefits to You or Others
Participants may benefit from the opportunity to express and discuss how they perceived their socialization process. Additionally, participation in this study may benefit future prospective White faculty members considering employment at historically black institutions. Even more so, your participation will benefit this study as it will contribute to generalizable knowledge about experiences as a White faculty member at a historically black institution. Furthermore, this study could provide additional insight for faculty and administrators across all institutional types relative to how to enhance the socialization process of all faculty.

7. Alternative Procedures
There are no alternative procedures for this study. Participation for this research project is entirely voluntary. Each participant may withdraw his/her consent and terminate participation at any time without consequences.

8. Protection of Confidentiality
Your name, current institution, and any other identifying information will be kept confidential at all times. You and your institution will be identified with pseudonyms in this project. The interview tapes will be transcribed by the Project Director. The signed consent forms, audiotapes, interview transcripts, and any other materials related to this project will be maintained in a secure and confidential manner by the Project Director. None of the personal information you provide will be revealed in any written report and no report will be provided to your employing institution. Only the Project Directors identified in #2 will have access to this data. The data collected for this research study will be destroyed in three years through shredding or a magnetic erasing device.

9. Financial Compensation
You will not be paid for your participation.

10. Your Rights as a Participants
If you have questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, Dr. Anthony Kontos at the University of New Orleans at 504-280-6420.

9. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Participant</th>
<th>Name of Participant (print)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Project Director</td>
<td>Name of Project Director (print)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Reminder Telephone Call Script

Researcher: Good (Morning, Afternoon) this is Kimya Dawson-Smith, I'm calling you to ensure that the interview that we have arranged for <<Date>> at <<Time>> in <<Location>> is still okay for you?

Participant: No it is not okay.

Researcher: That's fine. What date and time would you like to reschedule it for?

Participant: I'm sorry, I will not be able to participate.

Researcher: Thank you and have a nice day.

Participant: If possible, I would like to meet on <<date>> at <<Time>>.
Appendix G: 
Interview Guide

Individual Interview

1. Introduction
   - Doctoral student at UNO
   - Interested in White faculty perceptions regarding how they learn the norms, values, and skills needed to be successful in the promotion and tenure process at HBCUs.

2. Consent
   - Review consent form
   - Voluntary participation
   - Anonymous participants and institutions
   - Subjects may conclude participation with no repercussions
   - May bypass any question

3. Interview Questions

   Interview Pathology

   Section I – Personal Data – Background Information

   1. Please explain your previous experience.
      i. Did you teach at an HBCU prior to teaching at the current institution? What was the primary factor that led to your decision to take a position at this HBCU?
      ii. What experiences had you encountered in your previous roles that have assisted you in your current role?
      iii. Did you feel prepared for the tasks that you encountered once you began working at the current institution?

   2. Within your department as well as the institution, what appears to be most valued or rewarded?
      i. What do these values mean to you?
ii. How did you learn what was valued within your department and institution (information received formally or informally? (catalogs, other faculty members, etc.) and in what context?

2. In what way would you describe the leadership within your department and your institution? (paternalistic, cooperative)

iii. Within your department, how do your colleagues interact with you (supportive, nice, critical)?

iv. What departmental characteristics (reward system, mentorship program) assisted your development most? Least?

4. When you were first hired, what kind of problems do you recall having?
   a. Do you believe that the institution or your department could have facilitated these occurrences in some way?
      i. Did you participate in an orientation for new faculty members? University-wide, college-wide, or department-wide? Describe.
      ii. Were there other ways to facilitate the problems that you experienced that you would have liked to see occur?

5. In your role as professor, how were you made aware of what was expected of you?
   a. Was this information acquired formally or informally? (handbook or faculty members, etc.)
      i. Were you told that you would be rewarded for certain tasks, activities, roles?
      ii. Did you have realistic expectations?
      iii. How did you obtain this information?

6. Describe what is expected to obtain promotion and tenure status.
   a. How were you provided with this knowledge?
      i. Who was largely responsible for how you gained knowledge of this process?
ii. Was this information provided formally or informally (orientation, department chair, college, etc.)?

iii. In what context did you retrieve this information?

7. What factors contribute to faculty success in terms of promotion and tenure?
   
i. What are some of the more difficult aspects associated with working in a tenure-track position?
   
ii. What factors have assisted you in overcoming these difficulties?
   
iii. What kind of barriers might a new faculty encounter in working toward obtaining promotion and tenure?
   
iv. What factors might cause a new faculty member to have difficulty in the promotion and tenure process? Describe.

8. What kind of opportunities in terms of your professional development does the institution or department extend to faculty members?
   
a. Are you given the chance to attend conferences or to travel?
   
b. Are you given the opportunity to publish or write grants?
      
i. Do you find that these experiences facilitate you in any way?
      
ii. Are there other venues that you would like your department or institution to consider in terms of professional development opportunities?

9. How do you view your future at this institution?
   
a. Do you have future goals that you would like to explore as a faculty member?
      
i. How, if at all, does this institution fit in with your future plans?
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