THE SOCIALIZATION OF NON-BLACK FACULTY AT A HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE

by

KENLEY HALL OBAS

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational
Leadership, Policy and Technology
Studies in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2009

Submitted by Kenley Hall Obas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education specializing in Higher Education Administration.

Accepted on behalf of the Faculty of the Graduate School by the dissertation committee:

Brian D. Bourke, Ph.D.

Jennifer B. Jones, Ph.D.

Claire H. Major, Ph.D.

Karri A. Holley, Ph.D.
Co-Chairperson

Michael S. Harris, Ed.D.
Co-Chairperson

Stephen C. Tomlinson, Ph.D.
Department Chairperson

3-24-09
Date

David A. Francko, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

23 April 09
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

And Jabez called on the God of Israel, saying, Oh that thou wouldest bless me indeed, and enlarge my coast, and that thine hand might be with me, and that thou wouldest keep me from evil, that it may not grieve me! And God granted him that which he requested (I Chronicles 4:10).

If I were to acknowledge everyone involved in this research project it would exceed the pages of this document. So please accept my apologies if you are not mentioned specifically by name, but know that you are forever included in my memory and thoughts. I would like to thank Michael Harris for his continued guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank, Karri Holley, for her invaluable input. Her knowledge of organizational culture and socialization was instrumental to this dissertation. Additionally her wisdom encouraged me in both this dissertation and my coursework. I would like to thank the rest of the committee members, Brian Bourke and Jennifer Jones for their insight and expertise. I would like to thank Claire Major for her insight and guidance in developing this topic and refining the scope. I would like to thank all the faculty at the institution from this study, for without them this study would have been impossible. I am also indebted to Joe Lee, Evelyn White and Alfred Smith, and Willie Flowers. I would like to thank Cohort II, this journey would have been impossible without you. Thank you for listening and sharing your expertise.

I would like to thank my family for their commitment, encouragement and prayers. My in-laws James and Gussie Sutton for assisting in everyway possible, without

hesitation. For my parents, Michelin and Bernadette Obas for their emotional support. The custom-made computer desk was just the right fit.

I would like to thank my children Joshua and Kindred. You two were my motivation throughout this journey. I love you both dearly. Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Sondra. Her unwavering commitment from the very beginning of this process was incredible. Thank you for listening and reading countless pages. I am forever yours.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to understand the experiences of non-black faculty employed at a historically black institution. This study captured the perception of a group of non-black faculty and how they come to understand the norms and culture of the institution. Considering the increase in the number of non-black, specifically white faculty at HBCUs in recent decades, I focus on the following three research questions: (1) How do non-black faculty members perceive their socialization into the culture of their college campus? (2) How do non-black faculty members interact with their colleagues? (3) How do non-black faculty members interact with students?

Feldman's socialization (1976) theory was used in this research to understand how non-black faculty viewed particular activities throughout the socialization process. The theory assisted in providing a framework to examine how non-black faculty members define their roles at their institutions. Additionally the framework provided a mechanism to understand external forces, such as how family members influence the socialization process.

This study used a qualitative interview approach to capture the experience of non-black faculty members. The selected participants were asked to detail their experiences and their perceptions of the institutional culture and norms. The findings in this study provide an understanding of non-black faculty socialization at HBCUs. The conclusions also assist in understanding the socialization of various faculty and the role culture plays

in shaping experiences. Ultimately, such conclusions will benefit HBCU administrators focused on faculty socialization and the impact of culture on all institutional stakeholders.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examined the socialization of non-black faculty members at a historically black college (HBCU). My goal was to document how non-black faculty come to understand the norms and culture of an HBCU. This chapter presents a background to the study, research questions, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, and the significance of the study.

Historically black colleges and universities occupy a unique and crucial role in the American higher education system. The quest for knowledge has been a component paramount to American culture and the development of colleges and universities (Rudolph, 1990). When the Puritans first established themselves in New England, developing an institution of higher education was one major element to their pursuit for religious and political freedom (Thelin, 2002). As the colonial expansion developed, so did the desire to expand knowledge and create an educated citizenry (Rudolph; Thelin). The search for wisdom was the catalyst to the formation of the United States of America, democracy, and the American system of education. Centuries later, this thirst for knowledge did not remain solely with the Puritans. It would also reach throughout the colonies and to those involved with building the New Nation (Thelin).

Knowledge was revered as religious and used to separate the educated from the non-educated (Watkins, 2001; Williams, 2005; Woodson, 2004). One population

deprived of education was the African slave in America (Bowels &DeCosta, 1971; Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Slaveholders understood that knowledge would provide a slave with the ability to question his bondage and ultimately seek his freedom (Williams; Woodson). During the Colonial period, some slaves were fortunate to have access to education, primarily in black schools in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania (Watkins). Although a few states had black schools that educated slaves, most slaves were self-taught. Slaves often eavesdropped on their masters or obtained copies of the Bible in order to educate themselves (Holmes, 1934). Educating free blacks was also a punishable offense, one not taken lightly.

Many whites participated in the education of blacks in spite of the risk and consequences. Woodson (2004) noted that some whites disregarded state law and arranged training for blacks. One example is that of Margaret Douglass, a white seamstress from Norfolk, Virginia, who provided education to several blacks in 1853. Douglass was eventually arrested for partaking in a funeral of one of her students (Williams, 2005). During her trial Douglass claimed, "I deem it the duty of every Southerner, morally and religiously, to instruct his slaves, that they may know their duties to their master, and to their common God" (Williams, p. 28). Douglass vowed not to continue to break the law, but said, "I will teach them...how to live, and how to die" (Williams, p. 28). Thus based on her remarks and religious prospective, the court imposed a one-dollar fine, and promised to impose additional fines if she continued her work.

Another example of the influence of whites was the establishment of Cheyney University. When Cheyney University opened its doors in 1839 as the Institute of

Colored Youth in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), it solidified HBCUs as a permanent fixture in American higher education (Foster, Guyden, & Miller, 1999). Besides being established as an institution for the education for black students, Cheyney University was a testament to the relationship between whites and the education of blacks. The funds to create Cheyney University were primarily bequeathed by Richard Humphreys, a Pennsylvania Quaker who saw the social importance of a white influence for the education of blacks (Jackson-Coppin, 1987; Bowels & DeCosta, 1971). Both Douglass and Humphreys were preludes to the involvement of white and other non-black educators in the development of HBCUs.

HBCUs have existed as a beacon for the education of black students when there were few alternatives available. HBCUs are defined as institutions established prior to 1964 with the intent and mission to educate black Americans. The influence of HBCUs has permeated academia throughout American culture and history (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Institutions such as Howard University have been instrumental in shaping the face of America by educating prominent physicians, scholars and leaders. Tuskegee University in Alabama, for example, accounts for 75 percent of all African American veterinarians ("Veterinary Medicine: The Most Racially Segregated Field in Graduate Education Today," 2007). The success of these institutions illustrates the significant contributions of HBCUs to the development of the black culture and communities.

HBCUs have provided education to blacks for over a century (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Henderson, 1967; Foster, 2001). Prior to the Civil War, the influence of HBCUs was apparent through such institutions as Lincoln University in Pennsylvania (1854) and Wilberforce University in Ohio (1856). Both these institutions offered baccalaureate

degrees to black students when the vast majority of white institutions denied them acceptance. Though a few institutions such as Berea College in Kentucky and Oberlin College in Ohio offered degrees to black students, the responsibility of educating blacks was primarily that of HBCUs (Allen & Jewell; Henderson; Foster). After the Civil War, HBCUs experienced substantial growth with the assistance of government initiatives as well as the involvement of missionaries and philanthropists. HBCUs developed into the vessel of education for nearly eight million freed slaves after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 (Allen & Jewell; Henderson; Holmes, 1934; Foster,). Today black students have several alternatives for higher education. However, HBCUs continue to be an option for many black students.

While HBCUs were established for the education of blacks, they also carry a history rooted in the soil of white philanthropists and white missionaries. As with many HBCUs, whites played a vital part as administrators and educators for many years. Holmes (1934), in his study of HBCUs, noted the contribution of white missionaries and philanthropists in the formation of HBCUs. He wrote, "The Negro college has a history peculiarly its own. Its establishment was an emergency measure and its evolution has been guided by missionary motives arising from a sense of the duty of a stronger social group to a weaker" (p. 3). Holmes' comments illustrated the perspectives held by many whites as they founded and developed institutions for blacks. Holmes (1934) further noted, "The other colleges of our country were established and developed by white Americans for their own children. The Negro college was established by the zeal of these same Americans and their descendants, but for the children of slaves" (p. 3). This statement explains not only the importance of HBCUs, but also the relationship of white

citizens in developing these institutions. Juxtaposed against the historical perspectives of HBCUs, the white faculty members of today's black colleges are placed into a unique position with social and racial implications.

Though several HBCUs were established by blacks such as Lincoln University (Pennsylvania), many others were founded by white missionary organizations. The American Missionary Association, the American Baptist Home Mission Society, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the American Church Institute of the Episcopal Church, and the United Presbyterian Church all participated in funding and establishing several HBCUs. Additionally white philanthropists such as Samuel P. Chase, Matthias Baldwin, Levi Coffin, and Henry Ward Beecher contributed to the founding of many private HBCUs (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Foster, 2001; Henderson, 1967; Holmes, 1934; Slater, 1993; Watkins, 2001).

These organizations and individuals were primarily responsible for the management and funding of these institutions. Slater (1993) indicated, "Even well into the twentieth century, most black colleges were still controlled and dependent on whites for operating funds. For the most part these institutions were run by white administrators and staffed by white faculty" (p. 67). Browning and Williams (1978) noted that many white missionary organizations "mixed social, economic, and religious ideas in their dedication to the task of uplifting freed men and woman" (p. 69). The influence and control of whites at HBCUs began to dissipate once whites began to hire and recruit black faculty members and administrators to operate the growing number of HBCUs.

At the conception of these institutions, many HBCUs consisted of all white faculty and administrations. Spelman University (Georgia), for example, was founded in

1881, but did not appoint its first black president until 1953 ("The Tradition of White Presidents at Black Colleges," 1997). Similarly, Talladega College (Alabama) appointed its first black president in 1957, though it enrolled its first students in 1867 ("The Tradition of White Presidents at Black Colleges,"). Today, HBCUs are largely governed by black administrations ("The Tradition of White Presidents at Black Colleges,"). A subtle yet symbolic fingerprint of the influence of white influences on HBCUs was the naming of buildings. Many buildings and several institutions boast the names of white founders and philanthropist. For instance, Howard University (Washington, DC) bears the name of General Oliver O. Howard, who was commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau and the college's third president. In addition, Howard, a white Union general in the American Civil War, was instrumental in the establishment of several other black colleges (Logan, 1969). Several of Howard's fellow officers were the catalyst for the founding of many HBCUs. Clinton Bowen Fisk, an officer of Howard's at the Freeman's Bureau, was the namesake of Fisk University (Tennessee). *US News & World Report* recently named both Howard and Fisk as two of the nation's highest ranked HBCUs (US News and World Report, 2007). The formation of these two institutions and many others illustrate the involvement of whites in constructing higher education for blacks.

HBCUs are today primarily black-populated institutions in regards to leadership, administrators, faculty, and students. For example, black enrollment at HBCUs accounted for 13 percent of all black postsecondary enrollments in 2001 (Provasnik & Shafer, 2001). Of the 54,551 persons employed at HBCUs in 2001, 76 percent were black. Additionally blacks constituted for 60 percent of the full-time faculty in 2001 (Provasnik

& Shafer). Therefore, the leadership that started with white missionaries and philanthropists has given way to black educators and administrators.

While HBCUs are primarily comprised of black faculty, staffs and students, they have also been leaders in the acceptance of diverse faculty (Dwyer, 2006; Jewell, 2001). Traditionally HBCUs have been a safe haven for many non-black faculty. During the 1940's and 1950's several European immigrants, primarily of Jewish decent, sought professorships at HBCUs. Foster (2001) noted that in the 1970's " faculty diversity at both private and public black colleges was enhanced by the presence of young, liberal, and idealistic white faculty seeking to carry forth the hard-won promises of the new American society grounded in equals rights and opportunity for all" (p. 123). Despite the influences of non-black educators, empirical research has given little attention to the experiences of Asian, Latinos, and Native Americans at HBCUs. The majority of the empirical research regarding HBCUs has focused on black students and faculty. Conversely, the limited empirical research of non-black faculty at HBCUs has revolved around the perspectives and experiences of white faculty (Foster et al., 1999; Slater, 1993; Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). The limited research on whites at HBCUs has been driven by the historical influence of white missionary organizations and white philanthropists. The continued presence of white faculty has been the catalyst of the research. However, the influence of Asians, Latinos, and Native Americans at HBCU has gone undocumented and overlooked.

Faculty play a unique role in the culture of the historically black campus. An instrumental component of the HBCU is the nurturing environment developed by the faculty (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Bowels & DeCosta, 1971).

HBCUs have maintained a focus on student development that has permeated campuses for decades. The relationships between the faculty members and students have been at the core of the longevity and success of these institutions (Roebuck & Murty). Faculty members at HBCUs have been on the front lines of black political activism and community building initiatives in the urban and rural communities (Foster et. al, 1999). In several instances, HBCU faculty members are viewed as the educational engine for developing black leadership (Allen & Jewell; Roebuck & Murty; Bowels & DeCosta). The emphasis on student and community involvement has transformed the faculty members at HBCUs into essential components of these institutions.

The non-black faculty population at HBCUs has grown in recent years (Foster, et.al, 1999; Slater, 1993). For example, white faculty members constitute 25% of all faculty teaching at HBCUs; at some institutions, the proportion of white professors represents the majority of faculty (Foster, 2001). It is anticipated that the percentage of white faculty will increase. Additionally the amount of Asian and Latino faculty has also increased. Foster attributed the increase of white faculty to the racial patterns which are rooted in the historical dominance of whites at HBCUs. White citizens have had a continual influence on HBCUs, which is currently being manifested by an increase of white faculty.

The relationship between whites and HBCUs has undergone several transformations (Foster et. al, 1999). From the Christian missionary organizations and the Freeman's Bureau during reconstruction, to the exiting of whites from HBCUs after the *Plessy v. Ferguson* ruling, the involvement of whites is apparent to varying degrees and through various forms (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Roebuck & Murty, 1993). After years of

decline amongst white faculty, HBCUs are witnessing a return by many non-black faculty members (Foster, et. al). In addition to white faculty, HBCUs are noticing an increase in Latino faculty and other minority groups. However, the relationship of white faculty members to HBCUs is unique because of their dual status. While white individuals maintain their majority status in America, when employed at an HBCU, such individuals are considered a minority. Hence, they are involved in balancing their social, personal, and professional identities in both environments.

Most HBCUs were established by whites to educate blacks after the Civil War. The faculty, staff and students of these institutions have been black and white individuals. The early intent of white faculty was to educate blacks into a democratic system. America has traveled down various paths in regards to race relations since the establishment of the first HBCU. As race relations have been altered, so has the role of white faculty at HBCUs. The early faculty role of paternalism has developed into one of educator and academic instructor. The white leadership at HBCUs has also drastically changed. The majority of HBCUs are managed by predominantly black administrators and staff. Given the relationships between whites and blacks, understanding the socialization of white faculty at HBCUs must be observed through the lens of race relations and racial identity. How faculty members perceive their racial identity will influence how they are socialized at an HBCU.

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation was to understand the experiences of non-black faculty employed at a historically black institution. I used the theoretical framework of

socialization to understand how such faculty members interpreted their interactions with the campus community. Thus, this study captured the perception of a group of non-black faculty and how they come to understand the norms and culture of the institution. Considering the increase in the number of non-black (specifically white) faculty at HBCUs in recent decades, I focused on the following three research questions:

1. How do non-black faculty perceive their socialization experiences as part of the culture of a historically black campus?

2. What role do other faculty and administrators play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

3. What role do students play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

Currently, non-black faculty members at HBCUs teach a predominantly black student population and interact with a primarily black faculty at institutions that were historically governed and funded by whites. White faculty members hold dual and competing roles, of being a part of a historical majority in the larger society while working in a minority-dominated environment. Additionally the historical context of black and white relations further complicates the dynamics of white faculty on black campuses (Slater, 1993). Despite the complexity and uniqueness of the phenomenon of white faculty at HBCUs, little empirical research has examined their experiences or the experiences of the non-black faculty (Foster, et.al, 1999; Roebuck, 1993; Slater; Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). Several aspects of the white faculty experience, such as their interactions with black students or with other white students at HBCUs, require further

examination and research. Few studies have examined how non-black faculty members at HBCU come to understand the norms and culture of such institutions. Thus, the purpose of this study is to explore the socialization process of non-black faculty at an HBCU.

Statement of the Problem

HBCUs have had an extensive relationship with non-black racial groups, specifically whites, throughout history. This relationship is apparent in several forms, such as funding leadership and philanthropy (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Additionally whites have continued to be represented in the faculty at HBCUs, since the formation of these institutions. While 59 percent of all full-time faculty at HBCUs are black faculty, the percentage of non-black faculty at HBCUs has increased significantly in recent years (Foster, 2001). For example, white faculty members accounted for 3686 (25 %) of the full-time faculty at HBCUs (Provasnik & Shafer, 2004). Conversely Asian or Pacific Islander faculty members comprise 1289 (9%) of all full-time faculty members at HBCU in 2001. Additionally, Provasnik and Shafer reported that 28% of full professors at HBCUs are white males. An examination of the statistical detail of specific institutions also reveals an increase of non-black faculty members.

On HBCU campuses such as the University of Maryland in Eastern Shore, Tennessee State University, and Delaware State University, white faculty comprise nearly 40% of all full-time faculty members (Provasnik & Shafer, 2004). In two rare instances, at West Virginia State University and Bluefield State University, non-black faculty members constitute over 80% of the faculty (Foster, 2001; Provasnik & Shafer). These statistics detailed the presence of non-blacks at HBCUs. Despite the influence and

presence of non-black faculty at HBCUs, few studies have empirically examined their experiences.

Foster (2001) suggested that at HBCUs the dynamics of racial and historical influences provide a context of challenge and response for white faculty. Conversely, non-black and black faculty members at HBCUs are constantly examining the boundaries of race and majority status (Foster). Smith and Borgstedt (1985) found that white faculty were generally satisfied with their employment at HBCUs. Additionally archetypes have been developed to categorize white faculty that are employed at HBCUs (Warnat, 1976). Although such research has provided insight into the experiences of white faculty at HBCUs, few have examined how they are socialized into these environments. In contrast, several studies have analyzed the socialization of black faculty at PWIs and HBCUs. Such studies have determined that blacks at PWIs often feel alienated and tokenized by the university administration (Richards, 1998; Butner, Burley & Marbley, 2000). Research of black faculty at PWIs determined that these faculty members experienced disparities in tenure and promotion (Richards; Butner et. al, 2000). Such studies have provided insight into understanding black faculty experiences and in assisting future faculty at HBCUs.

The socialization of black faculty at HBCUs may not resemble that of non-black faculty. Roebuck and Murty (1993) indicated that black faculty at HBCUs "adjusted well in a familiar milieu that met their personal, social, and career needs" (p. 118). Overall the experiences of the majority of black faculty at HBCUs were positive. Additionally, Roebuck and Murty found that black faculty members preferred HBCUs because they can avoid racial conflict they may have experienced at PWIs. Black faculty often

indicated that they identified with most faculty members at HBCUs racially, which assisted in their socialization. Therefore, their majority status at HBCUs supported them in the socialization process at these institutions.

Given the lack of empirical research on socialization of non-black faculty at HBCUs, research is needed to understand the experiences of non-black faculty at these institutions. This research will provide faculty and university administrators with knowledge on how to orient new faculty and assist veteran faculty in their continued socialization. The understanding of how non-black faculty members are socialized into HBCU communities provides insight into the experiences of faculty members, students, and administrators. This study emphasized the need for HBCU administrators to develop plans for non-black faculty as they progress through the socialization process. Further understanding of the socialization process also provides administrators with insight into the culture and norms of the institution. Examining the socialization process is essential to the success of all faculty.

This research examined the process of socialization of non-black faculty at HBCU. Additionally this research contributed to the literature on faculty socialization, and expanded the knowledge on this topic. Finally, this study provided additional documentation of the relationship between non-blacks and HBCUs.

Organizational Socialization

Socialization is the process through which an individual acquires the values and norms of an organization or society (Feldman, 1976; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Socialization is examined in stages as an individual moves through any organization or society (Feldman; Tierney & Rhoads; Van Maanen &

Schein). Further, the socialization process is an essential component in establishing and disseminating an organization's culture (Tierney, 1997). In higher education, the process generally begins with the recruitment of a faculty member and during graduate school experiences. The process continues as the individual partakes in campus events and interacts with colleagues. Tierney and Rhoads asserted that socialization can be implicit and may occur haphazardly. In contrast, explicit socialization involves a process that is specifically designed to introduce an individual to the culture and norms of an organization.

Faculty socialization has been found to play a critical role in improving academic environments. Additionally faculty socialization plays a key role in the quality of education and the experiences of students. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) acknowledged that faculty who experience positive socialization tend to be more satisfied and more productive. Positive socialization experiences assist an institution with maintaining higher morale, lower absenteeism, and increased job performance of faculty (Tierney & Rhoads). A positive socialization for a faculty member usually indicates that a faculty member is less likely to leave the institution, and the institution does not need to seek a replacement. When a faculty member departs from an institution, the institution is faced with an expensive process, which involves search committees, relocation cost, and time of faculty and staff. In contrast, some faculty members who experience a negative socialization may chose to stay at their institution. Johnson (2001) emphasized that these individuals may exhibit negative emotions towards the institution. Conversely, these negative emotions can transfer into interaction with faculty members and students.

Many theories of socialization exist, yet only a few are widely accepted as the framework for organizational socialization. Feldman's (1976) theory of socialization has been found to be applicable to various organizations, including higher education institutions. Feldman defined the stages of socialization as anticipatory, accommodation and role management. While most theories of socialization incorporate some form of the stages defined by Feldman, his theory involves the use of variables to understand the degree to which an individual experiences a particular stage of socialization. Additionally the variables gauge how favorable a particular activity was perceived during the socialization process.

Feldman's (1976) theory was used in this research to understand how non-black faculty viewed particular activities throughout the socialization process. The theory assisted in providing a framework to examine how non-black faculty define their roles at their institutions. Additionally the framework provided a mechanism to understand external forces, such as how family members influence the socialization process.

Significance of the Study

A study on the experiences of non-black faculty at HBCU is essential in order to understand the roles they play in shaping the academic community at these institutions. There has been little research that has examined the socialization of non-black faculty at HBCUs. While there has been a significant amount of empirical research conducted on black faculty at PWIs, less attention has been given to the experiences of their counterparts at HBCUs. Further a few studies have investigated the socialization and roles of black faculty on HBCU campuses (Frierson, 1993; Johnson, 2001). "White faculty members cannot successfully practice aversive behaviors that deny their personal

values, perception, assumption, and predispositions," Foster et. al concluded (1999, p. vii). White faculty members educate a population of a different racial group, and interact with primarily black scholars and administrators. This dissertation focuses on the socialization of non-black faculty and their unique roles at HBCUs.

While this research focused on non-black faculty, the findings provide insight into understanding other racial groups at HBCUs. Foster et. al (1999) indicated that HBCUs are more racially diverse than most PWIs in the United States. Further Slate (1993) noted that the "only significant diversity in academic ranks in this country exist in black colleges and universities" (p. 67). Given the diversity of HBCU faculty, this research will contribute to the understanding of the socialization of other racial groups such as Latinos, Asians and Native Americans in higher education.

The faculty socialization process is instrumental to the institutional climate and faculty efficiency (Tierney, 1997). Tierney and Rhoads (1993) maintained that faculty socialization provides a means to understand organizational culture in higher education. Additionally, a study of faculty socialization provides a conceptual framework for examining the experiences of faculty. Thus, university administrators can use socialization to make sense of the behaviors and perspectives of faculty. Socialization also affects the culture and structure of academic environments while also influencing individuals. Thus, the findings in this study offered scholars and administrators with information to understand socialization and its influence on their university and faculty.

Summary

HBCUs have greatly influenced the structure of American higher education. They have contributed significantly by providing education to black students after the

Emancipation Proclamation. Today, though black students can seek education at any other institution, HBCUs still educate 14 percent of all black students in the United States. Along with providing education for blacks, HBCUs has been continually diverse, especially amongst faculty (Jewell, 2002). Most HBCUs were founded or established by whites, and originally consisted of predominately white faculty. Throughout the years the faculty demographics have been altered with the addition of black, Asian, and Latino faculty. Consequently, HBCUs have been viewed as leaders in regard to faculty diversity.

Despite the diversity of faculty at HBCUs, empirical research regarding this group has been limited. While some studies have examined black faculty at HBCUs, few have examined non-black faculty. Some research has examined the experiences of white faculty, but research on Asian, Latino, and Native American faculty at HBCUs is rare. The focus has been on white faculty primarily because of their historical influence on HBCUs. This study examined the current roles of non-black faculty members at an HBCU. Using Feldman's (1976) theory of socialization as a theoretical framework, the study considers the socialization process of non-black faculty at an HBCU.

The results of this study offered HBCU administrators insight on the socialization process of non-black faculty. Further, the findings of this study suggested formal practices and activities that ensure positive socialization of these faculty members. Replacing faculty because of negative or a poor socialization is a costly process that involves the resources and time of multiple faculty and staff members. In order to maintain their diversity rich campuses, HBCUs will have to seek methods to improve the socialization process of all faculty members.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter provides background information and literature in areas relevant to this study. First, an historical overview and background of HBCUs is provided. In order to demonstrate the current state of HBCUs, I present a description of the challenges facing such institutions. Next, the literature related to organizational socialization is reviewed. This section analyzes the phases of socialization. Van Maanen & Schein's (1979) dimensions of socialization are discussed as well as the components of organizational culture. I also review Feldman's (1976) model of socialization. Finally, literature related to white faculty at HBCUs is discussed. Given the lack of literature on Asian, Latino, and Native American faculty at HBCUs, this section only examines the experiences and perceptions of white faculty at HBCUs.

Overview of HBCUs

Historically black colleges and universities represent a group of diverse and unique organizations. HBCUs comprise 103 institutions that include private, public, secular, liberal arts and research colleges and universities (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). HBCUs are institutions established prior to 1964 with the intent and mission to educate black Americans (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Bowels & DeCosta, 1971; Roebuck & Murty). Additionally an HBCU must be accredited by a national accrediting body or be making

inroads to gain accreditation. While they are all unique institutions, their distinction as HBCUs binds them together. Roebuck and Murty (1993) revealed three criteria that distinguish HBCUs from other institutions of higher education. First, they defined HBCUs as institutions that were founded in hostile environments; that is, HBCUs were often organized in the face of segregation and racial oppression. As I previously outlined in chapter one, many HBCUs were founded by white missionary organizations and philanthropists against the will of mainstream America. The second criterion indicated by Roebuck and Murty was that HBCUs primarily educate an underserved population. Becoming an institutional vehicle for a population to obtain access and opportunity is a vital role of HBCUs. Finally, HBCUs have been traditionally financially deficient when compared to their PWI counterparts (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Bowels &DeCosta, 1971; Roebuck & Murty). Conversely, HBCUs have lacked funding adequate to develop academic programs and facilities. This inequality stems from racial segregation and governmental neglect (Allen & Jewell; Foster, et al, 1999).

History of HBCUs

The history of HBCUs can be identified in four distinct developmental periods (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Holmes, 1934; Foster, et. al, 1999). Each period is marked by a series of historical events. The first period was from 1866 to the late 1880s. Holmes (1934) indicated that this period began with the end of the Civil War and continued until the end of Reconstruction. The second period is identified with the passing of the Second Morrill Act of 1890 and continued until the *Plessy v. Ferguson* ruling in 1896. The third period ranges from 1930 to 1954. This period is identified with the signing of the GI

Bill. The fourth period is marked by the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling and continues to the present (Allen & Jewell; Foster, et. al).

Pre-Civil War to Reconstruction (1866 to the late 1880s)

The first period was grounded by the activity of the establishment of education for blacks. One of the most active organizations during this period was the American Missionary Association (AMA). The members of AMA established seven black colleges and 13 normal schools for blacks during this time period (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Some of the institutions established by AMA included Fisk University (Tennessee, 1865), Talladega College (Alabama, 1867), and Tougaloo College (Mississippi, 1869). Also active were black religious organizations such as the African Methodist Episcopal Church and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church (Anderson, 1988).

The federal government established The Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands (Freedmen's Bureau) during this period (Holmes, 1934). Created by an 1865 Act of Congress, Holmes indicated that the Bureau was established with the intent to assist blacks, poor whites, and war refugees' transition after the Civil War. With the influx of slaves, the Bureau primarily focused on the responsibility of educating blacks (Anderson, 1988; Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Watkins, 2001). The first commissioner of the Bureau was General Olivier O. Howard, a graduate from West Point and Civil War hero. Watkins noted that with the assistance of Christian missionary organizations and black churches, Howard established several black institutions, most notably Howard Institute for the Education of Preachers and Teachers (Logan, 1969). This institution would later be renamed Howard University, and became one of the

premier black universities. In their description of this period, Foster et. al (1999) determined that the Bureau did not manage the day-to-day activities of the black institutions; rather, it provided financial assistance to white Christian missionary organizations to develop educational curricula, instruction, and administration for these institutions. The Freedman's Bureau continued its work until the end of Reconstruction in 1870 when it was officially dismantled by the government (Anderson, 1988; Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Watkins, 2001).

White Christian missionary organizations and black churches continued the work of establishing and maintaining black colleges (Anderson, 1988; Foster et. al, 1999; Holmes, 1934; Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Both groups believed in the importance of educating blacks and felt that the classical curriculum was the best method to educate black students. Anderson (1988) has suggested that both groups differed on who should educate blacks. The White Christian missionary organizations did not include many blacks in their administration or faculty, while the black churches relied heavily on blacks to develop their institutions. Holmes (1934) believed that during this stage, there was a formation of numerous private and denominational black institutions.

Second Morrill Act to Plessy v. Ferguson (1890 to 1928)

The second stage, which began in the late 1880s, witnessed a decline in the establishment of black colleges (Holmes, 1934). Roebuck and Murty (1993) determined that the *Plessy v. Ferguson* ruling and the passing of the Second Morrill Act in 1890 were influential in shaping this period. The Supreme Court's decision of 1896 in *Plessy v. Ferguson* legalized segregation, and called for separate but equal law in all public places, which included schooling. With this ruling, the education of blacks became what Foster,

et. al (1999) described as a "closed system." The ruling also required many white faculty members to vacate their positions at black colleges, which would later be filled by black faculty and administrators (Foster, et. al, 1999). Further, the training of black educators became the essential goal of HBCUs, thus increasing the black faculty. With a growing abundance of black faculty, the need for white faculty member diminished drastically (Foster, et. al, 1999).

The Second Morrill Act of 1890 required states with separate educational systems for whites and blacks to establish land grant institutions for both systems (Thelin, 2001). Several HBCUs such as Alabama A&M University, Florida A&M University, and Fort Valley State University (Georgia) were established as a result of the Morrill Act mandate. During this period, there was also an increase in the role of white philanthropist organizations, such as the Carnegie Foundation and the Rowenwald Fund, which became involved with the development of HBCUs. The primary focus of these groups was the industrial education of blacks (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Watkins (2001) noted that these groups understood that black citizens were a viable component to the economic development of America and they strategically assisted institutions that contributed to the industrial development of America. Black colleges that employed the Hampton/Tuskegee models of industrial education were heavily funded by white philanthropists (Watkins, 2001). Consequently, classical curriculum institutions were forced to rely on black churches and the shrinking number of white Christian Missionary Organizations.

The question of the proper curriculum within HBCUs was a crucial aspect during this period. The issue of curriculum sparked debates amongst black leaders and black intellectuals. Two of the key individuals during these debates were Booker T.

Washington of the Tuskegee Institute and W.E.B. Du Bois, the first black Harvard PhD (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Both men had distinct and opposing views of how the education of blacks should progress. DuBois (1903) declared that vocational education would not suffice to uplift blacks after slavery. He felt that Washington was leading blacks incorrectly and that his school in Tuskegee was conducting a disservice to blacks. DuBois stated:

> How then shall the leaders of a struggling people be trained and the hands of the risen few strengthened? There can be but one answer: The best and most capable of their youth must be schooled in the colleges and universities of the land. We will not quarrel as to just what the university of the Negro should teach or how it should teach it — I willingly admit that each soul and each race-soul needs its own peculiar curriculum. But this is true: A university is a human invention for the transmission of knowledge and culture from generation to generation, through the training of quick minds and pure hearts, and for this work no other human invention will suffice, not even trade and industrial schools (Du Bois, 1903, p. 45)

Washington (1901) understood the need for a liberal art curriculum, but stressed industrial training for the masses, as stated in *Up from Slavery: An Autobiography*, where he wrote, "I have had no patience with any school for my race in the South which did not teach its students the dignity of labour" (p.73). Consequently, during this phase the education of blacks began to move beyond basic instruction. Issues involving what the appropriate curriculum for students of color were critical issues raised by supports of industrial and classical education.

GI Bill (1930 to 1954)

As the black student enrollment at HBCUs grew, Roebuck and Murty (1993) acknowledged a concurrent increase in the number and visibility of black intellectuals. From 1929 to 1954, several black colleges selected their first black presidents and witnessed an increase in black administrators. HBCUs also experienced large

enrollments spearheaded by black servicemen attending colleges under the GI Bill. Black colleges during this period closed their secondary education institutions, and focused on their postsecondary schools (Holmes, 1934). To legitimize their growing collegiate offerings, several HBCUs sought accreditation during this period (Foster et. al, 1999). Foster (2001) asserted that many white faculty members returned to HBCUs to assist with achieving accreditation. These white faculty members were essential because the black faculty had not developed expertise in area such as graduate level programs and research which were required for accreditation (Foster, Foster et. al).

Brown v. Board of Education to the present

The fourth and final period begins with the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* ruling of 1954 and has been dominated by issues of desegregation and equality of opportunity initiatives (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Roebuck, 1993). Many HBCUs benefited from the attempts of the federal government to rectify the inequality of Jim Crow laws. Governmental mandates such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 included provisions to desegregate education. Allen and Jewell argued that while HBCUs did benefit from desegregation, PWIs did so as well.

After the Supreme Court rendered separate but equal education policies illegal in 1954, PWIs saw an increase in black student enrollment. Prior to the Brown ruling, HBCUs educated 90 percent of black college students. Conversely, in 1987, only 20 percent of black students graduated from HBCUs (Minorities in Higher Education, Sixth Annual Status Report, 1987). Allen & Jewell (2002) indicated that while HBCUs were strengthened and experienced growth, ironically black students were seeking enrollment

at PWIs. This paradox of enrollment was not mutual for HBCUs in relation to white students.

HBCUs experienced limited enrollment increases from black students, but this was not true of white students ("The Shrinking Number of White Students at Black Colleges," 2001). Though the enrollment pattern did not increase white students at HBCUs, Foster (1991) found that the number of white faculty at HBCUs increased drastically after the Brown ruling and that such faculty members were actively involved in equality initiatives during this period. HBCUs specifically had an increase in white faculty members seeking their first employment in higher education (Foster, 2001; Foster et. al, 1999). Many of these individuals came to HBCUs with a new level of understanding regarding diversity and inclusion (Smith & Borgstedt, 1985).

Challenges facing HBCUs

HBCUs have evolved and transformed throughout the decades and withstood many challenging times. Jim Crow and segregation once threatened the very existence of these institutions. As a result, many HBCUs witnessed declines in state funding and a backlash from citizens for their involvement in social change, specifically the Civil Rights Movement (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Such events have heavily influenced the culture of HBCUs and their operation. Therefore examining the major issues facing these institutions can provide an understanding of the current culture and norms that influence the socialization experiences of non-black faculty members.

The challenges that HBCUs have faced in the past fifteen years have been unprecedented (Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Gasman et al., 2007). Several HBCUs have closed their doors, while others have lost their accreditation, such as Morris Brown

College (Georgia), Knoxville College (Tennessee) and Barber Scotia College (North Carolina) (Keels, 2004). Gasman et al. (2007) has identified three specific challenges that are influencing HBCUs. The following section first discusses the litigation case *United States vs. Fordice*, a segregation case filed against the state of Mississippi. Next, the issues of shared governance and academic freedom at HBCUs are described. This section specifically addresses the relations between administrators and faculty members at HBCU. Finally, the challenge of enrollment and the changing demographics of both faculty and students are detailed.

The Fordice Case

In 1992, after 18 years of litigation, the Supreme Court decided the case of *United States v. Fordice*. Their ruling noted that the state of Mississippi still maintained a segregated postsecondary educational system. Furthermore, the ruling indicated that Mississippi needed to seek methods to remedy the inequities in the state. *Fordice* specifically noted that five Mississippi higher education institutions (University of Mississippi, Mississippi State, Southern Mississippi, Delta State, and Mississippi University for Women) were solely comprised of white students. Additionally the case indicated that three institutions (Jackson State, Alcorn State, and Mississippi Valley) were comprised exclusively of black students (Gasman et al., 2007).

One major premise of the case was the inequalities in the admission standards amongst the two groups of institutions. For example, the white institutions required higher standardized test scores than the predominantly black institutions. These admissions standards perpetuated a segregated system until the Supreme Court ordered the State of Mississippi to standardize its admission criteria. This ruling not only applied

to Mississippi, but also to seven other states that maintained dual education systems for blacks and whites.

The *Fordice* case altered the face of higher education for blacks, both at HBCUs and PWIs (Gasman, et al., 2007). Specifically in Mississippi, the public HBCUs were required to increase the admission of whites in order to receive settlement funds. In an effort to fulfill this requirement, several HBCUs sought to increase the visibility of white faculty, in attempts to attract white students (Roebuck & Murty, 1993; Gasman et al). Thus, white faculty members were involved in the desegregation of HBCUs in order to meet the mandates of the federal court.

Shared Governance and Academic Freedom

Gasman et al. (2007) acknowledged shared governance and academic freedom as the second challenge facing HBCUs. Resent issues regarding financial stability, academic quality, and the accreditation process have placed HBCUs in the national spotlight. These issues have eroded the relationships between faculty and administrators (Gasman et al). Institutional administrators at several HBCUs have been cited by the American Association of University Professors for neglecting the principles of shared governance (Minor, 2005). Faculty members have not traditionally been involved in the governance of HBCUs (Gasman, et al).

Minor (2005) in his research of HBCU leadership confirmed that many HBCU administrators attempted to silence faculty and control the images and the messages of the institutions. Further Minor (2005) indicated that many HBCUs administrators have overlooked shared governance and academic freedom and employed more aristocratic methods. Hence, faculty input at HBCUs primarily occurs at departmental meetings and

committees. Conversely, many HBCU faculty members are opposed to joining a faculty senate in fear of being singled out by university administrators. Thus, HBCU faculty are largely involving in influencing their departments, but rarely impact university wide decision making.

Gasman, et al. (2007) also commented that the diversity amongst faculty at HBCUs plays a role in shared governance. They indicate that PWIs have more homogeneous working environments which faculty members can quickly come to a consensus. In contrast, the diverse faculty at HBCUs makes it difficult for faculty to agree on issues of shared governance (Gasman, et al., 2007). Oftentimes faculty of various races may have opposing viewpoints on issues such as student expectations.

The culture of shared governance at HBCUs is important in examining socialization of non-black faculty at these institutions. The institutional method used to make decisions provides insight to how white faculty members are perceived and how they become part of the institutions. For example, white faculty members on the faculty senate are often placed in situations in which they are involved with working and negotiating with predominantly black administrations. Thus this dynamic can influence the socialization and experiences of the faculty members (Tierney & Rhoads 1993).

Enrollment and demographics

The demographics of HBCUs have shifted over recent decades, a fact which is evident in the student enrollment patterns (Provasnik & Shafer, 2004). In recent years, several HBCUs have sought to recruit a diverse student population. Often these institutions have targeted increasing the enrollment of white students. While most HBCUs remain predominantly black, with the exception of a selected few, many

institutions are seeking to increase the presence of white students on campus. Gasman et al. (2007) argue that this shift in enrollment conflicts with the original intent of the HBCU, and specifically their focus on of HBCUs on racial uplifting.

Of the close to 300,000 students enrolled at HBCUs in 2001, approximately 35,000 students were white, according to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2004). The increase of white students can be attributed to the *Fordice* case, low tuition, and marketing strategies of HBCUs (Gasman, et al, 2007). For example, Cheyney University developed a marketing strategy specifically designed to attract white students. This shift in enrollment patterns places the white faculty member at the core of the issue. As HBCUs seek to enroll more white students, their faculty will also need to maintain a representative presence of white members.

Roebuck and Murty (1993) suggested that non-black faculty will be a pivotal component of race relations as the white student population increases at HBCUs. Further, Brown (2002) found that white faculty participated in providing the unique diverse experiences at HBCUs. Hence non-black faculty members at HBCUs will be instrumental in developing the future environment and mission of HBCUs. Gasman et al. (2007) indicated that the challenges of non-black faculty members were maintaining the commitment to the founding philosophies of HBCUs while adapting to the new patterns of enrollment and shifting demographics.

Socialization

This section provides an overview of the process of socialization and the various dimensions of socialization. A detailed illustration of the research of Feldman (1976), Tierney and Rhoads (1993) and Van Maanen and Schein (1979) is also presented.

Additionally a brief overview of organizational culture is outlined as related to socialization. The theories of socialization examined in this section provide a framework to examine the socialization of white faculty at HBCUs.

Organizational Culture

Organizations have a distinct set of norms and cultures that govern the actions of its members (Tierney, 1998). Often times this culture has been developed over generations and has been established as the guidelines that determine activity for new members into the organization. Schein (1992) asserted that organizational culture is based on assumptions that a group uses to solve problems. Therefore, organizational culture expands further what is acceptable by a group, but defines that which maintains the existence of the group. For examples, HBCUs have developed a culture that provides individuals with a perspective to interpret specific problems or situations. Organizational culture offers a set of standards that assist to edit a member's everyday experiences and shared standards (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

According to Birnbaum (1988), higher education institutions have a unique and distinctive culture. Thus higher education operates differently from business organizations. Birnbaum further claimed that higher education institutions are faced with several challenges that can be attributed to their culture. He identified four factors: (1) shared governance between faculty and administration, (2) ineffective leadership, (3) limited funding, and (4) the conflict between teaching, service and research as four factors that create higher education's distinctive culture (Birnbaum). Organizational culture influences how faculty members view their role, and also shapes their behavior

(Tierney, 1998). These four cultural factors provide a mechanism to understand how non-black faculty members come to understand their role at HBCUs.

Culture of HBCUs

The culture of HBCUs is influenced by several factors and historical events that have determined their focus. Walter (1991) emphasized the focus of HBCUs in his description of the goals of black colleges and universities. Walter identified these goals as: (1) preserving black history and traditions; (2) contributions to the leadership of the black community; (3) contributing to the economic development of the black community; (4) fostering black role models; (5) preparing black graduates with the ability to address global issues; and (6) developing black graduate students for specialized research. These goals demonstrate the focus that faculty at HBCUs place on community and racial issues. Further, these goals have cultivated the culture of HBCUs and how they exist as institutions in higher education. By focusing on the goals defined by Walter, the unique mission of HBCUs when compared to PWIs is evident. Additionally the culture of HBCUs places emphasis on traditions and rituals. Certain events such as the founding of the institution have a significant value placed on them. Such events are often celebrated for their representations of the role of HBCUs in higher education and the African American community. In other words, the birthday of the first president is celebrated at several HBCUs because it serves as a remembrance of what it means to attend and be a part of the institution.

The role of religion and spirituality has also shaped the culture of HBCU. Many HBCUs were founded by religious organizations such as African Methodist Episcopal

Church and the American Missionary Association (Allen & Jewell, 2002). These organizations have strongly influenced the spirituality of HBCUs and the role that religion plays at such institutions. Several of the first presidents at many HBCUs were white or black ministers and often wrote provisions to ensure that religion would remain central to the mission of the institution (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Bowels & DeCosta, 1971; Roebuck & Murty). Thus at many HBCUs both secular and non-secular religion is a major contributor of the culture and mission.

Organizational Socialization

Veteran members of organizations often seek to ensure that new members are informed of the norms and cultures of the organization (Feldman, 1976; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Through various interpersonal exchanges, the expectations and ideologies of the organization are experienced and disseminated. The process in which individuals acquire the values, attitude norms, and skills to exist in an organization is called socialization (Feldman, 1976; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Organizational socialization is a process that influences both the individual's behaviors and the organization (Feldman, 1976; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Thus, as the members come to understand the norms, they can potentially influence the organization based on their expectations and previous experiences. For example, an individual may question an old assumption or procedure, and may have the capacity to alter the previous views held by the majority of organizational members. This is not to say that organizational culture is easily modified, but indicates that individuals and organizations are involved in mutually adaptive processes. As new individuals enter

the organization, they can provide their own context to rituals and ceremonies (Feldman, ; Van Maanen & Schein).

Process of Organizational Socialization

Anticipatory stage

During the anticipatory stage, an individual formulates norms prior to employment. Formal training and preparation for a career highlight the anticipatory stage (Feldman, 1976; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). During this phase, an individual can develop unrealistic expectations. As for academia, this stage is primarily experienced by graduate students or faculty members preparing for new roles. These individuals are primarily forming their perspectives and processing information about future employers. Such socialization is based on role requirements and how individuals begin to meet performance requirements (Feldman). Initial entry focuses on activity that occurs during recruitment, but primarily emphasizes events that happen soon after an individual joins an organization (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993).

Entry and induction

In the entry and induction phase, individuals transition from expectations into the reality of an academic role. During entry socialization, an individual learns new tasks and establishes relationships with coworkers. Additionally, individuals in entry socialization continually evaluate their role and performance in an organization. During entry socialization, faculty members must often cope with expectation and the reality of new positions (Bolger & Kremer-Hayon, 1999). Faculty members in this phase have often classified themselves as the "outsider" and begin their search for methods to understand

the roles and norm of the institution (Louis, 1980). Additionally, faculty members often seek to develop relationships that will assist them during the socialization.

Role Management

Finally, during the continued socialization phase, individuals begin to master their role and become more acclimated to the norms and culture of the organization (Feldman, 1976). During role management, an individual's responsibilities may broaden and he or she may gain access to informal networks. Further during this stage individuals have come to resolutions with their new roles, and begin to focus on issues regarding group dynamics (Feldman; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). These issues can involve a lack of inclusion in decision-making or priorities. Additionally individuals may experience conflict between home life and work schedules during this stage (Feldman; Tierney & Rhoads; Van Maanen & Schein).

Faculty often experience difficulty moving from one phase to another. Frustrations become manifested as new doctoral graduates have difficulty releasing their preconceived expectations to accept the realities of an academic career. Conversely, Tierney (1997) argued against a structured process of socialization of faculty. He suggests "socialization involves a give-and-take where individuals make sense of an organization through their own unique backgrounds" (pg. 6). Thus, Tierney emphasizes the need to understand first the individuals prior to interpreting the socialization process.

Dimensions of Socialization

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) revealed tactical strategies to viewing and understanding socialization. They provide an understanding of how an individual

progresses from one role to a new role. They indicated six dimensions of socialization which are: (1) collective versus individual; (2) formal versus informal; (3) sequential versus random; (4) fixed versus variable; (5) serial versus disjunctive; and (6) investiture versus divestiture.

Collective versus Individual

Collective socialization is associated with group members who experience a similar set of experiences together. This normally happens in groups where their socialization is a major component of their group dynamics. An example of such a group would be new tenure track faculty hires, or a graduate school cohort. While groups that experience collective socialization have shared experiences, individual socialization is the contrast (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Individual socialization focuses on the isolated experiences of a new member of an organization. This would resemble a single new faculty member in one department. Unlike collective socialization, the individual has only their experiences to reference during the socialization process.

Formal versus Informal

Tierney and Rhoads (1993) described the second dimension as formal versus informal. Formal socialization refers to experiences that are specifically designed with the intent to socialize an individual. These are often rituals or customs with the intent to socialize an individual to an organization. An example would be new faculty seminars or an orientation event. While formal socialization is deliberately established to orient an individual to an institutional culture, informal socialization does not attempt to

differentiate individuals from existing group members. An example of an informal dimension would be a faculty member determining where to eat lunch.

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) indicated that the informal dimension relies on the new member to select methods of information gathering. Examples of informal socialization are casual conversations and discussion with co-workers. Van Maanen and Schein suggested that informal socialization has a substantial influence in shaping an individual's behavior. Informal socialization often involves communication with coworkers seen on a daily basis, thus this socialization is continually enforced. In contrast, formal socialization is intended to segregate an individual from veteran members of an organization.

Johnson (2001) identified formal and informal methods as key components of the socialization of faculty. According to Johnson, formal methods consist of faculty convocations and orientations. However, informal methods of communication were casual conversations and undocumented procedures. Johnson conducted research on faculty at urban colleges to examine the processes and stages of socialization and found strong evidence of both formal and informal methods. He determined that the understanding of informal methods existed primarily amongst veteran and senior faculty. Bogler and Kremer-Hayon (1999) found in their research of Israeli professors that they also emphasized the role senior and veteran faculty played in informal methods.

Sequential versus Random

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) described random socialization as the tactical dimension where the steps of socialization are not clear. In this dimension, a new member may understand the new role, but is not clear on the steps. Tierney and Rhoads (1993)

indicated that this random socialization often occurs for new faculty in a culture that is not clear on tenure and promotion procedures. While they understand there is a tenure and promotion process, they are unclear on how many publications are required, or how much public service is required. Conversely, sequential socialization involves a defined set of steps to the organizational role. Hence, the steps of socialization are clearly defined and articulated. Van Maanen and Schein described that sequential socialization is closely related to hierarchical boundaries, and that individuals have a defined checkpoint during their socialization.

Fixed versus Variable

According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979), fixed and variable socialization are associated with the time spent in different organizational roles during socialization. An example of fixed socialization would be 12 years in high school. During an individual's tenure, his or her progress is well defined and given limits. Variable socialization involves an individual moving from one organizational role with no predetermined time limit. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) determined that variable socialization occurs with tenure-track faculty, who are unclear of the length of service required to gain tenure.

Serialization versus Disjunctive

When an individual shadows a veteran member of the organization, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) defined this as serial socialization. During this process, a new member is presented with a role model, who becomes a partner during the socialization process. An example of serialization would be peer faculty assigned to assist an individual with the first year at an institution. In contrast, disjunctive socialization indicates that no role models are available to the new organization member. Tierney and Rhoads (1993)

suggested that disjunctive socialization occurs with underrepresented groups in an organization. Hence, a female faculty entering a male dominated institution would have difficult time locating a female role model.

Investiture versus Divestiture

The final dimensions are investiture and divestiture socialization and are related to the identity of the new organizational member. During investiture socialization, the traits of a new member are reaffirmed by the organization. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) asserted that the individual identity is confirmed as accepted by the organization. Thus, the organization seeks to promote an individual with similar prospective and views. In contrast, divestiture socialization seeks to transform individuals to make them more acceptable to the organization (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). During the divestiture process, the organization attempts to redefine an individual to ensure their beliefs and views are in line with that of the organization. Van Maanen and Schein indicate that divestiture aims at maintaining the organizational culture and norms.

Faculty Socialization

Essential to the socialization process is the demographic composition of the institution. Hence, the experiences of an African American male faculty member at a PWI will differ from that of a white male at the same institution. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) suggested that underrepresented faculty members often face a unique set of challenges during their socialization process. An analysis of the socialization of underrepresented groups by using Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) dimensions provided a better examination of the problems they encounter. Tierney and Rhoads specified

several problems that underrepresented faculty face. One issue is related to inadequate anticipatory socialization. This issue is involves a lack of mentoring of minority graduate students. Therefore an African American graduate student can have little interaction with other faculty members that can prepare them for their future academic roles. Tierney and Rhoads indicated that serial socialization would also assist in providing mentors for new faculty of underrepresented groups.

Socialization is a key component of predicting an individual's favorable or unfavorable experience in an organization. Faculty socialization has been documented as a process in which a faculty member develops his perception of an institution (Johnson, 2001; Johnson & Harvey, 2002; Tierney, 1997). During the socialization process, a faculty member is presented with acceptable behavior and institutional expectations. For example, issues such as dress codes and tenure processes may be articulated to new faculty members.

Thus, socialization is an instrumental process that provides faculty with an understanding of their roles at an institution. Bolger and Kremer-Hayon (1999) indicated that socialization is a lifelong process that faculty will experience as they move from various institutions. Thus, socialization entails not only the experiences by novice faulty members, but is also experienced by veteran faculty that may change institutions.

Tierney and Rhoads (1993) cited faculty work as the major component of faculty socialization. Thus, faculty come members to understand their role in the academic culture by teaching, research, and service. While faculty participate in campus events such as convocations and presidential speeches, their primary mechanism for understanding culture is through their work and interaction with other faculty members.

Consequently, although an individual may be told at convocation on how the tenure process operates by the president, the daily interaction with peers will have a great influence on their socialization.

Culture of Faculty

Instrumental to understanding the socialization of faculty is the culture of faculty and how it is defined. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) suggested viewing faculty through five sociological forces: national, professional, disciplinary, individual, and institutional. The national perspective is based on the customs and norms of a particular country. Thus, how a country values education and its perception of education will influence the culture of faculty. For example, the view of faculty in the United States is perceived differently than in the South American counties. South American faculty are often expected to have employment beyond their educational roles. In contrast, American faculty are primarily educators and researchers, and hold no additional employment. Thus the national culture influences the socialization of a faculty and provides a context of what is expected by a faculty member.

Culture of the Profession

The culture of the academic profession begins to shape what it means to be faculty. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) defined a profession as a group of individuals who are involved in similar type of work. Hence, the profession of faculty is defined by general expectations and ideologies. The views of the profession of faculty are deeply rooted in the early roles of faculty that extend to the formation of Harvard College and beyond (Thelin, 2004). Clark (1987) articulated three ideologies that can encompass

almost all faculty. The first ideology is associated with the dissemination of knowledge and information. The second ideology of the profession of faculty is academic honesty. Thus, a faculty member is perceived to have academic integrity during the dissemination of knowledge. Finally, a faculty member is anticipated to place some emphasis on academic freedom. Conversely, the work of the faculty is universally understood with slight variance for county to country and plays a considerable role in the socialization of a faculty member.

Culture of the Discipline

The culture of the discipline also has an influence on the socialization of a faculty member (Becher, 2001). Disciplines have established norms and culture that govern the activity of members of the disciplines. This culture involves the language used by disciplines as well as recognizable "idols" identified by a culture (Clark, 1980). The discipline for many faculty is what they identify with most, since this is where most of their daily activity transpires.

Culture and the Individual

Social groupings such as race, gender and class are components that develop an individual. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) suggested that individuals experience faculty life in unique ways as related to individual characteristics. For example, a white chemistry faculty will have a different experience than a black chemistry faculty. Hence, individual characteristics can have an influence on non-black faculty teaching in a predominately black environment.

Institutional Culture

Finally, institutional culture is based on the characteristics of the institution, such as size location and type. The institution's culture heavily influences the faculty role and their expectations. Tierney and Rhoads (1993) determined that institutional size and type are key components in shaping the role of faculty at an institution. Further, leadership and symbols used by the organization also influence the roles and expectation of faculty members (Tierney & Rhoads; Kezar & Eckel, 2002). The culture of an institution can conflict with the culture of faculty (Keup, Walker, Astin & Lindholm, 2001; Tierney & Rhoads). For example a faculty member who is student centered may experience difficulty at a research focused institution.

White Faculty at Black Colleges

While several studies have examined the experiences of black faculty at PWIs (Richards, 1998; Moore & Wagstaff, 1974), few have explored the relationship of non-black faculty at HBCUs. Given the lack of literature on non-black faculty, this section discusses the literature related to the experiences of white faculty at HBCUs. The three most significant studies were (1) Decker's (1955) early study of white faculty at Black colleges; (2) Warnat's (1976) development of theoretical archetypes of white faculty; and (3) Smith and Borgstedt's (1985) study on the experiences of white faculty. This section focuses on these studies and their relationship to the socialization process of white faculty at HBCUs. It is important to acknowledge the temporal limitations of this research. While the three serve as important works related to understanding non-black faculty at HBCUs,

they also represent a unique cultural and social context that may or may not be different today.

Decker (1955) conducted one of the first studies on white faulty at HBCUs. In his research entitled "A study of White Teachers in Selected Negro Colleges," Decker surveyed 55 black colleges in 26 states to attempt to capture the experiences of white faculty. Of the 3600 faculty included in his research, 8 percent were classified as non-white. The majority of whites in Decker's research responded that they had favorable experiences at HBCUs.

Decker (1955) noted that most of the white faculty interacted with black students, faculty, and administrators in both work and personal life. A few faculty indicated that they wanted the administration to assist in their adjustment to the institution. For example, one faculty member indicated that he felt as if he were in a "strange no-man's land." While some faculty indicated feelings of isolation, many faculty members noted a feeling of being included in campus activities. Decker wrote of a white faculty member who was elected president of the faculty club at one of the black colleges surveyed.

While Decker's (1955) research examined some of the perceptions of white faculty, Warnat (1976) indicated that white faculty had various motives for seeking professorships at HBCUs. Warnat identified four theoretical archetypes of white faculty members and what influences them to work at HBCUs. The four archetypes he developed were Moron, Martyr, Messiah and Marginal Man. Using Linton's (1939) framework of role and status, Warnat constructed these archetypes. Warnat wrote "the congruence in which white faculty seek reference to their status as minority faculty contributes to their assuming various roles" (p. 335). Thus, the perceptions that a white

faculty has of black faculty and the administration will become paramount to their socialization at the institution.

Warnat (1976) described "moron" as the white faculty that taught at black colleges because of their inability to teach at PWIs. Those who fit this archetype tend to view the environment at HBCUs negatively or as being inadequate. Warnat suggest that this individual tends to use the institution as a scapegoat for their own shortcomings. Further, this group of faculty members tended to lack competence in their disciplines. The second of Warnat's archetypes is the "Martyr." This individual is seeking to "expiate racial guilt" (p. 335). This individual will undertake any academic endeavor to alleviate any racial guilt. Warnat suggests that these individuals will often hold several appointments at the institution such as committee chairs and faculty members. This group is the most accepted by black faculty members, since they can sympathize with their plight for racial equality. Hence this individual seeks employment at black colleges to rectify past racial problems. The third archetype is described as the individual who exhibits a feeling of superiority over black faculty members. Warnat indicates that the Messiah is fixated on "saving the damned," and assumes a paternalistic attitude toward HBCU faculty and administrators. The messiah tends to have conflict with black faculty, since they are in constant opposition. This group of white faculty often speaks of feelings of alienation and hostility for HBCU administrators (Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). Finally, the Marginal Man seems to appear as the most complicated of the individuals. The Marginal Man encompasses a conflict between two cultures because of his affiliations with the black and white community. Warnat suggests that the marginal man is involved in "passing" on the campuses of the HBCU. In other words, the marginal man attempts to

become part of the culture and the environment that sounds him. Hence this individual associates himself with the campus and seeks to identify similarities between him and the black faculty and administrators. Furthermore, Warnat suggests that this group of individuals is often perceived as being alien, because of their inability to be socially accepted by the black and white communities. The marginal man operates as a bridge between blacks and whites, because his role with both racial groups.

Smith and Borgstedt (1985) noted that beyond Warnat's archetypes, the element of race played a crucial role in white faculty member socialization at black colleges. In their study they focused on racial relationships and gathered perspectives of white faculty at HBCUs. They focused their sample on six HBCUs and mailed questionnaires to all white faculty at these institutions. The researchers explored white faculty perceptions of their experiences at HBCUs. Additionally, the questionnaires sought to examine the minority/majority role and gather demographic information. Specifically, Smith and Borgstedt were interested in understanding interracial relationships and current job characteristics of the selected white faculty at the sample institutions.

From their questionnaires, Smith and Borgstedt (1985) garnered that one-third of the white faculty of the sample felt that black faculty held negative stereotypes of them. Conversely these white faculty members felt that black students had more favorable attitudes of them. Additionally, 89 percent of white faculty felt that being white affected their career advancement. Hence, while these faculty perceived a racial conflict with faculty and administrators, they developed positive relationships with black students.

The majority of the faculty members in Smith and Borgstedt's (1985) research indicated that they felt committed to the goals and missions of the institutions. While

many of the faculty members could identify with Warnat's (1976) archetypes, 40 percent indicated that their family members expressed negative feelings toward their employment. While on campus, 44 percent reported feeling felt out of place at meetings and campus events. Overall the respondents indicated that the majority of faculty were socially accepted at their institution, and felt that their employment at the HBCU was unrelated to any racial mission or guilt. Finally, the researchers suggested that some whites had negative attitudes towards the administration. They articulated being viewed as the "hired help" by the administration at these institutions. Despite the conflict and frustration, the majority of faculty had overall positive adjustments. Further, they felt equipped to deal with any conflict that arouse at the institution.

Foster (2001) also found that white faculty discussed racial issues with students, and felt that race influenced gaining the trust of black students. Smith and Borgstedt (1985) suggest that white faculty members often struggled with being a social majority and becoming socialized as a minority at a black college. Their research further suggested negative perceptions that were often held by friend and family members of white faculty member. Slater (1993) indicated that the historical white control of black colleges also contributes to the complexity of faculty experiences and the need to examine race.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used for this study is based on Feldman's (1976) research on socialization and Schien's (1979) formal and informal dimension of socialization. The following section is an overview of Feldman's model of socialization, which is also outlined in Table 1. An explanation of the stages is provided as a context.

Feldman developed a model of socialization that provided insight on how individuals become members of an organization. The model consisted of three components. First, the stages of socialization were explained, particularly how an individual travels through stages as they attempt to become a member of an organization. Second, Feldman provides the specific activities an individual performs at each stage. Finally, variables associated with the outcomes of socialization are revealed. Feldman's research was based on data collected from 118 hospital employees. Feldman's research attempted to provide insight on the outcomes of the socialization and the process an individual selects to achieve a specific outcome. I provide an overview of Feldman's theory and how it relates to the research question, by discussing the four stages of socialization: (1) Anticipatory Socialization; (2) Accommodation; (3) Role Management; and (4) Outcome.

Anticipatory Socialization

During anticipatory socialization, an individual develops thoughts and opinions prior to being recruited by the organization. Thus an individual formulates their expectation about a future employer and begins to make decision about the employer. Feldman (1976) suggested two variables that are associated with anticipatory socialization. The first variable is realism, which encompass how realistic an individual's

perception of an organization is. This variable is essential in determining how successful an individual is in gathering information as part of the recruitment of a new position. The second variable of anticipatory socialization is congruence. This variable determines how successful an individual has been in selecting an employer. Thus, this variable suggests how resources available to a candidate were used to make a decision on employment. Additionally, this variable indicates whether the resources of an organization will make the employee successful.

Accommodation

Accommodation is the stage when an individual attempts to become a member of an organization. During this stage the individual begins to understand the reality of the organization compared to the assumptions held during the anticipatory stage. Feldman (1976) indicates four activities that new organization members are involved in during accommodation: (1) learning new tasks; (2) establishing new interpersonal relationships with co-workers; (3) clarifying role activities in the organization; and (4) evaluating their success in the organization.

Accommodation is associated with four process variables that indicate how an individual progresses through socialization. The first variable, initiation to the task, entails the organization member becoming acclimated with his new position. This variable illustrates the potential success of the new member. Thus, this variable revolves around an individual's competence and ability to perform the task. Feldman (1976) defined the second variable as "initiation to the group" (pg. 435). This variable is grounded on how an individual feels in the new organization. In contrast to "initiation to the task," this variable focuses on the interpersonal relations that a new organization

member develops. How comfortable an individual feels in his work environment contributes to his socialization.

The third variable is what Feldman (1976) claimed as "role definition." This variable involves the organization members clarifying his or her role in the work group. An organization member begins to develop an understanding of his or her role, and develops an agreement on what is expected. Additionally, an organization member comes to an understanding on which specific task take precedent. The key element of this variable is prioritizing the task and identifying the permitted time to perform each task.

The final variable associated with accommodation is "congruence of evaluation." This variable reveals whether the expectation of the new organization member and the supervision are in agreement. Thus, a supervisor evaluates an individual's performance, and then the evaluation is compared against that of the new organization member's. In essence, the variable is a performance review that indicates the agreement or lack of agreement between employer and supervisor.

Role Management

During role management, an individual has established a balance with their task and work expectation. A conflict with their work has come to some resolution or compromise. The source of conflict during this stage resides with balancing work life with home life. Feldman suggested that during this stage an individual begins to experience conflicts such as "demands on the employees' families, the effects of the jobs on the quality of home life" (p. 435). Thus, individuals in this stage formulate methods to gain a balance between work life and personal life.

Two process variables are essential during role management: (1) resolution of outside life conflicts and (2) resolution of conflicting demands through the socialization process. The first variable "indicates the extent to which employees have come to be less upset by home-life/work life conflicts" (p.435). Thus, "resolution of outside life conflicts" relates to the degree in which an individual develops a balance between their work and personal life. Resolution of conflicting demands relates to accepting conflicts at work. Additionally the variable deals with the individual developing rules that address conflicts, and prove guidelines on approaching issues with groups at work.

Finally, Feldman (1976) determined the possible outcome that an individual can experience based on their process of socialization. These outcomes have four variables associated with them that provide a method to measure the degree and success of the socialization process. The variables are: (1) General satisfaction; (2) Mutual influence; (3) Internal work motivation; and (4) Job involvement.

General satisfaction encompasses and measures the entire socialization experience. Feldman (1976) cited that general satisfaction is "an overall measure of the degree to which the employee is satisfied and happy in his or her work" (pg. 436). Conversely, mutual influence refers to the ability an individual has on making decision on process and procedures in their task. Hence a lack of control in a work environment will lead to inefficient socialization.

Internal work motivation is regarded as the amount of self-motivation an individual demonstrates on performing his or her assigned task. Feldman (1976) indicated this variable is closely associated with job performance and personal achievement. The final variable associated with outcome is "job involvement." This variable indicates the

level of commitment of an individual to the organization. Thus, the lack of job involvement would result in detachment from an organization, which could eventually conclude in termination of the socialization process.

The Feldman model provided a framework to understand the experience of an individual throughout the socialization process (see Table 1). Specially, for white faculty, researchers can examine how the socialization experience at a HBCU. Hence, if a faculty member indicates difficulty in being a member of the group, Feldman's model provides a basis to analyze what variable and stage the individual is experiencing. The model provides a guide to examine the socialization process of non-black faculty member at HBCUs.

Contingency Theory of Socialization

Table 1

Socialization Stages	**Process Variables**
Anticipatory Socialization	Realism Congruence
Accommodation	Initiation to the Task Role Definition Congruence of evaluation Initiation to the Group
Role Management	Resolution of outside life conflicts Resolution of conflicting demands at work
Outcome	General satisfaction Mutual influence Internal work motivation Job involvement

Adapted from Feldman, D. (1976), A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 433-452.

Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) dimensions of socialization are also important as a theoretical framework for this study. While six dimensions exist, only the formal versus informal dimensions are used in this study. Tierney and Rhoads (1994) suggested that the majority of faculty socialization occurs through formal and informal processes. Additionally, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) specifically identified how this dimension influences newcomers to organization. I adapted this formal and informal dimension to examine the socialization of white faculty. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) explained formal socialization as the practices in which a newcomer is intentionally segregated from regular organizational members while being put through a set of experiences tailored explicitly for the organization members. Hence, formal processes are explicit as to the individual's place in the organization.

In contrast, informal socialization processes do not distinguish the role of organization member. This tactic is more laissez-faire where recruits learn through trial-and-error. Such a situation occurs when the newcomer is accepted from the outset as at least a proverbial member of a work group and is not placed into the recruit role by specific labels, uniforms, assignments, or other symbolic devices (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979, p. 237).

Conclusion

The review of the literature revealed that HBCUs have developed significantly since their establishment after the Civil War. Throughout their development whites have been involved, specifically philanthropist and Christian missionary organizations. Additionally HBCU have been shaped by national events, such as the GI Bill, and *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The studies on non-faculty at HBCUs have focused on white faculty

primarily. No supportive literature was found on the experiences of Latino, Asian, and Native American faculty. The literature on white faculty at HBCU has focused on their experiences in general and not specifically their socialization. In this study, I examined the socialization of non-black faculty using Feldman (1976) theory of socialization as a theoretical frame. Before I turn to a presentation of the data, I outline the research methods and rationale employed for this dissertation.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the research methods that were used to examine the socialization of non-black faculty at HBCUs. I begin with an introduction and review to the research. Next I present an overview of the research. This overview includes a description of qualitative research and the rationale for selecting the research method for this dissertation. In this chapter I also discuss the data collection procedures, the participants, and data analysis for this study. This chapter details the ethical considerations, trustworthiness, delimitations, and limitations as they related to this study. Finally, I provide specifics on the approval process for the International Review Board and a summary of the research method.

Research Questions

The purpose of this dissertation was to understand the socialization of non-black faculty employed at an HBCU. The subsidiary questions of this research are:

1. How do non-black faculty perceive their socialization experiences as part of the culture of a historically black campus?

2. What role do other faculty and administrators play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

3. What role do students play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

Research Design

In order to examine the socialization of non-black faculty at HBCUs, this dissertation utilized a qualitative research design. Creswell (2003) suggested that qualitative research is best suited to view and examine social phenomenon such as faculty socialization. Similarly, Strauss and Corbin (1990) stated, "Qualitative methods can be used to uncover and understand what lies behind any phenomenon about which little is yet known" (p. 19). Thus, by using the elements of qualitative research, I was able to capture the experiences of the participants of this study. Additionally, a qualitative study allowed for an in-depth examination of the phenomenon with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible (Creswell, 2003).

Using a qualitative approach provides insight that proves unavailable in quantitative research. The thoughts and views of the participants were essential to ascertain the socialization into the environment. While quantitative research interprets statistical data, qualitative analysis provides details of an individual's experiences and perspectives. A qualitative approach also allowed for an examination of the natural settings of non-black faculty at HBCUs. Thus, qualitative research was best suited to examine the socialization of non-black faculty members at HBCUs. Bogdan and Biklen (2001) identify five characteristics of qualitative research that a researcher must take into consideration. They suggested that the following characteristics must exist in qualitative research.

Naturalistic

The first characteristic of a qualitative study is that it must be naturalistic. Bogdan and Biklen (2001) asserted that the setting of the study is directly related to the study and that environment provides the context for the study. In this study, I examined the socialization of non-black faculty at an HBCU while maintaining a focus on the context.

Descriptive Data

The second characteristic of a qualitative study is descriptive data. Bogdan and Biklen (2001) indicated that data collected in qualitative research are represented in words or images, rather than numbers. Therefore, data in qualitative research includes interview transcripts, videotapes, and official records. Qualitative research provides a detailed description of a particular situation or phenomenon. In this study, I attempted to gain an in-depth understanding of non-black faculty socialization through interviews. Thus with these elements my goal was to develop a descriptive representation of non-black faculty perceptions of socialization at an HBCU.

Concerned with the Process

The concern with the process is the third characteristic of qualitative research. Qualitative research regards the process of study more than the outcome (Bogdan & Biklen, 2001). Thus, in qualitative research, a researcher's intent is to capture the experiences of a participant rather than to provide an analysis of the findings. How non-black faculty members understand various components of their environments is an essential aspect of this study. Hence my intent was to examine the socialization

experiences of non-black faculty member as opposed to the analysis of statistical data related to socialization.

Inductive

Qualitative research is inductive, since the research does not intend to prove or disprove a hypothesis. The goal of qualitative research is to allow theories or conclusions to emerge by examining the data collected. In this study my objective was to identify themes that provided an in-depth understanding of non-black faculty socialization at an HBCU.

Meaning

The final characteristic described by Bogdan and Biklen (2001) of a qualitative research is meaning. They suggest that the purpose of a qualitative study is to describe "how people make sense of their lives." Thus, I sought to describe how a group of non-black faculty members make sense of their experiences and socialization at an HBCU.

Qualitative Interview Approach

A qualitative interview approach was used in this study. Patton (1990) wrote, "The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in and on someone else's mind" (p. 279). He further discussed that the intent of interviews is to gain insight into an individual's perspective. I determined that a qualitative interview approach was the best method to examine the socialization of non-black faculty.

Patton (1990) described three approaches related to gathering data from interviews: (1) informal conversation, (2) the general interview guide approach and (3)

the standardized open-ended interview. These approaches vary based on concepts and the use of instruments. Further, each approach is appropriately based on the intent of the researcher. Informal conversational interviews involve a high level of spontaneity and a lack of structure (Patton, 1990). An interviewer using this approach would be engaged in a natural conversation with a participant. The participant is almost unaware that they are involved in an interview (Patton, 1990). This approach is generally used when the researcher is attempting to gather information based on observations or when the context is deemed to be open-ended. Similarly, Merriam (1998) describes this interview approach as unstructured/informal.

Standardized open-ended interviews focus on a specific set of questions that are asked to all participants (Patton, 1990). These questions all follow the same sequence and order for all participants. Patton wrote, "The standardized open-end interview is used when it is important to minimize variation in the questions posed in the interview" (p. 281). This approach may be used with large sample sizes, to ensure that the responses are comparable. Finally, the general interview guide approach focuses on a developed set of issues. These issues are generally determined by the researcher prior to conducting the interviews. In other words, a researcher would explore the topics and develop a thematic representation of the issues surrounding the topics. In contrast to informal conversational interviews, the general interview guide approach uses an outline of questions that focus on specific topics.

The general interview guide approach (also defined as semi-structured) was used in this study because it allowed for adaptation from interview to interview. Questions were asked based on the context of the interview. However, the entire interview focused

on faculty socialization and allowed flexibility to explore various comments. Using this approach allowed the socialization framework to guide the interviews questions.

Role of the Researcher

I have worked in higher education for more than 10 years. During that time, I have been employed at both a PWI and a HBCU. The positions I have held are primarily in the field of information technology and distance education. My employment at both these institutions developed my interest in examining the socialization of faculty. I particularly became interested in the socialization of non-black faculty during my employment at an HBCU.

Currently I work closely with the vice president of academic affairs, department chairs, and numerous faculty members at an HBCU. My primary role is assisting faculty with the use of technology in the institution's curriculum. Therefore I interact with faculty of various races and nationalities. I conduct trainings and meetings with faculty which allows me to interact with them regularly. I believe that my experiences and work with faculty at an HBCU will be an asset to understanding and examining the setting and the context for this research.

Data Collection

For this dissertation, I employed individual interviews as the primary means of data collection. With the use of interviews, I was able to gain insight in the lived experiences of non-black faculty in relation to their socialization at a HBCU. Merriam (1998) emphasizes that multiple strategies can be used for qualitative research; however, she indicated that they are rarely used equally. The researcher must determine which

method of data collection will dominate the research. Therefore, I relied primarily on interviews to capture the experiences of faculty.

The data collection process in this study began with developing an interview protocol. This protocol provide as a framework to guide the interview questions. I then conducted 20 interviews with non-black faculty at an HBCU. These interviews examined how these faculty members perceived their roles and how they come to understand the norms and culture at their institution. According to Merriam (1998), data collection and analysis must happen simultaneously in qualitative research, thus coding must begin with the first data collection. In this study, interviews were recorded and then reviewed for themes and categories. The themes were also analyzed against related literature for clarification.

Interviews

Merriam (1998) defined interviews as a conversation with a purpose. Interviews allow the researcher to obtain specific information that cannot to be captured through observations. Merriam further suggested that individual thoughts and perspectives as well as how people make sense of situations cannot be garnered by observations. The use of interviews provided a method to capture the experiences of non-black faculty at the HBCU and their perceptions of the socialization experience. Interviews allowed me to determine how faculty members view their role at the institution.

Upon gaining access to a listing of non-black faculty I generated a list of possible participants for the study. The names of these participants were randomly selected. I then contacted the selected faculty members via telephone and email, and informed them of

the study. Faculty members who agreed to participate in the study were mailed a confirmation of the interview time and location. The scheduling and location depended largely on the faculty member's availability and schedule.

The interviews were person-to-person encounters, since they allowed for conversations with the participants. The interviews were semi-structured and allowed for a mix of open-ended as well as close-end questions. As indicated this method encouraged the participant to provide detailed responses. Additionally, this method allowed the researcher flexibility to deviate from the list of questions. The goal of the interviewing approach was to have the participants reconstruct their experiences in relation to the research questions.

The interviews ranged from an hour to an hour and a half, and focused on questions related to faculty perceptions of the university and their roles at the institution. Regulated by the research questions, the interview questions were centered on the participant's perceptions of institutional culture, informal norms, role expectations, and interpretations of processes and procedures. The interviews were conducted at various locations on campus. Further, the interviews were digitally recorded with the consent of the faculty member. All the interviews were transcribed verbatim in order to be coded for themes.

Interview Protocol

An interview guide was developed to assist me during the research process. The protocol is included in the appendix. The interview guide provided as a method to ensure that during the interview session the research questions and topic remained the focus. Further Merriam (1998) suggested that an interview guide also assists in determining the

structure of interviews. The themes and subject for this dissertation revolved around Feldman's (1976) model of socialization. The questions focused on role definition, as well as how individuals perceived the organization prior to their employment. Additionally the interview questions explored how non-black faculty interacted with colleagues and students.

Consent. A consent form was provided to each participant prior to the interviews. Each participant was given an opportunity to voice their comments or concerns in regards to the consent form. Finally the participants were asked to sign and date the consent form.

Introduction. I provided the participant with an overview of the study and indicated the structure of the interview.

Interview Questions. The interview questions consisted of primarily open-ended questions, with a few closed-ended questions. When necessary I asked additional questions for further clarification. Seidman (2005) suggested not asking participants to remember experiences, but instead to reconstruct their experiences. Further, Seidman asserted, "Reconstruction is based partially on memory and partially on what the participant now senses is important about the past event" (p. 88). Additionally I explored unclear facial gestures and laughter. Siedman indicated that these unspoken elements of an interview can provide additional insight of the participant's experiences.

Closing. I completed the interview with providing the participant with an opportunity to explain further points that needed clarification. I thanked the participant and indicated that the interview would be transcribed and analyzed for this study. Finally, I indicated that they would be able to review the transcribed interview for accuracy.

Data Analysis

Data analysis is described as the process of systemically searching and arranging the interview transcripts that have been collected to provide insight to a phenomenon (Bogdan & Biklen, 2001). Data was analyzed by capturing themes from transcripts and field notes. Merriam (1998) defined this process as "breaking data down into bits" (pg. 179), then reorganizing data into categories. Developing themes occurs simultaneously with the collection of data. This process of data analysis developed an overall perception of non-black faculty at the research site while taking into account individual faculty members' experiences.

Upon completion of the interviews the audiotapes was transcribed for analyzing. Merriam (1998) suggested coding with the collection of the first data collected. Consequently, with the completion of the first interview, I developed categories that represented specific themes and ideas. Significant statements and comments related to socialization, organizational culture, and perceptions of HBCUs were extracted. Therefore, a rich description of socialization of non-black faculty members was developed from the statements and phrases of the participants.

Trustworthiness

Validating data is a core component of a qualitative study that ensures the accuracy of findings (Creswell, 2003). Triangulation and member-checking was utilized to analyze and determine validity of data. These methods are based on the premise of allowing participants to review the accuracy of the data and the findings. This engagement allows the participants to develop agreement on the meaning and interpretations. Triangulation is a process used to analyze sources and validate themes

(Merriam, 1998). Utilizing triangulation ensured that one individual's perspective does not dominate the study and dictate the research. Thus after each interview I reviewed the transcripts and identified the emergent themes. Further, I compared themes amongst other members, and against existing literature regarding socialization.

Additionally I utilized member checking to ensure accuracy in this research. Member checking is a process that offers research participants the ability to verify their narratives by analyzing the final report to ensure that their perspectives were accurately captured (Merriam, 1998). With the completion of interviews, I provided a transcript to each individual to ensure that their words were transcribed accurately. In the event of a discrepancy, I reviewed the audiotape with the participant. Finally, once I developed the finding and conduct an analysis, I presented the findings to individuals involved in the study.

Ethical Considerations

Maintaining the identity and privacy of participants is essential in qualitative research (Creswell, 2003). Thus, the researcher must use several methods to ensure that the ethical guidelines are in agreement with that of the institutions. I provided every participant with consent forms, which were reviewed and signed prior to the interviews. Additionally aliases were used to provide anonymity to all participants and the institution. Further access to data was limited to committee chairs and was only available to supervising faculty members of the researcher. Finally, all data, such as interviews transcripts and field notes, will be shredded or deleted after completion of the dissertation. This research was conducted in accordance to the guidelines of the Institutional Review Board of the University of Alabama.

Delimitations

According to Creswell (2003), delimitations are used to limit and narrow the scope of the research. Hence, delimitation provides a method to specify variables, such as participants and sites. Three delimitations were specific to this study. First, only one institution was examined for this study. Second, the study only focused on the perspective of non-black faculty. The final delimitation included the criteria used to identify participant status, such as tenure track and full-time faculty.

Limitations

Limitations are potential weaknesses that can influence the research (Creswell, 2003). One limitation of this study was the limited availability of non-black faculty members. While the percentage of non-black faculty at HBCUs has increased (Foster, 2002), these faculty still remain the minorities at their institutions. I attempted to address this limitation by selecting a site with a higher percentage of non-black faculty. Another limitation was my association with the sample institution. As an employee at the institution, it is possible that some faculty members were apprehensive to express their perspectives and experiences. Thus, the use of anonymity was essential to ensure that the identity of participants were concealed.

The race of the researcher was also another possible limitation. As an African American man conducting research on non-black faculty regarding their experiences, it is possible that faculty may withhold their true perspectives. Furthermore, the participants may fear that negative comments would have offended the researcher. Gaining the trust

and confidence of the faculty member interviewed was the only mechanism available to obtain a valid interview with the faculty member.

Sample Selection

Purposeful sampling was used in this study to examine the process of socialization of non-black faculty at an HBCU. Purposeful sampling allowed for the discovery of patterns, while taking into consideration cultural norms and contextual conditions of faculty socialization experiences. Additionally, Merriam (1998) suggested that purposeful sampling "is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (p. 61).

Therefore, three attributes were identified when selecting non-black faculty participants for the study. The participants were:

1. employed at an HBCU for longer than one year;
2. either tenure track or non-tenure track appointment, with a terminal degree
3. and full-time faculty.

These criteria allowed for selecting a specific group of faculty. Perspectives of socialization vary on a wide number of individual characteristics, including age, gender, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Thus, I believe it was essential to ensure an even distribution of male and female participants. Classification as tenure verses non-tenure track faculty influences a faculty's perception of socialization (Tierney & Rhoads). Thus, the researcher included a representation of both tenure and non-tenure track faculty. It was important to interview full-time tenure track faculty since their experiences differ from non-tenure track professors. Tenure track

faculty tend to be highly involved in their socialization and institution, since such experiences are directly related to the tenure and promotion process, as opposed to non tenure track faculty (Tierney & Rhoads).

Site Profile

The site for this study was a HBCU located in the southern United States. The site was selected for its racially diverse faculty population. Additionally the researcher was employed at the institution, thus access was easily granted. A condition of access was that the institution not be identified by name. The institution is a four-year public historically black institution that has an enrollment of 5,000 students from 42 states and 7 countries. The university offers baccalaureate, masters', and doctoral programs. The institution consists of 228 faculty members; 136 of the faculty identify as black, while 69 are whites (Provasnik & Shafer, 2001). Located in an urban location, the history of the institution includes affiliations with various missionary organizations and white philanthropists, even though it was founded by former slaves.

IRB Process

Before selecting participants for this study, and upon the consent of the dissertation committee, I sought the approval of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Alabama. The IRB reviews projects involving human subjects in order to determine that subjects are not placed at undue risk. Further the IRB ensures that researchers have consent for the participants without coercion. I obtained approval for this study in August 2008. Hence the IRB indicated that my research met all required federal guidelines. The IRB approval process required that I provide a copy of the interview protocol and the participant consent form. Additional I provided an overview and my

intent for this study. In accordance with the IRB process participants were informed of the following: (1) purpose of the study, (2) an opportunity to withdraw from the study at any time, (3) measures used to maintain confidentiality, (4) any possible risks associated with the study, and (5) possible benefits for the participant.

Summary of Methodology

The study explored the socialization of non-black faculty at an HBCU. This qualitative study used a qualitative interview approach to capture the experience of non-black faculty members. The selected participants were asked to detail their experiences and their perceptions of the institutional culture and norms. Purposeful sampling was used to identify participants for the study. The samples of non-black faculty members were drawn from those who had been employed for at least one year; tenure-track or non-tenure full-time faculty with terminal degree. Several methods were employed to ensure trustworthiness, such as member checking and triangulation.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This dissertation examines the socialization experiences of non-black faculty who work at a historically black institution. Given the complex relationship between culture, identity, and socialization, I consider how such faculty integrate with the institutional environment. I also focus on the impact of traditions, rituals, interpersonal relationships, and organizational structure on faculty socialization. Ultimately, these emphases underscore how non-black faculty come to understand the norms and culture of a HBCU. The primary research questions that guided this dissertation are:

1. How do non-black faculty perceive their socialization experiences as part of the culture of a historically black campus?

2. What role do other faculty and administrators play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

3. What role do students play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

The research questions highlight the fact that socialization is neither a singular experience, nor one that occurs in isolation. Rather, individuals are socialized as part of a unique organizational community. Newcomers interpret the artifacts which give meaning

to that community. For non-black faculty at a HBCU, some of whom are unfamiliar with the communal, closely-knit nature of the historically black college culture, the process of socialization represents the challenge of negotiating uncertain signposts. My goal in this chapter is to document the participants' interpretation of the socialization process. I do so through a presentation of the data collected through 20 faculty interviews.

Multiple themes emerged during the data collection for this dissertation. I explore these themes in this chapter; in Chapter Five, I provide responses to the research questions that guided my study. The thematic conclusions of the data analysis include:

1. The significance of institutional culture to non-black faculty socialization at a HBCU;
2. The sentiment of "it's only a job" by non-black faculty;
3. The supportive nature of family and friends of non-black faculty related to their employment at a HBCU;
4. The importance of involvement on campus as a means to understand the institutional culture; and
5. The significance of interactions with students at the HBCU.

Descriptions and attributes of these themes are articulated in this chapter. I focus on the narratives provided by the participants to give emphasis and illustrate the justifications of the themes.

Understanding organizational socialization

In Chapter Two, I outlined Feldman's theory of socialization (1976), particularly the stage process common to such experiences. Organizational newcomers bring a

collection of *anticipatory expectations* to the institution. These expectations are shaped by previous knowledge of the organization as well as individual experiences in similar organizations. Once they become an organizational member, their expectations are modified through the process of *accommodation.* Participants engage in daily organizational activities, and learn how to manage their role tasks. Through role management, individuals develop a balance between their personal and professional identities. Feldman's final stage allows for an *outcome* of mutual satisfaction and commitment between the participant and the organization. These stages served as a guideline for my analysis, allowing me to examine non-black faculty in various phases of the socialization process. I also considered these stages when defining the impact of the HBCU culture on non-black faculty.

Institutional culture

Previous research has documented the significance of institutional culture to the socialization process (Holley, 2009; O'Meara, 2002; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Trowler & Knight, 1999). "Socialization is not a singular experience… [cultural practices] translate abstract cultural values and norms into individual behavior," Holley wrote (p. 3). How individuals are influenced on a day-by-day basis is dependent on how the institution communicates meaning and how that meaning is interpreted by individuals (Tierney, 1988). Further, Tierney and Rhoades suggested that institutional culture in higher education depends on factors such as size, location, and institutional mission. Hence, culture influences how individuals come to understand the norms, values, and behaviors inherent to the institution. Institutional culture determines what is expected and acceptable from faculty members.

Minor (2005) suggested that HBCUs operate in a distinctive culture and context. Further, he indicated that these cultures are influenced by such factors as historical responsibility, race, political leadership, and traditions. These factors are essential in shaping the socialization of non-black faculty at these institutions. Certainly, all HBCUs do not share the same culture. While such institutions hold a common bond of education for the African American community, each university operates within the unique confines of a particular community or historical context (Sporn, 1996). The non-black faculty interviewed for this dissertation reported the dual challenge of deciphering the unique characteristics of the institution as well as the legacy of the HBCU history. An analysis of the institutional culture at the university offers a basis for understanding how a non-black faculty member experiences the socialization process. Faculty indicated that they experienced the culture of the institution by attending various campus events and through both formal and informal communication. Several faculty members also suggested that the university's leadership exhibited a particularly strong influence on the institutional culture.

Tradition. Several faculty members indicated tradition as the most prominent cultural value at the institution. For example, Robert an associate professor who has been at the institution for seven years indicated that he believes the institution values tradition, specifically its tradition of commitment to student success, development, and teaching. He indicated, "I see value like at other institutions where I have taught, that there are certain traditions here that are very important to the institution." Examples that Robert highlighted included events such as Founder's Day, gatherings associated with football games, and music which is performed at campus activities. "Tradition is what I would say

is valued here," he concluded. Robert also indicated that various modes of communication emphasized the importance of tradition. When asked why he interpreted tradition as a core institutional value, he explained, "It's everything. Events that are publicized. Information we received in advance of the event, some of it is what the leadership, namely the interim president or vice-presidents, say about the events. The extent to which they talk about the events." The pervasive nature of communication in regards to institutional traditions, according to Robert, also carried an implicit mandate that students and faculty participate in such events. Robert suggested Founder's Day as an example of the institution's commitment to tradition.

Founder's Day involves an assembly of staff, faculty, and students who commemorate the founders of the institution. The event has several ritualistic components that collectively contribute to framing the institutional culture. Started in the 1850s as a way to honor the university's first president, the event has developed into an elaborate gathering that involves the entire university community. The original ceremony involved children singing and thanking the president for his service. Similarly, several HBCUs have Founder's Day events in order to commemorate their early beginnings. For example, Hampton University's Founders Day recognizes and pays tribute to the University's founder, Gen. Samuel Chapman Armstrong. Additionally, beyond celebrating the founders, these gatherings are a communal event that incorporates various areas of the institutions, such as the academic mission and community engagement. Theatrical performances and academic presentations are all some part of this complex event. Hence, the faculty, staff and students are expected to attend and participate. Robert's comments demonstrate the emphasis that the institution places on Founder's

Day, "We are going to close and lock the library and academic buildings and expect everybody to show up. That tells me that they put a lot of weight on that."

Similarly, Amy, a tenured white professor, indicated how the traditions extended beyond the institution. The institution exhibits deep bonds with the surrounding community; the relationship that faculty have with the external community impact the socialization experience. Amy explained, "I call it the church network. Everyone seems to go to the same churches and they all know each other. I will never go these churches, so I'm automatically out of the loop. It's very interesting to see that." Amy is an associate professor and has been at the institution for 11 years. She has had various academic leadership positions and is now currently a department head. She further explained, "I'm also an outsider to [the town.] You have family and generations of families that have these long histories with the institution, not mine. My family is caught between both worlds. We don't go to church with everyone from here... our family is not from here."

Amy's view of the church network is heavily entrenched in what Feldman (1976) identified as the accommodation stage of socialization. During this stage, members negotiate becoming a group member and being accepted by the group. Conversely, many faculty members indicated feeling like an outsider during this stage. They then began to develop various methods to understand the internal and external institutional environment. Hence, Amy's comments suggest that she perceived a sense of exclusion from other faculty member. She has further justified this exclusion based on religious affiliation.

Some faculty members indicated that the emphasis on tradition results from the historical perceptive of the institution and specifically the commitment to educating

African Americans. The majority of HBCUs were established with the intent to provide educational opportunities to black citizens. By accounting for approximately 25% of baccalaureate degrees awarded to blacks, HBCUs still maintain a tradition of educating this population. Minor (2004) determined that sustaining a pipeline of educated blacks has been a tradition of these institutions.

Anita a female professor from India commented that she believed that the institution has a tradition of attracting black students. She said, "My understanding of the institution is that it tends to attract African Americans that are lower on the economic scale... some students might have low self-esteem. So that seems to be important to this institution. I know it shapes a lot of what I do here." Anita further suggested that the focus on the tradition of education for minorities fueled her commitment to the institution. She compared her experience at the HBCU with her life in India. "This might be my attraction to this university," she concluded. "In India, I was a minority, so personally I have always been attracted to the underdog. I kind of feel an affinity for an institution that understands what it means to be a minority, especially an institution that places a value on it." Hence, the institution's tradition of educating disadvantaged black students resonated with Anita. She was able to associate her religious minority status with that of black men and women in the United States.

Similarly, Jennifer a tenured faculty in her twelfth year at the university found the tradition of educating black students as central to the institution. She indicated, "The tradition of history of African Americans is very important, specifically equipping and preparing young blacks for professional positions and for graduate school." Jennifer also identified the connection between the university and the surrounding community as an

important part of the institutional culture. "I also think the tradition of the strength of the black community is also important. And also issues such as justice in this country and equality," she concluded.

All the faculty participants in this study identified the representation of tradition as an integral component of their socialization experience at the institution. This tradition was exhibited in various aspects of campus life, such as the opening convocation and Christmas parties. Most significantly, the tradition of educating minority students influenced the perception of the institution by non-black faculty. One professor commented, "I get it. I know what it means to work here. If you deny that, you are not being honest with yourself. In some ways it's really about tradition. Only a few years ago, blacks were not provided this opportunity." This cultural tradition provided a guiding influence for the daily activities of many participants. "I would be lying if I didn't acknowledge that. So yes, it doesn't guide everything I do, but it is in the back of my mind," the professor concluded.

The faculty in this study defined traditions as rituals and events that the university community adhered to and adopted. Traditions assisted in presenting the institution's history and legacy. Further, these traditions assisted in defining what it meant to "work here." They were emphasized in various university documents such as brochures and program guides, and ultimately shaped what non-black faculty experienced. Additionally the mission of the institution also contributed to the socialization of non-black faculty. The following section provides an overview of these findings related to mission

Mission. Participants in this study spoke of the mission as an instrumental component to how they viewed the institution. While faculty held various perspectives of

the institution's mission, the perception influenced how they viewed the institutional culture and how they experienced the socialization process. The mission often provided the framework in regards to the institutional norms (Tierney, 1988). Morphew and Hartley (2006) noted that the institutional mission serves two functions related to institutional culture: first, it defines activities that conform to institutional priorities and second, it provides a shared sense of purpose among organizational members. Several professors indicated that the institution's leadership often articulated the mission.

The mission of HBCUs is closely associated with its tradition of educating black students. In this study, the institution's mission emphasized educating disadvantaged black students who relied on the institution as their sole opportunity to gain a degree. The university also prioritized engagement with the local community. This mission was apparent in the decisions and policies of the institution. For example, the university has had a traditionally low retention rate and has recently attempted to address the problem. One of the recommendations of the faculty senate was to raise the minimal GPA requirement. The GPA was suggested as a mean to increase the "quality of the students" entering the institution. However, the GPA change was rejected on the premise that an increase may deny entrance to a significant percentage of students, thus conflicting with the mission of the institution.

Several faculty members discussed how the mission of the institution influenced their socialization. Further, their interpretation of the institution's mission also assisted in clarifying role activities of non-black faculty members. Hence, faculty that viewed instruction as the primary mission of the institution discussed how they were chiefly involved with activities that emphasized this focus. One participant indicated, "I would

like to publish more and conduct more research, but it doesn't appear to be valued here." The same participant suggested that formally "the institution indicated that research and service was important." However it was later indicated informally that he should emphasize and focus on student instruction.

Comparably Amy found that the institution's mission gave primary attention to undergraduate instruction. She said, "I think the institution values undergraduate education, specifically undergraduate education for African Americans. The same goes for the department. We value music and music education and upholding the values of the professions." This priority was demonstrated through departmental activities, such as musical performances at convocations and commencement. Amy also indicated that the culture of black music and art influenced the institutional mission. "It is apparent to me that African American culture influences what's important to the institution, if it doesn't it should," she added.

However, some participants viewed service as essential to the mission and commented on how they focused on service related activities. Conversely, Jennifer suggested that the institution's mission focused primarily on service, even though the university experienced difficulty conveying this message. Further, she voiced that the institution exhibited conflict in regards to explicitly stating its mission. "They may say research and creative activities, but I think service is important to this campus. I also know some people don't want to participate in that," she said. Jennifer highlighted the individual behaviors that were not unique to the HBCU environment. She concluded, "There seems, as with all groups, and culture as in a system or any environment, there are people who do the work and people who simply will never do the work. However, I think

that we are a service-oriented campus as far as committees and things. I don't think we do service to the students as well as we should. But that is an ongoing struggle for us as a campus."

Rushir, an associate professor from India, felt that the institution's focus on research was central to its mission. After being at the university for 10 years, he found that the institution was refocusing its mission. "I think institutionally the environment is great. We are developing a research focus; it is really exciting for me," he said. "Research has become very important to the institution. I would say it is more part of the institution now than ever. So I think it's more of the mission now. It's one of the things that are making people take notice of the institution. I'm really excited," Rushir concluded. However, Rushir was the only faculty member that found research as a focus at the institution.

Rushir's perception was based on his initial socialization to the institution; he was recruited specifically for his research accomplishments and to fulfill a research need at the institution. His view of the mission thus emphasized research rather than instruction. Further Rushir appeared to overlook that he was a professor at an HBCU. "The research we are doing here rivals major institutions in many ways," he stated. Having worked at a large research institution for several years may have influenced his socialization as a faculty member. For Rushir the reality of the institution's goals was congruent with how he viewed the institution prior and during his initial encounter. "Really like working here, it's what I came here for," he concludes. This finding is support by what Feldman (1976) defined as realism. Feldman indicated that the degree to which an individual's beliefs are

congruent with anticipatory socialization and perceived reality influences the socialization process.

Additionally faculty cited several methods on how the institutional mission was communicated to them. Campus email and newsletters were identified as primary sources of how information was transmitted about the campus. As indicated, events such as convocation and Founder's Day were perceived as critical events because they required participation from faculty. These rituals and events played a significant role in assisting professors to decipher institutional culture as part of the socialization process. Faculty indicated that these events demonstrated what the institution emphasized and found important. Faculty also indicated that new faculty orientation was a means of gaining information about the institution and understanding their role. The following section describes how faculty perceived both formal and informal orientations.

Orientation. Orientation provides faculty members with an opportunity to become acclimated with an institution's culture and the new academic environment (Fink, 1992). Orientation serves as a formal institutional process, during which activities, policies, and language prioritized by the organization are presented to newcomers. Feldman indicated that during the anticipatory stage, formal events such as orientation assist in determining that success of an individual in an organization. Orientation is also one of the events that provide an individual an opportunity to determine if their skills and the organization resources are mutually satisfying. Hence, an individual has opportunity to examine further the organization during orientation.

For many participants, the formal orientation process served as the first introduction to campus life at the HBCU. Additionally orientation also builds collegiality

amongst its participants, as a rite of passage for new faculty. Both campus-wide and departmental orientations serve as a starting point for new faculty members. The majority of participants in this research referred to the institution's orientation program as important in their efforts to decipher the organizational culture. They found that the orientation program was instrumental to their socialization.

The orientation program at the institution was held both in the fall and spring semester. The office of academic affairs scheduled the program. The agenda traditionally includes administrators from library services, payroll, public safety, and instructional technologies. The orientation commonly lasted six hours and concluded with a presentation from the vice president of academic affairs. Attendance was required for all new faculty members. The orientation was viewed by the administration as a critical component of the hiring process.

Faculty in the study held varied views of the orientation program, specifically its benefit to their employment at the institution. Amy, an associate professor who has been at the institution for fourteen years, suggested that the orientation lacked substance. She attended the orientation when the institution initially hired her. She explained, "Actually, I think that new faculty lacked a good orientation here, about anything, about processes. They gave me an orientation as a new faculty member, but it didn't cover the type of things you really need to know about how things are done on a day-to-day basis." Later in this chapter, I consider how non-black faculty members at the institution develop social networks to attain this sort of tacit knowledge. While Amy was frustrated with the lack of information, she suggested the program provided faculty with an opportunity to socialize. "I was given a chance to meet the other new faculty members and get an idea

where people were coming from. I still communicate with several faculty members that I met on that day," she recounted.

Most the faculty members interviewed felt that the orientation program was an essential component of the socialization process, but should be revised to provide more pertinent content. Mark, an Asian faculty member, found that the orientation needed more relevant information. Mark is a tenure-track assistant professor, who had been employed at the university for seven years. He discussed some of the components that he felt the orientation program lacked. "You didn't know how to request anything. Supplies, for example. No, I don't think it was intentional, I think they didn't realize how that stuff was a part of what we do every day," he explained. Todd suggested that orientation might benefit from a more explicit treatment of the institution's cultural norms. Todd, a twenty-year tenured faculty member and a department chair, indicated that he was unfamiliar with some of the cultural artifacts associated with the institution. He said, "I just didn't know certain things. There are things I wish I knew early on." When asked to give an example, Todd shared a story of cultural misunderstandings that can mark the socialization experience.

> For example, we had an African American secretary that really helped me a lot when I came to the institution. She gave a ton of information, and we had a pretty good relationship. Both her sons were in Iran. So we talked about them being in the service. And having a military background that was something I take seriously. So one day I asked her, "How's those boys of yours doing?" She turned to me and got furious, and I'm like "What did I say?" She said, "We don't call our men 'boys' down here, we call them men." Then she said, "'Boy' is a derogatory term. We don't use 'boy'." But what do I know? I was using it to refer to how's your son doing, you know. So it was just little subtle things like that. Our relationship was so different after that. I wish someone had told me that 'boy' could be taken as an insult. I'm not sure if that would have been on the agenda at the orientation but it would have been helpful. No, I don't want a separate orientation for us ignorant faculty. [laughter] But I wish someone had told this

> northern white guy that. And there are several other examples like that, of just little things.
>
> Todd was simply unaware that many blacks viewed "boy" as a derogatory term. The term is often associated with slavery and has a servitude connation; additionally, the term was used to perpetuate the idea of the inferiority of black men. Though the abolishment of slavery and the Civil Right Movement have worked toward deconstructing racism, some terms have lingered and still maintain negative connections in some context. Todd maintained he had little comprehension of historical significance of the term "boy". He insisted that he knew nothing of the term and its implication when spoken from a white man to a black woman. "I really wish that didn't happen," he uttered. "I think I lost a co-worker and possibly a friend." Hence, this event influenced how Pete interacted with other colleagues at the institution, specifically blacks. Further, as a consequence of this conflict, Todd may have been socialized to carefully select words when conversing with blacks at the institution.

Michelin detailed a similar experience that influenced his socialization at the institution. He commented on an experience with a student organization he advised.

> Now, I did have to learn some expressions that I innocently used, but were interpreted differently. This was from students. We had a big meeting. We were working on a project, and I referred to the group, meaning just them and me, as you people. And that's all I intended by it. But one of the students pulled me aside later because we had a nice relationship and said, "You shouldn't say that." I said, "What are you talking about?" I didn't even know that I'd said it. But he said, "You said, 'you people.'"
>
> I said, "Yeah, and I mean you, but not you black people or you African American people or whatever 'cause I wasn't doing it as that group." And it was his sensitivity to those words that I didn't know would have an impact. And he told me about it and I said, "Okay. Thank you for telling me. You understand, do you not, that there was nothing intended?" He said, "I think so, but I wasn't sure." And I said, "Ah, okay, then." So there is a certain cultural awareness that you say, "Well, you use words

> that are comfortable to your vocabulary that then are interpreted differently and you have to learn those things."

The institution's orientation was not necessarily presented as the forum for this type of awareness to be gained. Rather, several faculty mentioned that the orientation did not provide them with all the information they needed to know in order to thrive at the HBCU. As seen through the experiences of Todd and Michelin, often-difficult lessons had to be gained through interpersonal, informal interactions. No other faculty members interviewed indicated that the orientation should include a cultural component. Conversely, several faculty members indicated that orientation was appropriate and met their needs as a new faculty member. Rushir suggested that the orientation should not make any reference to culture. He commented, "I think the faculty orientation is good the way it is currently arranged. It should focus more on the procedures that you follow. Nothing about culture." He further explained his belief that the knowledge of the institutional culture was something acquired through day-to-day activities. "I think that happens at luncheons, birthday parties, just chatting with people. And they tell you about their background, and they tell you about the culture of the institution. Also some cultural things have to be experience and lived. The orientation cannot do that for you," he concluded.

Anita also echoed the justification of the orientation program. As a twelve-year tenured faculty she found the orientation to be adequate. She commented, "We have orientation. That was very helpful. In addition, the Faculty handbook was also complimentary to the program, and told us what is expected. Besides that we received information from personnel and the library." Additionally she discussed that the orientation program would not suffice alone to assist a new hire. She indicated that the

process of socialization was a collaborative effort on behalf of the individual, the institution, and the department. She indicated, "Also the department and college takes care of you. It's not orientation only. After orientation I had several questions but I was able to follow up with the department secretary. I would say orientation should not be a one-time thing. Procedures change. The department has to constantly update us on these changes. But I understand we are busy and you are expected to know certain things."

Faculty members indicated that the orientation programs made faculty feel like "part of the family." They were given opportunities to ask questions and provided with an overview of the institution. Further, the orientation helped professors understand their role and expectations as faculty members. As discussed in this section the views of participants varied on the usefulness of the orientation. However, all faculty members agreed that the orientation program was necessary for a proper introduction into the institution. Most of the negative comments suggested changes that could be made to improve the program.

While the institution held a formal orientation, many faculty members indicated that they came to understand the institution through informal methods. Hence informal socialization involved learning through trial and error (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Sanjay, a professor in his fourteenth year, stressed the importance of informal engagement and interaction. "Of course the orientation was important, but what you are told after is just as important," he indicated. "The formal orientation told you what was expected and the informal told you what was the reality." Further Sanjay indicated that the informal network persisted long after the formal event concluded. "It's not only orientation, but there are always two sides, be it departmental meeting or other formal

meetings, that people discuss similar things at informal events like parties and luncheons. HBCUs are no different in this regards. We are just like any other institution."

Orientation is an essential component of the experience of new faculty. It introduces new faculty to the institution's culture, and provides details on procedures and rules for faculty. Further orientation developed camaraderie amongst faculty members at both the university-wide level and the departmental level. While the opinions of the effectiveness of the orientation varied, all participants indicated that it influenced their socialization at the institution. In addition to their earlier experiences with the institution during orientation, several faculty members commented on their continued role management. This aspect focused primary on how faculty came to understand their role at the institution. Hence, the next section discusses how participants viewed their employment at the institutions.

It's a Job

Several studies have suggested that non-black faculty (specifically white faculty at HBCUs) experience some degree of discomfort or discontent at the institution (Foster, 2001; Warnet, 1976). Further, it has been indicated that some non-black faculty sought employment at HBCUs only after being denied positions at PWIs (Thompson, 1973). However, all the non-black faculty members interviewed for this study indicated that they viewed their appointment at the institution positively. Most participants indicated that they sought employment at the institution because of various issues such as location, salary, and peers. Hence, the faculty in this study indicated that working at an HBCU was "just a job."

During the role management stage, individuals focus on resolving problems in their immediate work. Additionally, individuals begin mediating conflicts that exist between their work life and home life. One particular issue that individuals have to negotiate is the perception of their employment by their family. Feldman (1976) suggested that family members may influence priorities and certain task of an organization member. Hence, I consider the socialization of the participants in this study by exploring their relationships between work and home. I specifically examine how family members viewed their employment at an HBCU.

Several participants discussed how their families viewed their employment at the institution. For example, Amy suggested that her family viewed her employed at the HBCU like any other faculty appointment. She referenced her family's long history with academia. "My father was an academic librarian, and has a PhD in higher education. To him it's an academic environment that happens to serve black students. He would tell me, "You should be happy you are working in an academic environment," which I am. Working with students in these age groups. My mother was much of the same way," she said. The support of her family was almost a given for Amy. "[My parents] were supportive. They didn't see any difference. We have a library; we have a university president, departments, and the same issues like every campus. I think that's true. I've worked at both types of institutions. Because my father was in higher education and I was exposed to college at birth. [Laughter] I don't think it's that different; all the students are trying to get an education."

Robert's family also viewed his appointment as "just a job." Robert left a PWI for employment at the institution. He explained that a better salary and location led him to

the institution. "First of all, the place I was teaching was not paying anything. This institution paid better. Frankly, I was trying to get closer to my mother-in-law. It's only an hour down the road. I commuted two hours a day for a year. So it was some for more money and a better location," he concluded. Similarly, Todd selected to work at the institution because of convenience and location. He indicated, "Well, the main reason was because I was working in the area. I had both my sons in the local school system. So it was just the natural thing to stay close until they finished school."

While some studies have indicated negative comments from family members can adversely impact the socialization of non-black faculty at a HBCU, the entire faculty in this study noted that their family spoke highly of their employment (Foster, 2001; Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). The comments of Rushir reinforced this perspective. "Again, my family does not have any biases. They don't see it differently. They are coming to the understanding that the population is African American, but that doesn't make any difference. They see it as a job or work," he concluded. Rushir also explained that a personal relationship brought him to the institution. While seeking to working at a HBCU had little to do with this employment, Rushir suggested a positive work environment played a significant role. He said, "It was a personal relationship that really lead me here. I met Dr. S., we both worked in the same lab. We worked so well together. We thought it might be a possibility that we might work together again. Mainly our plans in the research area, what we wanted together, and the potential for the institution."

Michelin suggested his family viewed his career at an HBCU positively. "I'm single, but my parents – my father's deceased, but he was alive when I was first working here. My mom is still alive. My sister and my niece and her kids and so on. No

problem. That's what you do. That's your area, and so, "Okay." There was never any question or concern or anything of that sort of thing," he noted. The institutional context seemed to hold little importance for his family and friends. "This was a new job. And because, as I said, when I accepted the position, it was a wonderful career move, and they were happy for me. They said, "Yeah, great. That's fine." So never been an issue, no."

Some question existed as to whether white faculty and Asian faculty viewed their employment at the HBCU in a similar fashion. Deepak is a tenured faculty member and had been at the institution for 18 years. He suggested that white faculty might have difficulty socializing at an HBCU because of the weighted historical legacy between blacks and whites. Deepak indicated, "I personally feel as an Asian American, I think you need to interview whites. Asians come to HBCUs without any bias. They are neutral. However, whites will have a different experience because they were born here. Asians will see the HBCU as an institution. They are not involved in the historical aspect." Deepak further commented that he has spoken to several whites that "hated" working at an HBCU. He specifically indicated that some white faculty members were waiting for the opportunity to leave the institution for a PWI. He explained, "You hear the comments. They say things like they [students] can't learn or what's wrong with them. But it's not all, just some. But I'm like why are they working here. It must be that they can't a job anywhere else. It must be a white and black thing for them."

While all Asian faculty in this study regarded their appointment positively, the white faculty also viewed their appointment in high regard. Further, all participants indicated that race had little or nothing to do with their employment at the institution. However, the race of the researcher may have influenced the responses on this aspect of

socialization. Participant may have been hesitant to describe their families' views to a black man. Further, faculty members may have feared repercussion if they suggested their family viewed their employment negatively. Participants also discussed the external participant of the institution differently. These external factors mostly involved colleagues at other institutions and communities surrounding the institution. The following section discusses how non-black faculty members interpreted external factors in relationship to their socialization. Also discussed is how participants viewed HBCUs prior to their employment.

External Factors

Another factor that influences socialization is the perception of an institution prior to employment (Feldman, 1976). Faculty in this study held various views of HBCUs prior to their employment. The majority of faculty interviewed indicated that they were unaware of HBCUs prior to their employment. These views were emphasized by the comments of Roxanne. "I didn't really know much about them. I mean, I just assumed they existed." She compared her knowledge of HBCUs to that of other special-interest institutions. "I knew that the college I worked at before was designated as a Native American serving institution. I knew we had programs. To the extent we had them I was not aware. I did know we had Latino, Black and Tribal serving institutions." Comparably, Tina, an eight year tenured faculty member, also had little previous knowledge of HBCUs. Tina, a department head, explained that she saw a posting for a position in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and sent her vita. She recounted, "I knew nothing about HBCUs. It was kind of embarrassing. Truth be told, I didn't even know what the acronym

stood for. But once I found out it was an HBCU I did some research and began to understand what an HBCU is and what it means to go to school here."

Michelin, a tenured professor, was also unaware of HBCUs. After being at the institution for 33 years, he discussed his experience when he first came to the institution. He explained, "I had never heard the acronym, HBCU. Though I knew that there were schools that were historical black, but I didn't know that acronym. So that's part of my education coming into a place and people are tossing terms around. And you're saying, 'What are you talking about?'" When asked to discuss his initial perceptions of the HBCU culture, he responded, "I don't know what I really had thought about HBCUs. Other than they are just schools and I wasn't making any judgments about the quality or whatever of them, just that, yes, they served a particular group of people like many private schools serve a religious denomination or whatever. So that was not a judgment call on my part." Conversely, while Anita knew about HBCUs prior to her employment, she admitted she was unaware of the mission and goals of HBCUs. "Previously I was pretty much at a white school. So when I came here I was kind of 'Whoa.' I knew it was an HBCU, but I didn't know it would be so completely African American," she admitted. Her status as a minority faculty in the HBCU culture caused reflection on Anita's part. "I didn't have a single white student. I didn't, it was so predominately a black institution. I didn't really encounter problems. But I think the students thought I was a student. I had a hard time telling them and getting them to see me as a teacher. I think they thought I was the same age." These initial experiences shaped Anita's current behavior as part of the institutional culture. "I tend to be more formal now. I don't want them to think of me as a friend," she concluded. Rushir also had similar views of HBCUs prior to his faculty

appointment. He explained that he knew HBCUs existed, but he was unfamiliar with their mission. He indicated, "I wasn't really thinking about them. Never really thought about them. No bias. I knew there were such things, but had no preconceived views of them."

The faculty participants in this study had little interaction with HBCUs prior to their appointment at the institutions. A few professors were unfamiliar with minority serving institutions in general. Those familiar with black colleges and universities indicated that selection to an HBCU had little to do with the missions and goals of an HBCU. Further working at an HBCU was also viewed as a respectable faculty position. The professors in this study also indicated that family members supported their employment at the institution.

Several studies indicated that there is a negative connotation associated with working at HBCUs (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). These assumptions tend to stem from a historical perception that HBCUs traditionally lack resources and facilities. Bowles and DeCosta (1971) suggested that many faculty view HBCUs as operating in isolation from mainstream institutions. Further many HBCUs are perceived as institutions that produce educators that educate other blacks (Blackwell, 1987; Johnson & Harvey, 2002). Leadership at HBCUs is frequently perceived as autocratic and lacking in the credentials to operate universities successfully. Minor indicates, "Financial instability, accreditation challenges and questionable governance structures are constant quandaries associated with HBCUs" (2004, p. 40). Thus while HBCUs are important to educating blacks, these negative perceptions often interfere with their accomplishments.

The participants in this study agreed that external perceptions of HBCUs were often negative. Consequently, some faculty interviewed suggested that the external

pressure influenced their socialization at the institution. Tom, a white faculty member at the institution admitted that he recognized the perceptions of external members of the institution. "I saw it as soon as I interviewed. I would ask around about the school and I heard all types of negative comments. Most of the people I spoke to didn't have a good opinion of the institution or HBCUs in general," he explained. The negative perceptions of the institution were evident based on derogatory statements made by other people. "One person told me, 'This is the best high school education in the state.' Just comments like that made you think, 'What am I getting myself into?' So yes, I questioned if this was a good career move, should I be going here. So when they called me back for the job offer, I hesitated a bit."

Specifically some faculty suggested that colleagues at other institutions viewed HBCUs negatively. It was suggested that some peers found working at an HBCU "beneath them." Anita's comments illustrated these sentiments. "There is definitely a negative feeling, like 'you poor thing.' [Laughter]." She illustrated the negative perceptions in terms of her academic discipline. "In geography very few HBCUs have geography programs, many schools are attempting to recruit graduate students for their programs. So they know we don't have money for research, so you get the feeling that they don't take you very seriously. So we don't get many applicants because they don't view HBCUs as having resources."

Tina also found that peers at other institutions viewed her employment negatively. She also indicated that colleagues were unfamiliar with HBCUs. "Usually they don't know unless I say something. They say, 'I didn't know anything like that existed.' Then I think, 'You must not have read the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.' I have a friend at a

Latino institution. Working at an HBCU the treatment sometimes is different from other institutions. Negative things are blown out of proportion at most HBCUs."

Other professors interviewed for the study indicated that they perceived no external influences. They suggested that their peers do not view HBCUs negatively. Further they explained that HBCUs are often perceived at resourceful in their academic discipline. These views are representative of those held by Rushir, who indicated that the research work done at the institution is highly regarded and respected. "In fact, people are quite excited about what we are doing when we attend conferences. First, the research we are doing here is better than what the other institutions that are considered mainstream are doing. For example, we have 40-45 presentations coming from the group. So our research is published in the best journals." He compared his research productivity to colleagues at predominantly white institutions. "HBCUs are not looked at so highly, based on your question. But I've never seen that. In fact if I compare what is happen at some other PWIs, we are miles ahead of them in research in certain areas. That might just apply to our area. Maybe other areas need to be improved and worked on. We need to look at the whole institution," he concluded. Hence, Rushir felt his area did not experience the same negative perceptions as other academic disciplines at the institution. However, the majority of faculty interviewed indicated that peers and external constituents, such as the community, often perceived the institution negatively. External constituents may influence the involvement of faculty in the campus community. The following section discusses the involvement of non-black faculty members in activities such as faculty senate and campus events.

Faculty Involvement

HBCUs frequently serve as cultural and extracurricular communities for both students and faculty. Many of these institutions were established to educate blacks and to support the advancement of the black community (Jewell, 2002). Further studies have indicated that HBCU students are more likely to seek social support networks that consist of both other students and faculty (Hirt, Strayhorn, Amelink, & Bennett, 2006; Palmer & Gasman, 2008). Kannerstein indicated that most HBCUs view service to the community as an "inextricably intertwined, producing together an appreciation of the relationship between the curriculum and the world beyond the campus" (1978, p. 31). Hence, the faculty involvement at HBCUs is viewed as an essential element in the development of the community.

The participants in the study were involved in various campus activities at the institution. Several professors indicated that the participation in these events assisted in their socialization at the institution. Faculty senate and campus committees were cited as activities that provided faculty with an opportunity to understand the norms and culture at the institution. Further non-black faculty were often active participants in such academic activities. Michelin's comments illustrate the emphasis given to service. "I serve on lots of committees. I think what often is the case, though, is that faculty at this school, unwritten rule of course, are expected to spend more time and go out of their way and jump on every opportunity possible to serve in one way or the next....Serve the institution by special committees, ad hocs, and so on," he concluded. He explained the multitude of roles faculty were expected to assume. "I mean, I serve on departmental committees, on college committees, on university wide committees, on ad hoc

committees at those levels, too, as well as special projects. And to my mind, that's all volunteer work. Because the real contractual expectations are go to your classes, hold your office hours, and do your bit in some committee work. That's it." According to Michelin, service on communities consumes a significant amount of faculty time and resources. He concluded, "But all of a sudden, you have all these other things, and moderating or advising student organizations and doing plenty of other things at the university level. Up until recently, every year that I was eligible, I served on the faculty senate. And I served at the president of the faculty senate for a term."

Faculty Senate. The faculty senate plays a substantial role in the decision-making and governance at colleges and universities (Minor, 2004). However, the scope and power of the faculty senate varies from institution to institution. At HBCUs the role of the faculty senate is often viewed differently compared to PWIs. The leadership of HBCUs and the mission of the institution have often deterred faculty members from participating in the faculty senate. HBCU presidents often have a paternal association with their faculty, which mirrors the relationship between a religious clergy and the congregation (Minor, 2004). Involvement in the faculty senate by non-black faculty at HBCUs is a vastly understudied topic in higher education.

All the participants in this study had some level of interaction with the faculty senate. However, while non-black faculty members constituted less than ten percent of the faculty, they comprised over 50 percent of the faculty senate. Several faculty members indicated that non-black faculty found the faculty senate to be an informal introduction into the institution. The faculty senate provided inroads to influence the decision making and governance at the institution. Most significantly, the faculty senate

served as a vehicle for the socialization of non-black faculty. For example, Stephen indicated that he came to understand the institution through his involvement on the faculty senate. He explained, "I think people find it makes sense to them. It's a way to understand the institution, find out how it works. Who's calling the shots around here? Because nothing formal is going to tell you this. So the senate is sort of an initiation. Maybe black faculty might not need that initiation." Rushir felt his involvement in faculty senate was seen as a method to assist with his tenure and promotion. He said, "I was appointed by my chair, they need people, so they are just grabbing people. I'm applying for my tenure and promotion and being on the senate can help... I'm involved in academic events. Various committees. I do try to take part in the seminar and teaching related seminar."

Robert was also a member of the faculty senate and was involved in several academic committees. He indicated that that he viewed the senate as an opportunity to serve and understand the culture of the institution. "Some crazy people voted me on to the faculty senate," he said, laughing. "My colleagues voted me a senator at-large. By being on that body I would get to hear about faculty issues and get an executive report from the faculty senate, from trustees and other leadership on campus. So you get to hear what the plans are. What's going on?" He offered this example: "If there has been a shooting on campus I'll first hear about it from students, then I'll hear the details at the senate." Conversely, Michelin, a white faculty and an active member of the senate for 20 years commented on how being a senate member influenced his socialization. "I mean I was brought more into the inside of things and would sit at the table with people who

were in the upper administration. I might not have as many of opportunities to do it as just a plain regular faculty member," he indicated.

Additionally Michelin served as the president of the faculty senate for several years. He described his experience with the senate and the university administration. "It's very interesting in a number of ways. And part of it I have to say –without thinking that I'm patting myself on the back, but I know that there has been a tug of war between the senate and the administration for a long time. There's certain aggressive behaviors." He explained his approach to the history of institutional conflict between the administration and the senate:

> When I was elected the president of the senate, I wrote letters to people in the upper administration just saying, "I've just been elected president. I want to open the doors of communication. I'm happy to serve, and nah, nah, nah, nah, nah."
> Well, all of a sudden I started getting invitations to things from the administration that no other faculty senate president had ever gotten before. I was asked to be on a program. I was invited to the president's house for a reception before a ball game, all this kind of stuff. And with real letters coming from the president's office or the VPs or whatever.
>
> I'd report that back to the senate executive committee. – "How did you get that? What did you – what do they think?" I said, "Well, I don't know other than I just made the first overture. Rather than waiting for them to contact me, I contacted them and said, 'Let's open the communication. Here you go.'"
>
> So that kinda thing was very interesting. And I also tried, with only partial success, to guide the senate to focus on academics, and not exclusively on benefits and the things that are the complaints, but to move it in a direction to improve the academic quality of the university.

As indicated, non-black faculty members were highly involved and influential in the faculty senate. They found that the senate was an informal orientation into understanding the norms and culture. Faculty senate members indicated that the membership assisted in influencing the culture of the institution. Additionally several

participants indicated that faculty senate served as a mechanism to gain the trust of a primarily black administration. Participants also indicated their level of involvement in other campus, the following provides an overview of these activities

Campus Involvement

Many HBCUs view campus involvement as a necessary component of the professorship. Faculty at HBCUs are often expected to partake in various campus activities, such as athletic events and holiday parties. Several participants were involved in various academic committees and organizations. These committees often required leadership and academic governance. Amy indicated her involvement in several committees at the institution. She commented, "I've been on too many committees. Adviser, accreditation, search committees. I've been on 10 campus-wide committees in 10 years. It's an achievement from being a member of a committee to being the chair of one. I guess that's a sign that I'm doing good work or willing to do work." Several participants indicated the importance that HBCUs placed on campus involvement and service. Robert, a tenured professor, explained, "Campus service is highly valued at HBCUs." Additionally several faculty members indicated campus service was instrumental to the tenure and promotion process. Several studies indicated that black faculty at HBCUs are highly involved in campus, specifically events that occur "after hours" (Johnson, 2002, Minor, 2004). However, a few participants in this study indicated that they only participated in campus events that took place "during normal work hours." Robert indicated his hesitance to participate in campus events held "after hours." He explained, "There are certain events that I have not participated in. And it's not in any way boycotting the event, it's just that when I clock out, and leave campus, I'm hard

pressed to comeback. I live in [a neighboring town] and I'm hard pressed to come back here." He recounted the events in which he had not participated. "I haven't gone to a football game. And my students will ask me, are you going to the football game, and I say 'No, I have something else to do' and whatever it is. I basically make up an excuse. I haven't been to a football game and that sort of thing like film festivals that I haven't participated in. Music events, I typically have not come back for the after hour stuff. So typically, the events that I attend are during business hours."

Todd also indicated that he rarely participated in after hour events. "Outside of convocation and Founders Day, I don't attend other social events like football games," he explained. "I am just not interested. I hope the team does well, but I don't really care. It has nothing to do with the institution." Athletic events at HBCUs often serve as communal activities that involve faculty, staff, students and alumni. Individuals who have attended an HBCU often patronize these athletic events. None of the individuals involved in this study attended an HBCU, which may have influenced their involvement at HBCU athletic events.

Michelin went beyond athletic events and discussed his level of engagement in other social activities.

> Currently I do participate in some of the arts activities. I will go to a concert or I go to see the exhibits in the art gallery, that kinda stuff. I – depending on my availability of time, will go to certain lectures, whether it's the small lecture series or a big public thing. I mean I try to go to those. Some major university events, of course, I'm required to participate in graduation, things of that sort, but those sorts of things.
>
> And as I can – I mean there is a lot going on and you have to be selective because I've got a life outside the university, too, and lots of things that I do professionally that I can't do here. But the university gains from everybody who does things and has the name associated. So it's mainly those things.

> I don't usually – I haven't in years attended an athletic event, except peripherally I may be walking by when there's a baseball game going on if they're playing out here, or a track meet. But I don't go to football games, not because I don't support the institution, but because I don't care very much for football. It doesn't interest me. That kind of stuff. So it's just that I do a number of things, but you have to pick and choose.
>
> A lot of times, we, like other people, when the workday is over, you leave and you don't come back. I mean I come back at night for meetings of the student organizations that I'm faculty advisor for, and I do come back at night for certain events. But a lot of times like many people, you finish your workday and it's going to take a lot to get you back.

Numerous participants indicated they rarely attended holiday gatherings or retirement parties that took place outside of normal offices. Amy, in her tenth year at the institution said, "I just didn't have a lot of interaction with faculty members outside of departmental meeting and those types of activities. I mean, I've never and I can still say this, I've never been invited to someone's home for dinner. Which wasn't the case in my previous institution. I don't know if it's the norm for the campus. It might be a campus norm maybe." Anita also reflected on the lack of social engagement after hours. Anita, an Asian faculty, indicated she regularly attended social event doing normal hours. However, she indicated difficulty in attending faculty gathering in the evenings. "It's not that I have anything against it. It just that I don't have the time. I never really gave it any thought. I mean, I have a good relation with my peers. And I see other faculty going to things. Maybe it's me. I really keep to myself. Maybe if I felt it was necessary I would attend."

Anita's comments suggest that faculty may not see any value in attending after hour events. Hence, these events may not influence the socialization process significantly. Further, Amy suggested that the many faculty would rather not return to the institutions after spending their entire day there.

Student Interaction

Faculty and student interaction is essential at higher education institutions. How faculty view their role as educators depends highly on how they interact with students. Additionally, if the culture of an institution is student centered, this emphasis will influence how faculty are socialized. HBCUs have had a history of a culture that is student focused. This culture is based on how HBCUs have met the educational and emotional needs of black students (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Further HBCUs are often called upon to provide conditional admissions and remedial courses for students who otherwise would not seek higher education (Allen, 1987). Hence, while HBCU faculty members are involved in research and service, the interaction with students often supersedes other duties.

Participants in this study discussed their interactions with students and how such interactions influenced the socialization process. The majority of faculty viewed their interactions with students as paramount because of the emphasis the institution placed on it. Rushir commented on the value that the institution placed on student interaction. "The first day you step into the environment, you realize that this is different from a non-HBCU institution, and some of the challenges are obvious from the beginning." Rushir felt the challenge of working with unprepared students was one hallmark of his experiences. "One [challenge] is that many of the students are not as well prepared when they come to the classroom. Not because they don't want to do the work, but their preparation in the earlier part of their life, was not of the same standard as other places. Which then makes it interesting, because you really want them to do as well if not better than others," he said. Rushir recounted the challenge of balancing his professional

responsibilities with his commitment to students. "So some things take a back seat. You try to publish and produce scholarly work, but we are required to focus so much on the student. So from the beginning my role became clear that I had to encourage them to get up to that level," he concluded.

Robert suggested student interaction influenced how he was socialized at the institution. He discussed some conversations he had with students that "would only take place at an HBCU." Further he suggested how his role as non-black faculty at an HBCU is influenced by the education of primarily black students. Robert provided a scenario he experienced in one of his classes as an example.

> Just the other day I was giving them [students] my mid semester sermon, as I call it. "Ok we are approaching the drop day, but I'm not advocating that behavior. But you need to assess your life and this course and your schoolwork." I went into details about scoring and grading. Then I started harping on attendance, preparedness, having a textbook, and reading it. All that sermon stuff I do. Then I said, "You know folks, you all need to have the attitude of what can I get out of this institution and class. You need to take full advantage of the opportunities that this university has to offer instead of just doing the minimum you can do to get by." Then I said, "Either your tuition dollars have been invested or some else's on your behalf" ... Then I said, "Ya'll more than any people on the planet, this group of students doesn't need a white guy telling you the cost that has been paid so you can be sitting here. Don't waste it. Take advantage, because for a long time you didn't have this opportunity. By you I mean your race didn't have this opportunity."

Robert acknowledges he rarely discuses race in his course, but felt it was necessary for motivation. I asked him what reaction he received from students after his words. "They got it, they understood it," he maintained. "Also the part at the end about not needing a white guy to tell them this made them say 'yea, you're right.' But you might need a guy or gal, somebody to remind you. And I think that's what I need to do. So I guess in that case I can use the racial difference to an advantage, hopeful to their advantage."

Amy commented on how her students sought her for assistance. She indicated that students felt very comfortable with approaching her. "In fact, if you ask around, that would be my reputation," she explained. "I have students not my advisees come to me frequently for my assistance outside of my department and administrative capacity. That's has been going on for 10 years." Similar to Robert, Amy rarely discuses race with her students, and often avoided any racial conflict. However she did outline an experience that had a racial implication. "Some one told the students that I was racist. Without any direct evidence," she explained. Amy only realized this challenge when students admitted it to her in class. "Because I was having trouble engaging the students in the classroom, and I finally said 'What's going on?' They said, 'We heard this about you.' I said, 'What evidence do you have about this?' These weren't freshman. I said 'What do you know about me, and what have you been told? And give me evidence of that.'" Amy felt that the interaction provided a learning moment for students. "And it was really interesting. They have never been asked to examine their own biases. I've told students I cannot change the fact that I'm not African American, just like they can't change the fact that they are. But I'm here."

All participants indicated they had positive experiences with students. Many faculty indicated that students interacted with them after graduation and that they viewed many students as friends. Additionally most professors felt students were willing to approach them for both academic and personal matters. Some studies have indicated that white faculty at HBCUs are likely to discuss race with the students (Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). However, non-black faculty members in this study indicated that they rarely

discussed race with their students. Except for the example indicated earlier most faculty members avoided issues revolving around race.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the themes that emerged as a result of the interviews and analysis. Five themes were discussed: 1. The significance of institutional culture to non-black faculty socialization at a HBCU; 2. The sentiment of "it's only a job" by non-black faculty; 3. The supportive nature of family and friends of non-black faculty related to their employment at a HBCU; 4. The importance of involvement on campus as a means to understanding the institutional culture; and 5. The significance of interactions with students at the HBCU.

The views and experiences of participants assisted in providing an understanding of the socialization of non-black faculty members at a HBCU. Participants discussed how they viewed the institution's culture and other factors that influenced their role as faculty members. Further, the unique culture of HBCUs also contributed to the socialization of non-black faculty. Participants indicated that such aspects as traditions and mission influenced their role management and work expectations.

Orientation was also discussed as a central part of the socialization process. The orientation provided procedural information and an overall introduction to the institution. While the orientation was a formal event, informal orientation with peers also provided valuable information. Several participants indicated that the orientation lacked substance but felt it developed relationships amongst faculty members. Faculty revealed how various campus events provided them with an understanding of the institution and what was expected of them. Additionally faculty indicated that they had positive experiences at

the institution. Similarly, the participants' families highly regarded their faculty appointments. Participants detailed their interactions with students and its contribution to their socialization. Also noted were some issues related to race that should be discussed during orientation. A few faculty felt unprepared as non-black faculty entering a predominantly black workplace. However, the majority of participants indicated that racial issues and situations needed to be experienced rather than discussed at orientation.

All participants indicated that they viewed their employment as primarily a job. Faculty indicated that they sought employment for personal reasons and convenience. Comparably participants indicated that family members viewed their employment positively. However, it was indicated that colleagues outside the institution often viewed their employment negatively. Several participants commented that the negative views of HBCUs hindered their creditability when they attended professional conferences.

HBCU faculty are expected to participate in community activities and events. Many non-black faculty indicated that participation in university activities and events assisted in their socialization. The faculty senate was commented on specifically as an important organization for non-black faculty. The majority of non-black faculty served on the senate in various capacities at the institution. However, events that were held outside of normal work hours were often not attended by non-black faculty members. Events such as football games were viewed unnecessary for socialization. Further some faculty members indicated that they felt "out of place" at events held after hours.

Finally, faculty discussed their relationship with students and how it influenced their socialization. Most non-black faculty indicated that they felt students viewed them as approachable and had little reservation with speaking with them. It was indicated that

black students assisted non-black faculty with the socialization process by discussing the institution's culture. Issues of race were rarely discussed between non-black faculty and black students. However, faculty indicated they referred to race as a motivational tool in some of their classes.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

In this final chapter, I first provide an overview of this research study. Secondly, I summarize the findings of my study and provide responses to the research questions that guided my work. Further, I consider the implications of these findings for faculty and administrators at historically black institutions. A discussion of the implications for further research as well as practices and policies are included. Finally, limitations of the study are discussed, which is followed by the conclusion.

Like all institutional types, HBCUs have unique cultures and traditions that influence various aspects of their missions and objectives (Tierney, 1998). Many of these traditions are deeply rooted in the origins of HBCUs. How HBCUs came to exist in American higher education continues to influence the interaction of students and faculty at these institutions (Allen & Jewell, 2002; Henderson, 1967; Foster, 2001). Historically black colleges and universities are perceived as highly invested in student success; faculty members at these institutions are key to the delivery of an educational experience that promotes student development, graduation, and future success.

This dissertation originated in these unique institutional characteristics, which help shape the HBCU culture and the interpretation of those characteristics by non-black

faculty. For many of the faculty included in this study who received their graduate degrees from predominantly white institutions, the challenges of socialization and integration is significant. Since culture has a strong impact on individual behavior, as well as individual perceptions of institutional beliefs and values, the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at HBCUs reveal much about the relationships between non-black faculty and the institution. Existing research has documented the different experiences of black faculty at HBCUs compared to their black peers at predominantly white institutions (Johnson & Harvey, 2002; Minor, 2004). Questions of racial identity and affiliation influenced how individuals perceived of others within the same organization as well as how they perceived their own "fit" with the organization. Black faculty members at HBCUs are socialized at an institution where they hold majority status. However, their experiences vary from that of their counterparts at PWIs.

While the experiences of black faculty at HBCUs have been considered by researchers, less attention has been given to the socialization of non-black faculty at HBCUs. Given the increasing diversity inherent in American society, and its impact on all institutions of higher education, the question is a significant one. Thus this dissertation examined the socialization of non-black faculty at a HBCU. The primary research questions that guided this study were:

1. How do non-black faculty perceive their socialization experiences as part of the culture of a historically black campus?

2. What role do other faculty and administrators play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

3. What role do students play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

These research questions guided my efforts to understand how the culture, rituals, traditions, and organizational structure of a HBCU influenced the socialization experiences of non-black faculty. Given the emphasis on culture, a qualitative approach in terms of research method was well-suited to this study. Using a qualitative interview approach allowed for an in-depth examination of the socialization process of these faculty members in this study. Further, a qualitative approach provided insights that would have proven unavailable in quantitative research (Merriam, 1998). Data collection was conducted through twenty in-person, semi-structured interviews. Numerous open-ended questions were used to ascertain the experiences and perspectives of these faculty members.

Because of the richness of institutional culture, and the highly individualistic manner in which participants experience and are socialized to that culture, difficulty exists in terms of determining a theoretical framework best suited for a study of socialization. Feldman's (1976) theory of socialization was used as a theoretical basis for this study. Feldman's model provided a framework to understand the experiences of an individual throughout the socialization process and the context variables that influenced their socialization. Hence, Feldman's model identified four stages of socialization: (1) Anticipatory Socialization; (2) Accommodation; (3) Role Management; and (4) Outcome. A strength of this theoretical perspective is the recognition that socialization is not a process that begins from the moment an individual joins an organization, nor is it a process that is experienced universally by all organizational members. Rather, as

participants experience life in the organization, they formulate individual responses to activities based on their own expectations, background, and goals. Additionally this model indicated that context variables influenced the degree to which an individual experiences each stage of the socialization process. In Chapter 2, I discussed the context variables of HBCUs and their relationships to the socialization process. The research questions guided this study in order to provide summative conclusions regarding my findings.

Discussion

How do non-black faculty perceive their socialization experiences as part of the culture of a historically black campus?

In general, the non-black faculty interviewed for this study perceived their socialization experiences to be similar to those often associated with faculty positions regardless of institutional type. Their descriptions and responses frequently focused on the process of socialization rather than the unique characteristics of the HBCU culture. For example, numerous respondents outlined the challenge of balancing teaching and research responsibilities, learning the nuances of daily departmental life, and determining how to become best involved with institutional events. The participants encountered many of the activities that define faculty life and professional roles within higher education. This finding is supported by Tierney and Rhoades (1993), who concluded that faculty come to understand the values and beliefs of the academic profession through socialization, not wholly that of the institution. The finding also reveals the academic discipline and professorship may supersede the institutions culture. However, faculty did perceive that various aspects of their socialization were unique given the culture of

HBCUs. Whereas non-black faculty were engaged in a cultural process experienced by many faculty members, the context of the traditions and values of a HBCU did influence their role to some extent. Non-black faculty progressed though the socialization process, but as indicated by Feldman (1976) the context of the process was just as significant. Therefore the mission and traditions of HBCUs contributed to their socialization at the institution and their faculty role.

During the anticipatory socialization stage, participants indicated their challenge in gaining adequate knowledge of the institution. Many faculty noted that they were unaware that HBCUs existed and were not aware of the unique mission of the institution. Further many participants sought employment at the institution because of personal reasons unrelated to the institutional mission and culture. Non-black faculty indicated that they were underprepared for the experience at a HBCU. While participants attempted to learn about the institution prior to their employment, many faculty were unsuccessful in achieving an accurate picture. In short, the anticipatory stage was perceived as a difficult stage of the socialization for non-black faculty in this study.

As participants moved to the accommodation stage of their socialization, some of the challenges encountered through the anticipatory stage were lessened. Faculty came to understand the mission and culture of the institution by their interactions with colleagues and by partaking in rituals and traditions. Role definition and initiation to the task were the primary activities of faculty during this stage of their socialization. By attending events such as Founder's Day faculty were able to gain an understanding of traditions and missions of the university.

Many of the perceived problems during the accommodation stage were related to cultural and racial views. Participants were often unaware of the language and terms associated with the context of working at a HBCU. An example of the unique context of a HBCU was the negative racial connotation of terms such as "boy" and "you people" in the black community. Hence non-black faculty indicated tumultuous situations might have been avoided if the administration or colleagues had more deliberately offered advice or insight into cultural norms. All faculty members regardless of institution type must negotiate language and terms used at the institution. Inappropriate negotiations, language, or interactions, however, can impede the socialization process.

Faculty members commonly experienced alienation during the accommodation stage of socialization. Participants in this study perceived they were alienated because of their lack of understanding of the black community and HBCUs, which was closely associated with their race. However, this alienation was primarily found amongst white participants, not those faculty of other ethnic origins. The racial context between white and black Americans influenced the socialization of white faculty at the institution. As a result, faculty avoided emphasizing or discussing racial issues during their socialization.

Participants in this study experienced some socialization activity associated with role management. These activities dealt with management of external conflicts related to family and external perceptions of HBCUs. Participants indicated that working at an HBCU poised no apparent conflict with their family members. This finding was contrary to the studies that indicated that non-black family may experience conflict with family members for selecting to work at HBCUs (Smith & Borgstedt, 1985). This contradiction may be related to the race of the researcher. Non-black faculty may have been hesitant to

divulge their family's displeasure with working at an HBCU to a black man. Since I was a member of the racial majority, non-black faculty may have feared a negative response if they indicated familial frustration with the institution. Participants did encounter difficulty with other external factors such as peers at PWIs and professional organizations. Faculty felt marginalized because of their employment at a HBCU, explaining that they were often stereotyped. The negative views often associated with HBCUs contributed to their socialization. Participants found that they had to prove their ability in areas that a non-black faculty members at a PWI would not. Thus the history and stereotypes associated with HBCUs influenced faculty perceptions.

The socialization experiences were influenced by both formal and informal means. Participants attended orientations and other formal events that provided them with knowledge and information about the university's culture and values. While limited, such events assisted in providing non-black faculty with invaluable information about their role at the institution. In general, however, participants felt that formal events were not sufficient to adequately prepare them for their experience at the institution. Thus limited informal interaction was supplemented in order to provide specifics of institutional culture and mission.

Race was an essential component of this study that must be acknowledged. The foundation of this research involved a black man interviewing non-black faculty about their socialization experiences at a historically black university. These elements were surrounded in issues of race and racial identity. It is undeniable that the interactions and dialogues may have been influenced by my race or the race of the interviewers.

As an example, faculty indicated that they were rarely involved in athletic events at the institution. The general sentiment was that faculty had no interest in the universities athletics events. Repeatedly faculty indicated that they simply were not excited about the sporting events. Nevertheless, athletic events are a large component of the culture of HBCUs. These events are commonly attended by black students, black faculty and black administrators, who have and have not attended HBCUs. There is a possibility that this aspect of non-black socialization is greatly influenced by race. Non-black faculty may have difficulty attending athletic events because of their fear of being isolated racially. Comparable studies of black faculty members at PWIs have indicated that they are often reluctant to engage in events in which they are racially isolated.

It must be reiterated that race was rarely explicitly mentioned as a factor in their socialization. Further, the majority of participants indicated that they rarely discussed issues related to race at the institution. This view may be related to the experiences and length of service of the faculty in this study. The majority of the non-black faculty interviewed had been at the institution from seven to thirty years. These faculty members may have progressed beyond issues of race during their socialization. In other words, these individuals may have faced and resolved many racial conflicts. Most likely, these racial conflicts were regulated during the accommodation stage of their socialization.

Many faculty viewed their employment at the institution as "just a job." This finding was surprise, in light of Warnat (1976) study on archetypes of white faculty. Warnat suggested that white faculty at HBCUs are highly motivated by race. However, faculty in this study indicated otherwise and suggested that motives were primarily related to convenience and salary. It is still possible that the perception of "it's just a job"

may be associated with race. The faculty in this study indicated they "checked in" the morning and "checked out" at five, and rarely were involved in afterhours events. Their race may have been a barrier in partaking of these activities, similar to the athletic events. Faculty may have felt unwelcomed attending after hour events, thus viewing their employment as "just a job."

Despite the finding that race was not influential in faculty choice to work at a HBCU, it may have played a role in their continued socialization at an HBCU. Warnat's (1976) study was conducted nearly thirty years ago. The racial complexion of American and American higher education has been altered significantly since. It is possible that the racial conclusion indicated by Warnat will be less relevant today. Further Minor (2004) suggested that perception of race are often viewed by outsider of the institutions. Race highly influences how HBCUs are viewed by society however, within the institution race may have a reduced emphasis.

Several of the Asian faculty interviewed felt that racial conflict only existed amongst whites and blacks. Their view of the racial climate suggested that whites and blacks were intertwined in racial issues that seemingly excluded Asians or those of other racial backgrounds. This perception may also be based on the views of Asians also being of a minority status in American. The Asian faculty may have felt more connected to black faculty at an HBCU, as a relation of their shared minority status. While whites were a minority at the institution, their majority status was undeniable. Therefore, Asians viewed themselves at a racial minority and identified with black faculty. The majority of Asian faculty seldom discussed race, thus suggesting that race was less salient in their socialization.

What role do students play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

Students play a critical role in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty. Students are essential agents in defining the values and cultures of the institution. Students were particularly involved in activities associated with the initiation of non-black faculty members in the institution. Participants often gained insight into certain campus traditions from their interactions with students. Additionally participants found that the focus on students at the institution also determined what activities they were involved in. Further positive relationships with students contributed to positive socialization experiences. Faculty that were comfortable with their students found their work relationship with peers to be more satisfying.

Faculty in this study indicated that they felt comfortable approaching students. While respondents noted that issues of race were rarely discussed with faculty colleagues or administrators, student interactions were an exception. Surprisingly faculty also had very little reservations of discussing race with their students. This degree of comfort seemed to be primarily related to the positive relationship between non-black faculty and black students.

This willingness may be related to the dynamic that exist between faculty and students; that is, faculty felt in control of the classroom, even though they were a racial minority. Further faculty were not fearful of engaging in racial dialogues with students. A professor could be comfortable in discussing a student's racial prejudices, but avoided the same conversations with black faculty members. This comfort in the classroom should be understood in the context of the academic profession and the role of students.

Some non-black faculty felt that in their role as faculty they were required to prioritize the cultural significance of HBCUs and the education of black students. Thus, racial discussions were viewed as teaching opportunities and safe within the confines of the classroom. While racial issues were mentioned in the classroom, such topics did not seem to be the dominant issue.

What role do other faculty and administrators play in the socialization experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU?

Faculty colleagues served an important role in the informal socialization of non-black faculty. During informal conversations and meetings peers provided non-black faculty with information that assisted in their success at the institution. By communicating with these individuals, the participants in this study indicated that they were able to better understand their role and position at an HBCU. Non-black faculty also relied on peers to demonstrate how they should interpret the goals and objectives of the institution as suggested by the university administration.

While participants indicated positive relationships with colleagues, they rarely interacted with faculty outside of work. The effect of being a minority at a black university was a factor in the lack of interaction. However, non-black faculty participated in similar events together such as faculty senate. The involvement in faculty senate is a compelling finding given the traditional role of faculty senate at HBCUs. Faculty at HBCUs are frequently viewed as external to the decision making process (Minor 2005). The majority of decisions are made by the president, administrators and the board of trustees; however, faculty are called upon to make recommendations. Thus, the traditional view of faculty senate at a HBCU is marginal and limited. The role of the

faculty may also be related to how professors communicate with administrators and the president on an individual basis. However, this relationship and contact to administrators may only be related to black faculty members. The findings suggest that non-black faculty rarely have direct interaction with administrators or the president. This lack of interaction may explain the high involvement by non-blacks in the faculty senate. The senate may be viewed as a vehicle that allowed non-black faculty to interact with the administration.

It is also possible that the high involvement of non-black faculty indicated that the faculty senate provided a method to view the institution's culture and that it contributed to the socialization process. Conversely, the faculty senate was viewed as a rite of passage for non-black faculty. Participation in the faculty senate ultimately aided in fostering relationships amongst other faculty administrators. Administrators attempted to articulate the mission and traditions of the institution, and in doing so, contextualize the socialization process. This finding suggested that further examination of the involvement of both black and non-black faculty is needed, thus providing insight to the various prospective on faculty senate held by HBCU faculty members.

Implication for Policy and Practice

This study has several implications for policies and practices in regards to both faculty and administrators at HBCUs. However, these implications discussed could also benefit policies and practices at PWIs. Faculty socialization can influence academic environments and their culture. The policies and practices suggested a deliberate effort on the part of institutions to develop positive socialization experiences for faculty members.

The findings in this study emphasized the context of an institution in relationship to the socialization process. Hence, HBCU administrators should develop annual faculty climate surveys. A survey would provide administrators with a continued pulse of the experiences of black and non-black faculty. Further, an annual survey would determine the effectiveness of programs and policies involving faculty. Such a survey could be administered periodically to all faculty members. Understanding the climate of the institution as perceived by faculty would assist in the socialization experiences of both black and non-black faculty members.

Several faculty indicated they occasionally participated in campus events. These events were mostly required, such as convocation and Founders Day. However, the finding suggested that faculty lacked interest in events that were held after hours. Participants indicated several reasons that restricted their involvement in such events. Many individuals indicated they would attend events after "regular hours" if they were focused on faculty and provided time to interact with colleagues informally. Thus, a recommended policy would be that the institutions develop weekly or monthly social events for faculty. Such events would build collegial relationships between faculty and administrators. Faculty would develop a greater connection to the institution. Additionally these events will foster informal socialization for both black and non-black faculty.

Participants of this study indicated that they all attended the campus-wide orientation program. However, several faculty indicated that the orientation lacked substance and information. Hence, HBCU administrators must develop policies and procedures that continually evaluate the effectiveness of the orientation program.

Additionally the orientation program should provide faculty with opportunities to interact informally with faculty. For example, the evening after the orientation program the institution should hold a social event that would include deans and department heads, new faculty and their families. Thus beyond initiating faculty to institutional policies, faculty would have another opportunity to develop relationships. Faculty indicated that isolation is one challenging component of the socialization process. This isolation is exacerbated in the experiences of non-black faculty at a HBCU. Opportunities to socialize with other faculty members would diminish social isolation.

An additional component of the orientation should include a brief overview of HBCUs and their mission. This overview should include discussions on the Higher Education Act of 1965, the act that designated which institutions are recognize as HBCUs. Additionally the founding principles of HBCUs should be discussed to provide both black and non-black faculty members with an understanding of the institution's history, culture and tradition. Several participants indicated that their lack of information on HBCUs proved frustrating during anticipatory socialization. Hence providing information and literature to faculty about HBCUs would assist them to better understand the institution, its culture, and their role within the institution.

Faculty in this study held various views of the institution's goals and mission. Further many participants had difficulty articulating the institution's focus during interviews. The lack of a clear mission had adverse effects on the socialization process. HBCU administrators should create processes, which ensure that the mission of the institution is clearly stated. Such procedures will allow faculty to understand their roles as institutional members in relationship to the institution's mission.

Limitations

There were some limitations to this study that restricted the generalization of the results and findings. The most apparent limitation was the race of the researcher. Being a black man had the potential to influence the responses of the participants. The trustworthy procedures discussed in Chapter 3 were utilized; however, some participants may have been concerned with discussing socialization at a historically black institution with a black male. Some participants may have been hesitant in being forthright with their views, particularly issues related to race. This limitation may have influenced the opinions expressed about family perspectives of their employment at an HBCU.

The sample in this study consisted of Asian, White and Latino faculty from various colleges at the institution. Further procedures outlined in Chapter 3 were used to insure that participants had significant experience at the institution. Therefore, these faculty members were able to discuss their socialization experiences at the institution. However, the population at the institution dictated the sample size and selection. Conversely, Asian and Whites are primarily represented in this study. Thus, caution is suggested in generalizing these findings to Latino Faculty.

Finally, HBCUs have a similar set of cultures and traditions. These elements bound and distinguish them from other institutions. However, each institution has a unique set of characteristics such as location, institution type and size. These characteristics may influence the environment and individuals at these institutions. In applying these findings to other HBCUs, context should be taken into consideration.

Future Research

Several implications for future research are generated by this study. These studies can both increase the literature on organizational socialization and HBCUs. This study focused on non-black faculty at a HBCU; however, additional research should focus on the socialization experiences of a particular racial group. Hence, a study examining the socialization experiences of one racial group such as Asian, White and Latino faculty would provide insight into the socialization experience for specific groups. Additionally this effort would provide comparative literature to explore the relation of racial experiences of faculty at HBCUs.

Given the fact that study focused on one institution and was bounded by a unique culture and environment, research should be conducted that focused on multiple cases, thus providing a comparative examination of socialization of non-black faculty. Several non-black faculty were involved in the faculty senate and governance. Further research is needed on the academic governance at HBCUs. Such a study could investigate the history of academic governance and the experiences of faculty and administrators.

This study examined the perception of faculty and provided insight to their experiences. An intriguing further study would examine the socialization of non-black administrators at HBCUs. Such a study would provide literature to understanding the culture and norm of HBCUs and insight to organizational socialization. Additionally this study focused on full-time faculty members at a HBCU. While full-time faculty represents a large population at the institution, adjuncts also have an important role in the academic function of the institution. Thus, a study that focused on the socialization

experiences of non-black adjunct faculty would provide insight into institutional structure and organizational culture.

Finally, future research is needed on the perspectives of non-black faculty from black students, administrators and faculty. Interviewing these stakeholders at HBCUs would provide a comparative analysis to the views and perceptions held by non-black faculty in regards to their socialization.

Conclusion

HBCUs have been essential in the education of blacks. Their goals have both racial and educational implications that extend beyond their humble beginnings. Their culture and traditions have continued to influence how they continue to exist in higher education. HBCUs continue to educate a significant number of black students and provide support and an invaluable resource to the black community. However, HBCUs have also faced several challenges that influence their perspectives in higher education.

The culture of HBCUs is essential in understanding their environments. These institutions have traditionally been heavily student centered and focused on academic opportunity. This emphasis stems from mission established by early HBCUs, which focused on access for those that were denied education. Further, HBCUs were viewed as the vehicles for social justice and success for African Americans. Crucial to this culture were white educators that assisted in establishing and developing these institutions. These individuals served as administrators and faculty in these institutions. Thus in many facets these white faculty assisted in shaping the culture at these institutions.

Today whites and non-blacks have an influence at these HBCUs. The presence of non-black faculty is more noticeable in the faculty ranks. Further, the amount of non-black faculty has also increased in recent years at several institutions. However, black men and women still consist of the majority of HBCU administrators, instructors, and students. Thus, HBCUs are environments in which individuals that are social minorities comprise the majority. Non-black faculty at HBCUs transform from being the majority to operating as a minority. How the dual status of non-black faculty influences their socialization at HBCUs is the essence of this study.

Thus, my goal in this dissertation was to understand how non-black faculty perceived their socialization at an HBCU. I sought to explore how non-black faculty came to understand the culture and norms of a HBCU. I used Feldman's theory of socialization to examine the socialization process and how variables influenced the process of socialization. The findings in this study indicated that faculty socialization experiences were similar to the socialization experiences of faculty at other institutions. Thus, faculty in this student associated themselves primary with the culture of faculty. Further they negotiated various tasks, balanced external conflicts and navigated the university culture. However, while race would appear to be the most influential variable in their socialization, the findings suggest that the culture of HBCU was the most prominent. The culture involved athletic events, student activities, and academic opportunities. These factors influenced the socialization process and shaped the perspectives of non-black faculty members at these institutions. Race was obviously an important construct and related to culture. But it was the latter that determined what it

meant to work at a historically black institution. While some faculty encountered racial dilemmas, the majority were able to navigate their socialization successfully.

Understanding faculty socialization is essential to understanding the climate of an institution. The findings in this study provide an understanding of non-black faculty socialization at HBCUs. The conclusions also assist in understanding the socialization of various faculty and the role culture plays in shaping experiences. Ultimately, such conclusions will benefit HBCU administrators focused on faculty socialization and the impact of culture on all institutional stakeholders.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R., & Moore, S. E. (2008). The benefits, challenges, and strategies of African American faculty teaching at predominantly white institutions. *Journal of African American Studies, 12*(1), 4-18.

Allen, W. R., & Jewell, J. O. (2002). A backward glance forward: Past, present, and future perspectives on historically black colleges and universities. *Review of Higher Education, 25*(3), 241-261.

Anderson, J. D. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the south, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories*. Philadelphia, PA.: Open University Press

Billingsley, A. (1982). Building strong faculties in black colleges. *Journal of Negro Education, 51*(1), 4-15

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). Qualitative research in education. An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogler, R., & Kremer-Hayon, L. (1999). The socialization of faculty members to university culture and norms. *Journal of Further & Higher Education, 23*(1), 31-40.

Bowels, F., & Decosta, F. (1971). Between two worlds: A profile of negro higher education. New York: MaGraw-Hill.

Braxton, J. M., & Hargens, L. L. (1996). Variation among academic disciplines: Analytical frameworks and research. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, 11*(1), 1–45.

Brown, M. C., & Freeman, K. (2004). *Black colleges: New perspectives on policy and practice*. Westport,CT: Praeger Publishers.

Browning, J. E., & Williams, J. B. (1978). *History and goals of black institutions of higher learning. black colleges in America: Challenge, development.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Butner, B. K., Burley, H., & Marbley, A. F. (2000). Coping with the unexpected: Black faculty at predominately white institutions. *Journal of Black Studies, 30*(3), 453-462.

Clark, B. R. (1989). The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. *Educational Researcher, 18*(5), 4-8.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. San Francisco: Sage Publications Inc.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (2007). *The souls of black folk*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dwyer, B. (2006). Framing the effect of multiculturalism on diversity outcomes among students at historically black colleges and universities. *Educational Foundations, 20*(1) 37-59.

Essien, V. (2003). Visible and invisible barriers to the incorporation of faculty of color in predominantly white law schools. *Journal of Black Studies, 34*(1), 63-71.

Fink, L. D. (1992). Orientation programs for new faculty. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 50*, 39-49.

Foster, L. (2001). The not-so-invisible professor: White faculty at the black college. *Urban Education, 36*(5), 611.

Foster, L., Guyden, J. A., & Miller, A. L. (1999). *Affirmed action essays on the academic and social lives of white faculty members at historically black colleges and universities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Frierson, C. L. (1993). *Perceptions of African American educators toward historically black colleges and universities.* Retrieved from ERIC.

Gordon, J. (2007). What can white faculty do? *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(3), 337-347.

Henderson, V. W. (1967). The role of the predominantly negro institutions. *The Journal of Negro Education, 36*(3), 266-273.

Hirt, J. B., Strayhorn, T. L., Amelink, C. T., & Bennett, B. R. (2006). The nature of student affairs work at historically black colleges and universities. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(6), 661-667.

Holley, K. (2009). Animal research practices and doctoral student identity development in a scientific community. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(1), 1-15.

Holmes, D. (1934). The evolution of the negro college. New York: *The Teachers College Record, 36*(4), 242-243.

It's America's black colleges that have the nation's most racially diverse faculties (2002) *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 36, 62-63.

Jackson-Coppin, F. (1987). *Reminiscences of school life, and hints on teaching*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Jewell, J. O. (2002). To set an example: The tradition of diversity at historically black colleges and universities. *Urban Education, 37*(1), 7-21.

Johnson, B. J. (2001). Faculty socialization: Lessons learned from urban black colleges. *Urban Education, 36*(5), 630-647.

Johnson, B. J., & Harvey, W. (2002). The socialization of black college faculty: Implications for policy and practice. *Review of Higher Education, 25*, 297-314.

Keup, J. R., Walker, A. A., Astin, H. S., & Lindholm, J. A. (2001). *Organizational culture and institutional transformation*. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 435–460.

Linton, R. (1936). *The study of man*. New York: Appleton-Century.

Logan, R. W. (1969). *Howard University: The first hundred years, 1867-1967*. New York: New York University Press.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 25*(2), 226-251.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Minor, J.T. (2005). Discerning facts about faculty governance at HBCUs. *Academe*, (91)3, 34-37.

Moore, W., & Wagstaff, L. H. (1974). *Black educators in white colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (U.S.), & NAFEO Research Institute. (1991). *Factbook on blacks in higher education and in historically and predominantly black colleges and universities*. Washington, D.C:

NAFEO Research Institute, Black Higher Education Center.

O Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education, 26*(1), 57-80.

Palmer, R., & Gasman, M. (2008). It takes a village to raise a child: Social capital and academic success at historically black colleges and universities. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*, 52-70.

Provasnik, S., & Shafer, L. (2004). *Historically black colleges and universities, 1976 to 2001*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Richards, P. M. (1998). A stranger in the village: A black professor at a white college. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 21*, 88-93.

Roebuck, J. (1993). *Historically black colleges and universities : Their place in American higher education.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rudolph, F. (1965). *The American college and university*. New York: Vintage Books.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Slater, R. B. (1993). White professors at black colleges. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 1*, 67-70.

Smith, S. L., & Borgstedt, K. W. (1985). Factors influencing adjustment of white faculty in predominantly black colleges. *The Journal of Negro Education, 54*(2), 148-163.

Sorcinelli, M. D., & Near, J. P. (1989). Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 60*(1), 59-81.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Strauss, A. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

The crossroads of history: America's best black colleges. (2007). Retrieved November 23, 2007, from US News and World Report Web site: http://www.usnews.com/articles/education/historically-black-colleges/2007/09/28/americas-best-black-colleges.html.

The persisting racial gap in college student graduation rates (2004). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 45*, 77-85.

The tradition of white presidents at black colleges (1997). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 16*, 93-99.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(1), 1-16.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education, 59*(1), 2-21.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). *Faculty socialization as a cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.93- 6). Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Trowler, P., & Knight, P. (1999). Organizational socialization and induction in universities: Reconceptualizing theory and practice. *Higher Education, 37*(2), 177-195.

Warnat, W. I. (1976). The role of white faculty on the black college campus. *The Journal of Negro Education, 45*(3), 334-338.

Washington, B. T. (1901). *Up from slavery: An autobiography*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co.

Watkins, W. (2001). *The white architects of black education: Ideology and power in America, 1865-1954*. New York: Teachers College Press.

White professors teaching at the historically black colleges (1998). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 20*, 62-63.

Williams, H. (2005). *Self-taught : African American education in slavery and freedom*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Woodson, C. G. (2004). *The Education of the negro prior to 1861: A history of the education of the colored people of the United States from the beginning of slavery to the Civil War*. Kessinger Publishing.

Wyche, J. H., & Frierson, H. T. (1990). Minorities at majority institutions. *Science, 249*(4972), 989-991.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications Inc.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

Introduction **Overview of Study**	Doctoral Student at University of Alabama Interested in socialization of non-black faculty at an HBCU, specifically how they come to understand the norms and culture of the institution	
Question	**Exploring**	**Research Question**
What is valued in the department and institution? How do you obtain information about the campus?	Norms and Culture	How do non-black faculty members come to understand the norms and culture of the institution How do non-black faculty members interact with their colleagues?
What is your level of interaction with students? Do you feel that students are willing to approach you?	Working with Students	How do non-black faculty members interact with students?

Examining the Socialization Process of non-black faculty	
What problems did you encounter when the institution first hired you? How did you view HBCUs prior your employment here? Why did you select to work at an HBCU?	Anticipatory Stage
How did you come to understand your role as a professor here? What tasks are you expected to perform as a faculty member at the institution?	Accommodation Stage

How do family members perceive your employment at HBCU? In what campus activities do you participate? How do you mediate conflicts that exist within your work environment? What are your goals as a faculty member? What external conflict do you experience for working at an HBCU?	Role Management

How did you come to understand the norms and culture of the institution? As a faculty member, what activities did you participate in that assisted your socialization?	Formal vs. Informal Socialization

Appendix B

Table of Participants

Name	Race	Discipline	Length of Service
Amy	White	Theater	11 years
Robert	White	Communication	7 years
Deepak	Indian	Computer Sciences	18 years
Michelin	White	English	33 years
Todd	White	Education	20 years
Rushir	Asian	Biology	10 years
Jacob	Indian	Biology	12 years
Lu	Asian	Computer Sciences	8 years
Ronald	White	Education	7 years
Anita	Asian	History	12 years
Thomas	White	Visual Arts	9 years
James	White	Music	14 years
Sanjay	Asian	Math	9 years
Mary	Asian	Chemistry	7 years
Mark	Asian	English	21 years
Phyllis	White	English	8 years
Jennifer	White	Social Work	12 years
Michelle	White	Communication	10 years
Emilie	Asian	Visual Arts	10 years
James	White	Literature	6 years

Appendix C

Invitation to Study Letter

Dr. ,

My name is Kenley Obas and I am a doctoral candidate in higher education administration at the University of Alabama. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements of my degree on the Socialization of Non-Black Faculty at a Historically Black College and University (HBCU) and I would like to invite you to participate.

This study focuses on how non-black faculty members come to understand the norms and culture of HBCUs. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to meet with me for an interview. In particular, we will discuss your perceptions and experiences as a faculty member at an HBCU. The meeting will take place at a mutually agreed upon time and place, and should last about an hour. The interview will be audio recorded so that I can accurately reflect on the discussion. The audiotapes will only be reviewed by the researcher in order to transcribe and analyze them. Upon the completion of the research study all transcripts and audiotapes will be destroyed.

I wish to make this process as comfortable for you as possible. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to. Although you may not benefit directly from participating in this study, I hope that others will benefit by gaining insight on your socialization at an HBCU.

Participation is confidential. The results of the study may be published, but your identity will not be revealed.

I would be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. You may contact me at 334-224-1882 khobas@bama.ua.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Michael Harris, 205-348-1731 mharris@bamaed.ua.edu if you have study related questions. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer at (205)-348-5152.

Thank you for your consideration. If you would like to participate, please contact me at the number listed below. I will also call you within the next week as a follow up to this invitation.

With best regards,

Kenley

Appendix D

IRB Approval

Office for Research

Office of the Chair,
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA
RESEARCH

October 21, 2008

Kenley H. Obas
ELPTS
College of Education
The University of Alabama

Re: IRB # 08-OR-231 "The Socialization of White Faculty at an HBCU"

Dear Mr. Obas:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your protocol has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the assigned IRB application number. Please use reproductions of the IRB approved informed consent form to obtain consent from your participants.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director of Research Compliance & Research Compliance Officer
Office of Research Compliance
The University of Alabama

152 Rose Administration Building
Box 870104
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0104
(205) 348-5152
FAX (205) 348-8882

870104

08-02-231

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

I. Identifying information

	Principal Investigator	Second Investigator	Third Investigator
Name:	Kenley H. Obas	Michael S. Harris, Ed.D	
Department:	ELTPS	ELTPS	
College:	Education	Education	
University:	University of Alabama	University of Alabama	
Address:	3511 Summerhill Ridge Montgomery, AL 36111	Box 870302	
Telephone:	334-356-5328	334-348-1731	
FAX:		334-348-2161	
E-mail:	obas818@gmail.com	mharris@bamaed.ua.edu	

Title of Research Project: The Socialization of White Faculty at an HBCU

Date Printed: 6/12/2008 Funding Source: ~~N/A~~ None

Type of Proposal: _X_New | __Revision __Renewal __Completed | __Exempt

Attach a renewal application

Attach a continuing review of studies form

Please enter the original IRB # at the top of the page

UA faculty or staff member signature: Michael Harris

II. NOTIFICATION OF IRB ACTION (to be completed by IRB):

Type of Review: _____ Full board _ ___ Expedited

IRB Action:

___Rejected Date:_____

___Tabled Pending Revisions Date:_____

___Approved Pending Revisions Date:_____

X Approved—this proposal complies with University and federal regulations for the protection of human sub

Approval is effective until the following date. 10/20/09

Items approved:

___ Research protocol: dated

___ Informed consent: dated

___ Recruitment materials: dated

___ Other: dated

Approval signature Judy Green Date 10/20/08

IRB #_____

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Individual's Consent to be In a Research Study

You are being asked to participate in a research project conducted by Kenley H. Obas, a doctoral student in the College of Education at the University of Alabama. The advisor for this research project is Dr. Michael Harris, professor of Higher Education Administration at the University of Alabama. The purpose of this study is to examine the socialization of non-black faculty at a Historically Black College and University (HBCU).

Is the researcher making money from this study?
The researcher is not being paid for this research.

What is this study about?
The purpose of this dissertation is to understand the experiences of non-black faculty employed at a historically black institution. This study will capture the perception of a group of non-black faculty and how they come to understand the norms and culture of the institution.

Why is this study important—What good will the results do?

The results may show higher education administrator how to better assist non-black faculty members in their socialization at HBCUs. In addition, I expect this research to benefit faculty members seeking employment at a historically black college and university by providing them with insight into the socialization process.

Why have I been asked to take part in this study?

You have been asked to be in this study because you are a non-black (White, Latino, Asian, Native American) faculty who is a tenure-track or non-tenure track faculty member with a terminal degree.

How many other people will be in this study?

This student will interview 29 other non-black faculty members at your institution.

What will I be asked to do in this study?

If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to do the following: Participate in an hour and half interview. This interview will focus on questions about your experiences at Alabama State University. After the interview you will be ask to review a transcript of

your interview to insure accuracy. Your interview will be audio recorded and then transcribed. The audio tapes will be deleted upon the completion of the research study, approximatey 4 months. The audiotapes will be kept in a locked file cabinet at the home of the researcher.

How much time will I spend being in this study?

You will spend approximately an hour and a half being interviewed for this study, in addition to anytime spent reviewing the accuracy of your interview.

What will this study cost me?

The main cost to you is the time you will spend being interviewed.

Will I be paid for being in this study?

You will not be paid for being in this study.

What are the risks (problems or dangers) from being in this study?

The potential risks associated with this study are potential loss of personal time. There is also the possibility that you may become fatigue during the course of the interview. You may also feel some discomforts while discussing issues related to your work environment. The risk of a breach of confidentiality that might affect your employment status has been minimized by the confidentiality procedures discussed below. Any significant new findings developed during the course of this research that uncover new risks, which may affect your willingness to continue participation, will be provided to you in writing.

What are the benefits of being in this study?

I expect the project to benefit you by providing an opportunity to discuss your socialization process. In addition, I expect this research to benefit faculty members seeking employment at a historically black college and university by providing them with insight into the socialization process.

What are the benefits to scientists?

The research study will provide empirical evidence and increased understanding of socialization of non-black faculty at HBCUs. Specifically how these individuals come to understand the culture and norm of HBCUs.

What are the alternatives to being in this study?

The alternative to participation is not to participate.

What are my rights as a participant?

Please understand that participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will in no way affect your current or future relationship with Alabama State University. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without penalty. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question(s) for any reason, without penalty.

How will my confidentiality (privacy) be protected?

I will keep whatever information you provide confidential and secure. No one other than me will have access to the information, and the information you provide will not be identified by your name. Only I will have access to the transcripts and my observation notes. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all publications or presentations resulting from this study. You and your institution will be identified with pseudonyms in this research project. All tapes consent forms and interview transcripts will be secured in a field cabinet. All data collected for this study will be destroyed in approximately four months.

Could the researchers take me out of the study?

Yes. There are many reasons why the researchers may need to end your participation in the study. Some examples are:

- The researcher believes that it is not in your best interest to stay in the study.
- Your status at the institution changes.
- The study is suspended or canceled

I understand that The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (a committee that maintains the ethical treatment of people in research studies) will review study records from time to time. This is to be sure that participants in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

If you have immediate questions about this study, please ask them. If you have questions about this study later on, please call the investigator Kenley Obas at 334-224-1882 or my faculty advisor, Dr. Michael Harris, 205-348-1731.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at 205-348-5152.

I have read this consent document. I understand its contents and freely consent to participate in this study under the conditions described. I will receive a copy of this consent forms or my records.

Research Subject:_____ Date:_____

Investigator:_____Date:_____

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 10-20-08
EXPIRATION DATE: 10-20-09