

## **THE SOCIALIZATION PROCESS OF NEW COLLEGE FACULTY IN FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES TEACHER EDUCATION**

**Maggie Lichty, California State University Long Beach  
Daisy L. Stewart, Virginia Tech**

*This study examined the socialization experiences of ten new Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) teacher educators in four-year college institutions in nine states elicited through 60- to 90-minute, tape-recorded interviews conducted either by telephone or in person. Data were analyzed using the constant comparative method. All participants believed their experiences in secondary teaching provided the foundation for their careers and formed the basis for their career decision of being a teacher educator. Participants believed graduate school professors provided the role modeling crucial in preparing them for their future career. Challenging, relevant coursework and opportunities for a variety of professional experiences during graduate school prepared most participants well for their faculty roles. Other participants believed their transition to a faculty role was an overwhelming and unhappy experience. All respondents reported their second year to be more positive than their first year and made recommendations for improving the socialization process of new FCS teacher educators.*

*Implications for teacher education programs include examining graduate program coursework for relevance and application and including opportunities for increased responsibility in professional experiences related to teaching, research, and service. Graduate students without mentors in the profession should be matched with prominent mentors from other institutions to enhance their professional success. Department chairs should reduce the teaching, advising, and service loads for new faculty during their first year. Administrators should provide detailed, written information regarding workload, performance expectations, evaluation, promotion and tenure, and should organize meetings for new faculty to discuss with them this information.*

The field of Family and Consumer Sciences Education (FCSE) has not experienced much faculty turnover or attrition in the last twenty years. However, this situation may soon change as increasing numbers of professors leave their careers for retirement (Kellett & Beard, 1991). In order to retain current FCSE faculty or hire replacements for retiring FCSE faculty, Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) departments must face the challenge of finding ways to engage the talent and enthusiasm of new faculty while supporting them through the period of orientation and socialization into the academic culture of the university.

Student recruitment is one of the many important tasks FCS teacher educators are being asked to manage (Gritzmacher, 1997). Low student enrollments in teacher education programs jeopardize the existence of programs. The national directory of the family and consumer sciences division of the association for career and technical education (Kreutzer, 1999) provides information regarding the total number of graduates in undergraduate and graduate programs of colleges and universities. The numbers of graduates in recent years have been decreasing, with many institutions showing one or none in the 1998-99 school year. It is imperative that teacher

educators are able to fulfill their commitment to teaching, research, and service and have the time and resources for successful recruitment of new students (Gritzmacher, 1997). This responsibility adds stress to the already stressful “publish or perish” environment of new FCSE faculty members in research universities who are trying to “learn the ropes” in departments where they are often the only faculty member in FCSE.

### **Related Literature**

The pre-tenure years for new college faculty include a period of organizational socialization during which faculty adjust to the expectations of their new roles. Depending on what happens during the socialization period of new faculty, they may adapt very successfully to their new environments, becoming effective organizational members. However, they may also adapt poorly and become cynical, adopting values, attitudes, and behaviors at odds with the organization culture (Baum, 1990).

Socialization or “learning the ropes” of being a college faculty member can be exhilarating, but it can also be highly stressful (Mezei, 1994). New college faculty often describe their socialization experience as a painful and difficult process because they struggled with unclear performance expectations (Boice, 1992). They face the challenges of teaching under-prepared, ethnically diverse, and nontraditional students (Roueche & Roueche, 1993); they sometimes work in isolation from potentially helpful peers (Boice, 1992); and they usually find full-time college teaching to be more demanding than they anticipated (Sorcinelli, 1988).

The socialization process is generally experienced in three phases over a period of several years: (a) the anticipatory socialization phase, which includes special training and preparation for the new career, developing personal expectations of their new career, and acquiring their first position (Wanous, 1991); (b) the entry and induction phase, where the newcomer confronts the differences between their expectations and the actual role that exists, compares the new position to their previous position, and learns the new role (Corcoran & Clark, 1984); and (c) the continuing socialization and career development phase, which occurs as the newcomer masters skills, adjusts to the new job and new colleagues, and begins to feel like an “insider” (Corcoran & Clark, 1984).

The literature on the socialization process of new and beginning college faculty tends to be based on new faculty who may or may not have had teacher education and who may have come straight from graduate school to teach in a university setting with no prior teaching experience at all. What about new FCS teacher educators? What is the socialization process like for them?

### **Purpose of the Study**

Research is needed to understand the socialization process of new faculty in FCS education in order to provide better preparation for and smoother transition to their new positions. Historically in FCS education, teacher educators have not been a primary focus of research (Chadderdon & Fanslow, 1996; Nelson, 1982). This lack of research on teacher educators was evident in the Review and Synthesis of Research in Home Economics Education (Redick & Gritzmacher, 1986); however, the importance of teacher educators is not disputed. The satisfaction and support teacher educators feel regarding their work affects their interaction with and preparation of pre-service teachers, which in turn affects future programs and students.

The purpose of this study was to examine the socialization process into college teaching experience of tenure-track FCS teacher educators in four-year institutions. Included in the study

were their interpretations of career preparation, the first job, the first year of socialization, continuing socialization and career development, and their recommendations for improving the socialization process. Critical issues addressed in this research project were focused around the following research questions:

1. What were the socialization experiences of FCS teacher educators who began their college teaching careers after 1990?
2. How were the socialization experiences similar and different among new college faculty members in FCS education?
3. How did the tenure-track FCS teacher educators' socialization experiences relate to aspects of organizational socialization theory?

If new faculty in FCSE experience a smooth socialization into college teaching, they may feel a higher level of satisfaction with their career decisions, which could result in increased productivity in terms of recruiting, retaining, and certifying quality teachers, service to the community and the profession, and informed research to support FCS professionals in the field.

## **Method**

### Selection of Participants

In May of 1998, requests for the names of new teacher educators since 1990 were sent to the supervisors of FCS education in departments of education in each of the 50 states. Responses were received from 22 states, resulting in 25 names of possible participants. In June, 1998, follow-up letters were sent to the 28 state supervisors who had not responded. Seven additional responses were received with the names of three more possible participants. Finally, the major institutions of the states from which responses had not been received were contacted by phone to request names of new FCS teacher educators. As a result of the phone calls, the names of 15 additional new teacher educators were received. This brought the total number of state responding to 44, with 43 possible participants for the study.

In September of 1998, letters of invitation for participation and forms requesting demographic information were sent to the 43 possible participants. Follow-up letters were sent to non-respondents after three weeks. Of the 34 responses received, 24 indicated willingness to participate. The 24 willing participants were screened based on the following criteria: holds a doctoral degree; began a college tenure-track position later than 1990; is a full-time, non-tenured faculty member; has taught at least one full academic year; and is teaching at least one education course in FCS. Fourteen of the 24 respondents who were willing to participate were eliminated from the study as they did not meet the selection criteria. The final sample consisted of ten female respondents.

### **Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted with two new faculty members who fit the profile. One faculty member was in education foundations and one was in FCSE. One interview was conducted on the telephone and one was conducted in person. Each interview lasted approximately 60 to 90 minutes. Revisions were made to the interview instrument and process as suggested by the pilot study participants.

## **Data Collection**

This study utilized the phenomenological approach, in which human experiences are examined through the detailed descriptions of the people being studied (Moustakas, 1994). A qualitative methodology was chosen because it seemed best suited for encouraging faculty to “tell their stories,” reflect on and describe their experiences, and explore their perceptions of their socialization into full-time college teaching.

The final interview instrument consisted of 49 open-ended questions which were designed around six topics or phases related to the new college professor’s journey: participant information, career preparation, the first job, the first year of socialization, continuing socialization and career development, and respondents’ recommendations. The instrument was designed as a result of the major topics and themes generated from an extensive review of the literature on college faculty socialization.

The participants were given the choice of being interviewed by telephone or in person at the upcoming annual meeting of the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE) in New Orleans. Five interviews were conducted in person at either the researcher’s or the participant’s hotel room at the ACTE meeting, and five were conducted by telephone from the researcher’s residence to either the personal residences or the university offices of the participants. A late program change at the meeting in New Orleans caused one personal interview to be cancelled. It was conducted the next week as a telephone interview.

## **Analysis of Data**

The audio-taped interviews were transcribed into working copies for the researcher. The authenticity of the transcripts was verified by the researcher who listened to random selections. As each transcription was read, code words were developed by the researcher to identify key ideas and concepts being expressed by the respondent. The data was continually contrasted, compared, and then classified into a taxonomy of themes using the categories which had been identified by the researcher (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

## **Findings and Discussion**

The typical FCS teacher educator who participated in this study can be characterized as a white female in her mid-40s. She had eight to ten years of secondary teaching experience and less than five years of non tenure-track college teaching or other experience in higher education. She typically received her doctorate in a Research I institution in the eastern region of the United States. In her first position she was the only FCS teacher educator in a research or doctoral institution in the central region of the country. At the time of the interview, the typical FCS teacher educator was in her fourth year of tenure-track college teaching and taught education classes in both undergraduate and graduate programs in a department of FCS, as well as courses in other content areas.

Having a background that included secondary teaching experience played an important role in shaping the belief system of new FCS teacher educators; however, most of the respondents believed they had not been adequately prepared for their job as an FCS teacher in a secondary school. They believed society’s impact on families has changed the way teachers should teach, but they also believed teaching at the secondary level provided a foundation for their careers and formed the basis for their future career decision of being a teacher educator.

A description of the socialization experiences of new FCS teacher educators highlighting similarities and differences among new college faculty follows. The discussion includes related

organization socialization theory to help in the interpretation of the findings. The interview data resulted in findings categorized as themes related to career preparation, the first tenure-track position, socialization during the first year, continuing socialization and career development, and recommendations for improving the socialization process.

### Career Preparation

The majority of respondents remarked about the relevancy and challenge their graduate coursework provided. Their comments were consistent with Wanous' (1980) theory which identified training skills as a socialization tactic during anticipatory socialization. One respondent in particular mentioned graduate courses that focused on curriculum change and reform, which she viewed as a strength her preparation as a teacher educator because she now knows "the bigger questions to ask." Another respondent mentioned lesson planning and evaluation courses as providing her with the training skills she would need for her career. Yet another described the opportunities her coursework provided for application of learning. One respondent described a common feeling among this group of beginning college faculty that some courses were valuable, while others were not.

I think I had particular courses that I really enjoyed, some I did not. Some I will still be figuring out the rest of my life... because they were so challenging....Some of them were drawbacks and... some courses were not challenging to me....I wish I had pursued some particular content areas more so, where now I feel gaps and wish I had that information and don't really have time at this point to go take another course.

Louis, Posner, and Powell (1983) found that graduate school was a primary source of anticipatory socialization for faculty members. Fisher (1986) believed organization newcomers developed personal expectations of their careers during the anticipatory socialization phase of socialization. All ten respondents referred to their professors as role models who made certain they "had the necessary experiences for our careers as teacher educators." Role models served as the base for the respondents to develop their expectations for their own careers. They felt their professors were strongly committed to mentoring and preparing the next generation. Even the respondent whose doctoral professor was losing her position because of elimination of the program believed she saw the whole picture of what it meant to be a teacher educator from her advisor's experiences. One respondent described her professors in the following way:

I think I had the best. I wouldn't be here if it wasn't for many of them. And that is really what convinced me that this is what I wanted to do. And I had people that were strongly committed to mentoring and preparing the next generation....I was very fortunate that I had lots of people that knew how to do that.

The majority of respondents had opportunities to maximize their teacher educator training while in graduate school with experiences related to teaching, advising, supervising student teachers, conducting research, and publishing their work. The experiences of the respondents represented the elements valued by their institutions, elements that Boice (1992) found new faculty carried into their new institutions after graduate school. In fact, one

respondent actually felt she was “able to go to my first university position and hit the ground running with publication.”

I felt they helped us do [the writing and publishing]. We [wrote and published] as part of our graduate programs.... They helped me put together an agenda so that when I left I was already launched. I wasn't starting cold. I was able to go to my first university position and hit the ground running with publication. And I think that is such an obligation that we have. I am really committed to doing that for my own graduate students....

### The First Job

Acquiring the first job is a major component of the anticipatory socialization phase. Personal expectations of careers are developed from messages and information received from a variety of sources (Fisher, 1986). In this study, respondents learned about their positions from announcements in their departments, higher education journals, and through their professional organizations.

In an interesting variation to the findings of a study by Gibbs, Gold, and Jenkins (1987), the respondents' expectations continued to form throughout the interview process and through any communication related to acquiring their first position. However, several of the respondents in this study found that the impressions they had formed during their interviews later turned out to be false, such as believing a specific faculty member had the most decision-making power, believing the collegiality of the faculty was better than it really was, or believing the program had a larger enrollment than it really did.

According to Tierney and Rhoads (1993), various cultures such as faculties, disciplines, individuals, and institutions affect the socialization process. This was found to be true with the respondents of this study. When respondents were asked what type of position they preferred, all but one had a preference for the faculty, such as FCS education, general education, textiles and clothing, or position, such as tenure or a non tenure-track, which they sought. Respondents also had preferences for a type of institution, knowing there was a different emphasis on work roles within various types of institutions. Another cultural aspect was the respondents' views of the quality of their programs. About one-half of the respondents believed the quality was high; the other one-half believed the quality of the program could be improved.

What I'm concentrating on right now is trying to look for good students. I'm not interested in just students who are just trying to find some way to get out of college. I'm interested in looking at high quality teachers and I am taking these students although I only see them technically for two courses, I try to do a lot with them as far as technology is concerned. They are doing things like PowerPoint presentations....I'm looking for a good quality student who is a hard worker. I am pretty selective about what I'm looking for because I believe that is the only way we are going to improve the image of home economics in the secondary schools too.

Peer groups were described as invaluable and included various combinations of individuals, from new to senior to emeriti faculty, and from other departments as well as their own. They described commonalities with members of their peer groups, such as newness to

institution, students, research, personal interests, religion, and family types. This appears to align with Fisher's (1986) research, which found that newcomers usually selected their own peer groups according to similarity of roles, perception of their expertise, and availability. This also supports the findings of Gibbs et al., (1987), who found that integration of newcomers seemed to occur faster when they held positions where their lifestyles were similar to those of the existing faculty. One respondent mentioned specifically that she interacted with members of her peer group on a daily basis, which is consistent with findings of Louis et al., (1983), who found that daily interaction with peers was the most helpful strategy for achieving feelings of effectiveness in newcomers.

[The other new FCS faculty] are my peer group because we have this commonality being non-tenured and trying to figure out this process, and I feel like there is a sense of camaraderie in that. A sense of peer group has evolved since I've been here because over the last year my department chair has organized us into being kind of a support group and we meet regularly, once or twice a semester. Sometimes we have met for full days, sometimes we have met for lunch or whatever and [talk] about issues in relationship to becoming tenured, and talk about our [specific philosophical writings] and things like that.

### Socialization During the First Year

The second phase of the socialization process is referred to as entry and induction (Corcoran & Clark, 1984), encounter (Van Maanen, 1975), initial entry (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993), and accommodation (Feldman, 1976). Feldman found that upon entering a new organization, the newcomers confront the differences between their expectations (which were formed in the anticipatory socialization phase) and the actual role that exists.

Louis (1980a) referred to the comparisons of various differences that are made in this stage as "sensemaking." The existing environment is an important component in this process. One respondent referred to the comparison of her new position with her old job as a secondary teacher in another region of the country as "reality shock." Louis (1980a) called it "culture shock" and labels this form of comparing old to new as "sensemaking of change."

Also in the entry phase, some respondents compared the differences in the faculty's approach to work and others compared differences in the faculty's approach to socializing. Louis called this "sensemaking of contrast." All the respondents revealed differences between their expectations of the job and the realities of the job, most of which were related to the demands and the intensity of the job. This is referred to as "surprise" (Louis, 1980a).

Respondents' entry into their new career and position was experienced primarily in two ways. Most respondents were overwhelmed with the numerous responsibilities of their positions and with the struggles to balance job responsibilities with family lives and/or personal lives. The impact of the job in these cases was severe, and in some cases the respondents felt they were at a point of breakdown and inability to function. However, some respondents seemed to react very differently to their new environment. Some found it similar to their previous level of workload as a graduate student and were able to manage with lots of adjustments in their attitude and time management. Others found their new position to be fairly easy, even to the point of calling it "a rest." Reynolds (1992) referred to these two types of experiences as the difference between socialization and acculturation. Socialization occurs when the newcomer's worldview is compatible with the new environment. Acculturation exists when one's worldview is extremely

different and the new experience is much more demanding. Those who are being acculturated are less likely to survive in the new environment. The acculturation experience of the participants in this study revealed descriptions of confusion, isolation, stress, and exhaustion. The following comments from various respondents illustrate the extreme differences in the way their new positions impacted their lives.

I think it has taken me [three years] to figure out that it is okay to have an outside life, that I don't need to work on homework every night. Now that I have sort of figured out I don't dread it so much if I work in the evening or something like that. Whereas before I was just avoiding doing that because I felt like I was supposed to be doing it all the time. So now I kind of control what I bring home so that even if I don't work on it over the weekend I don't feel so guilty about it Monday morning....I think that part of being a faculty member right now and being really involved also means that it does become part of your overall life.

It was not a whole lot of difference for me, the way I had been working before. We think that things might get different but responsibilities just shift and change...I still have a life. I mean, I will never not make room for my family but I do a lot of work at home and I do a lot of reading, I mean that just becomes my free time. Instead of watching television I am probably reading and writing an article. And that is the only way here with the teaching load that I could do what I've done...I was used to working that way and I have always been that kind of a student so it wasn't a whole lot different.

[I felt] excitement...at teaching because this is the first time that I sort of felt security and I was going to get to teach in an area that I really wanted to be teaching in. [I felt] autonomous in a way because again, there is a little bit of security... sort of renewed—like a whole new phase of life...

...you are inundated with everything under the sun...like insurance and your retirement plan. That in addition to the overwhelming feeling that you've got to get a syllabus together and getting your courses out there and what it is you are going to teach and how you are going to do it and figuring out who the contact people are that you want to use for resources and that kind of thing. My first year out was really pretty rough, just to figure out what all you needed to know....

I think I went in a severe state of depression. I came home every night and I slept. I slept on the couch or I went to bed every night as soon as I got home from work. I was so depressed I couldn't stand it. I was so exhausted from trying to finish my dissertation and having that defense...I felt burned out when I got here. I was so tired all the time. I just felt like I was not functioning...I just think I was really truly at a breaking point before I got here. So I was very stressed out. I did not seek out help. I wish I would have.

One of the key elements of the entry and induction phase of socialization is the learning of new roles. Dirsmith and Covaleski (1985) found that mentors may affect the degree of

socialization success for newcomers; however, Bragg (1981) found that pairing an experienced person, or an insider, with a newcomer was the most effective way for newcomers in an organization to learn a new role. Wanous (1980) referred to this practice as apprenticeship and Van Maanen and Schein (1979) referred to a role model or mentor as a serial tactic. The majority of participants in this study did not formally have a mentor assigned to them by their department or institution; however, almost all had role models either within or outside of their institution whom they called upon for support and assistance.

Most of the respondents learned their job responsibilities from the department chair or from a combination of sources, including colleagues, vacating faculty member, job announcement, and emeriti faculty. Their experiences were consistent with the findings of Fisher (1986) who reported that job-related information came from a variety of sources. Some respondents did not know what their job responsibilities were until they arrived on the job. One respondent found her responsibilities were different from what she had expected when she arrived. Williamson (1993) also found that new faculty face confusion regarding their new roles. Corcoran and Clark (1984) found that job expectations are not made clear to new faculty. Two respondents had course overloads during their first year, which confirmed Fink's (1984) finding that lack of support for new faculty included heavy workloads.

As the respondents learned their new roles, they seemed to struggle to do only what was required of them during their first year in the new position. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) referred to this as content custodial, or maintaining the status quo. In order to accomplish their jobs, several of the respondents had to change the content or environment of their classes, change their approach toward the course, or figure out new ways to manage time and accomplish research responsibilities. This was referred to by Van Maanen and Schein as content innovation.

The majority of respondents believed there were unwritten rules at their institution or department, most of which related to values, promotion, and tenure. One respondent described her perception of promotion and tenure as three different sets of guidelines on three different levels. Consistent with Boice's (1992) findings, another respondent believed promotion and tenure procedures were subjective.

I hear the dean say one thing...I hear the vice-chancellor saying another, and then what is written down is a third thing about achieving tenure...How do you show that you are doing your job or performing, and the idea that we are supposedly moving toward a different culture, a different paradigm but we are still being measured on these old guidelines.

The department chair met with each of us new hirees at least once a month, but it might have been once every two weeks at first...We were to bring any questions...In my case it was my concerns, my questions. So anything that I lacked clarification on, I got.

The first week of classes for most respondents was a positive experience; however, in spite of the fact that all the respondents had previous teaching experience, several had a difficult time planning courses and writing syllabi. They were uncertain about how much to include, how long it would take, and what needed to be on the syllabi (Fink, 1984; Boice, 1991).

The participants of this study made several adjustments in their approach to the class or in the content of the class in order to improve the academic success of their students. This conflicts with Fink's study (1984) which found that new faculty became disillusioned with the academic success of their students and in turn lowered their expectations of students.

The respondents in this study mentioned numerous kinds of support, at both the university and department levels. The majority experienced new faculty orientation sessions and socials sponsored by important university individuals or groups. Sometimes organizations employ "manipulation by guilt" of their newcomers by investing effort and time into their socialization and reinforcing an expectation of being repaid by loyalty, hard work, and rapid learning (Schein, 1968). One respondent was flown in from another state to attend her university's week-long orientation of new faculty because she would not be starting her job until mid-year. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) would characterize this type of socialization as: (a) collective, because it involves a group rather than one-on-one socialization; (b) formal, because it involves new faculty only rather than new and returning faculty mixed together; and (c) fixed, meaning it was held at a specified time as opposed to events held with no set schedule.

All ten respondents mentioned their department chair as a facilitator for their successes. This is in contrast to Whitt (1991) who found that department chairs believed themselves to be supportive, but that their faculty members did not feel supported by them at all.

On the other hand, Whitt (1991) also found that administrators expected their new faculty to be able to hit the ground running, but that new faculty didn't know how to do this. The participants of the study did experience this expectation and pressure from their administrators and believed it was unrealistic. The results of Williamson's (1993) study revealed the same pressure to perform among his respondents.

Several participants were members of new faculty groups, some of which met occasionally and informally while others met formally with the department chair on a pre-arranged schedule. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) refer to these tactics as collective, formal, and either fixed or variable depending on whether there was a schedule. Conflicting with findings from other researchers (Boice, 1991; Fink, 1984; Sorcinelli, 1988; Turner & Boice, 1987; Whitt, 1991), collegial support was reported by the majority of respondents in this study.

Two other inhibitors of the respondents' success were lack of time and the related problem of balancing work, family, and personal responsibilities. Sorcinelli (1988, 1992) also found that faculty did not have enough time to do their job well without jeopardizing their physical and personal self.

Time [is an inhibitor], trying to manage your classes and...manage the work load, the papers, trying to get them back. And staying abreast of the content and then looking at the service that is required of you, the research... trying to balance all of these.

### Continuing Socialization and Career Development

According to Corcoran and Clark (1984), the third phase of socialization, called role continuance, occurs when newcomers master skills, achieve roles, adjust to their work groups, develop professional identity, and show an interest in promoting change in the organization. Related to this phase, respondents answered in a variety of positive ways when asked to compare their second year to their first year. They mentioned not being as overwhelmed, increasing their research and service, establishing a reputation, and gaining respect. None were at the point of

being an insider after their second year, but many were well on their way. As one participant said,

I think the teaching—I am more comfortable with it, working between two departments, so that some of the stress that I felt in that first year, I no longer feel that. I have managed and I am doing quite well so I have had some time there that I have filled up with these other kinds of things....I'm taking on more service and I'm trying to do more research. That first year was really like a learning for me. I was being oriented into what was actually required of me so it was really a lot of still learning...Even though there is still a time constraint, I don't feel just completely overwhelmed. I don't feel that there is someone else dictating my time...

The promotion and tenure process is part of that journey to becoming an insider. One-half of the respondents received information from their department chairs regarding promotion and tenure; however, most respondents were informed through a variety of sources. Even though the majority of respondents had been provided with information regarding tenure, confusion and uncertainty still existed. One respondent began her new position working very hard to make sense of her split appointment and organize the content and method of her classes. Not until her peer review did she realize she had been putting too much emphasis on her teaching and not enough time on research and publishing. Sorcinelli's (1992) found that new faculty received inadequate feedback from supervisors. This is also consistent with Boice's (1991) findings that new faculty spend too much time on preparing for teaching and not enough time on research and Gibbs' et al., (1987) findings that newcomers misinterpreted cues given regarding performance expectations. The same respondent's peers told her to ignore the teaching to do what she needed to do for the research, supporting Williamson's (1993) and Fink's (1984) findings that teaching was not highly valued.

The one thing I don't like very well is our peer review process of work. It was fine the first year because...my tenure clock didn't start ticking until the fall because I came mid-year. I got good feedback and the next year, because I didn't have anything written, I got a negative mark because I didn't have anything published. So...that just made me sick...and then I started realizing in order to have anything count, you have to practically have it in the year before... this whole cycle of writing has been very difficult for me...I feel like what I am doing now is trying to spend time writing and ignore the rest because that is what they told me to do...I still don't know who has more credibility...is it the peer review committee saying, "okay, you haven't done this," or is it your department chair evaluation....People are coming from different perspectives ...then if you have a gap, "why do you have a gap?" So I get the message that is going to be questionable, then about why do I have three things in one year, or four things in one year...that maybe I was just playing catch up in order to make up to get tenure. You know, it is like a no win situation...

At the time of the interview, seven respondents were in at least the fourth year of their tenure-track position. When asked to compare their career at that time to the beginning of their

career, they mentioned the following: can see the “big picture,” actually enjoy teaching, have increased department and college involvement, have proven themselves across college, are more stable, feel greater meaning in their work, have an increased knowledge of job, are able to focus, and have more confidence.

The first couple of years, people would see me and go and say “yeah, we’ve seen you before but we really don’t know who you are or what you do.” I now feel like I can go to other departments, other colleges, other buildings on campus, and they know who I am and they know what I can do. That is making a difference. I feel comfortable there and I feel comfortable with them knowing who I am and what I am. I would probably say it took the first two or three years I was here.

The non-tenured group of people and meeting with the department chair has been one of the best experiences for me for really understanding about promotion and tenure. We talk about our [specific philosophical writings] and it was risky sort of starting to share those in the beginning....Having the chance to really talk about that, talk about our concern and questions, along with the formal written information that is in this handbook, that has been more meaningful. I think I have grown more through that experience than anything else.

One-half of the respondents viewed themselves at the time of the interview as an “insider.” One respondent stated she had made a conscious choice to not become an insider at the university level, but instead felt she was an insider in her professional organization.

The majority of respondents’ greatest satisfactions with their careers were related to their students—either teaching, advising, supervising, or observing their progress. This finding is consistent with Feldman’s (1976, 1981) research which found outcomes of continuing socialization to be either affective or behavioral. Job satisfaction is considered by Feldman to be an affective outcome.

The most satisfying things in my career [are] helping them figure out or affirm that this is where they want to be, this is the direction they would like to take, letting them know it is okay if they don’t really want to be in education. As I have found out, students seem to be in fear of telling us that. I would rather them have a happy life figuring out their direction....That makes me really happy.

While some respondents viewed student evaluations as supportive, one respondent felt that student evaluations were the least satisfying thing to her.

I will give them a glance and I put them away and I will put them away and never look at them again....I am forced to look at the numbers to put them in my annual report and I don’t like it. I hate it....I get more feedback from students during the process of the class that I could figure out things are not working or working than those final course evaluations.

The aspect of their work that gave respondents the most career dissatisfaction was the difficulty they experienced in trying to balance personal and professional responsibilities.

It is still very difficult for me to draw the line between [work responsibilities and family responsibilities]...and my husband and kids let me know about it....Then you have colleagues who don't have family responsibilities and it's not so much that they don't understand, it's just that you don't understand sometimes because you are really trying to make everything fall together, and you are really trying not to let your family be a negative part of your professional responsibilities. And I don't mean that negatively....I've never liked to use the fact that my kids kept me from getting this done....I still believe I have a responsibility to get something done.

These outcomes and sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction illustrate the professional growth that evolved for the respondents over time. Growth opportunities affect the self-efficacy of respondents, which affects the capability to accomplish research tasks, and in turn results in progress toward promotion and tenure.

When respondents were asked what they would change regarding their careers, all but one said they would change nothing because they appreciated the process that shaped them into the professional they had now become. One respondent, however, believed if she would have been more focused on her career goal at an earlier time she would have finished sooner and felt more confident when she began her first job as a teacher educator. When respondents shared their one-year and five-year goals, they mentioned earning tenure, being promoted, increasing the size of their programs, designing distance education and Internet classes, taking on more leadership in their departments, and increasing their service across the university. These are examples of behavioral outcomes, according to Feldman (1976, 1981), which are defined as role dependability, innovation, and cooperation to achieve or exceed organization expectations. Other respondents mentioned expanding their research, becoming professionally involved at the state, national, and international levels, acquiring more resources for schools in the community, and becoming involved with areas schools through in-service work.

When asked whether they would be continuing at their same institution, the vast majority responded affirmatively; however, the few who expressed a possible change stated the reason to be a desire to be closer to their family roots.

I really would like to be closer to home—to my family. And if I could find something, I would consider moving, I really would. But it would have to be something that I would almost have to pick where it was because I really am happy with what I have. I have a home here. I've got some roots here. But I would like to be a little closer to family.

In spite of being classified as new and non-tenured faculty, the vast majority of the respondents expressed a deep commitment to their universities. According to Buchanan (1974), adopting the university's goals of teaching, research, and service illustrates identification. The respondents' goals of designing distance education and internet courses illustrate involvement because of the intellectual investment required. Goals of expanding service and taking on

leadership positions reflect attachment and dedication toward the university and are referred to by Buchanan (1974) as loyalty.

### Respondents' Recommendations for Improving the Socialization Process

Respondents offered their recommendations for improving the socialization process at both the university level and department levels. Recommendations for improvement at the university level were: provide assistance in facilitating collaboration across departments and the campus; offer workshops for new faculty on student advising, policies and procedures, and tenure; establish a new faculty mentor program; match FCSE mentors from other universities with doctoral students at universities without FCSE mentors; and allow new faculty members to ease their way into university committee work by offering them a role as an alternate committee member.

Recommendations from the respondents for improving the socialization process at the department level included offering more informal socialization opportunities; having organized, regularly scheduled meetings or brown bag seminars; and providing critical information and clear expectations and guidelines for research and publishing timelines. Similar recommendations were made by Hips (1980) and Freedman (1979) to increase contact among all faculty and to hold open seminars to address questions about faculty roles. One respondent believed existing administrators and faculty members should appreciate new faculty for who they are and for what they bring to the job. This aligns with Boice (1992), who found that new faculty will carry their skills over into their new institution especially if they are what is valued by the new institution. Several respondents felt mentor programs should be improved, which is consistent with Boice's (1992) and Clark and Corcoran's (1986) recommendations to strengthen serial relationships, which are role model/understudy relationships, by providing access to appropriate role models for faculty.

## **Conclusions**

In this study, new college faculty in FCSE experienced all three phases of the socialization process: anticipatory socialization, entry and induction, and role continuance. Each of the participants experienced anticipatory socialization during their graduate school and job search experiences, at which time the anticipatory socialization phase ended.

The entry and induction phase began when the participants started their first position. Some of the participants were still in that phase during the year in which the interviews for this study took place, having been in their positions only two or three years. However the participants who had been in their positions for four years or more were experiencing the changes that occur in the role continuance phase of socialization.

The experiences of the ten FCS teacher educators in this study help us to understand the socialization of a secondary FCS teacher who becomes an FCS college professor. The majority of respondents in this study believed that even though they were not originally well-prepared to teach secondary students in today's world, they felt strongly about the importance of being able to teach effectively in diverse environments. They also believed their secondary teaching experience laid the foundation for their career decision to become an FCS teacher educator.

Their family or another strong, personal relationship played a key role in determining when they would pursue their doctoral degrees and where they would take a position in higher education. The majority of the respondents' FCS professors and advisors in graduate school became their role models, and their university department chairs and colleagues generally

became their mentors and sources of support. The participants who did not have a FCSE professor or advisor in graduate school recommended that mentors be made available through another institution so that they could benefit from their knowledge and expertise.

Most of the participants in this study had fairly positive experiences. However, those who were very unhappy and disillusioned during their first year of college teaching stated that their second year was much improved. All but one of the respondents stated they would not change a thing about their career decisions, if given an opportunity. All of the respondents have very ambitious professional goals and stated a very high degree of dedication to their students and loyalty to their institutions while working very hard at balancing their work with their family lives.

### **Recommendations for Improved Practice**

Program leaders in FCS teacher education should examine the prior work experiences of applicants for their doctoral degrees to determine if they have sufficient teaching experience in FCS and a congruent belief system to provide a foundation for a career in teacher education. Coursework in graduate programs should be examined to ensure the content is relevant, the level is challenging, and the learning is applied. Professors in graduate school should realize the impact they have on their graduate students in terms of providing the role modeling necessary for their students' future careers. In order to prepare them for the faculty role, professors should provide opportunities for their students to take on projects that carry with them a reasonable level of responsibility. These projects could be related to assistantships, research studies, or funded projects.

Because FCS teacher educators in this study made the decision to begin their doctoral programs after having taught in public schools for many years, they are also at the point in their lives when they have other commitments to consider, such as a husband or other significant partner, children, and extended family members. Prospective doctoral students may not live near an institution that has a prominent FCS professor to serve as a role model or mentor for a mature graduate student who wants to begin a career in teacher education. Graduate students without mentors in the profession could be matched with prominent mentors from other institutions to enhance their professional development. Perhaps this type of mentoring process could be facilitated through the national professional organization.

Departments should provide mentors for new faculty members. Colleagues within the department are valuable to new college faculty members because they provide important information and serve as sources of support and encouragement. Mentors should be recognized by their colleges or departments for their efforts with tangible rewards. Professional organizations, too, could recognize the efforts of members who serve their profession by mentoring new colleagues at their own or other institutions.

The major inhibitors of lack of time and inability to balance professional and personal commitments could be lessened if department chairs would support new faculty by reducing their teaching, advising, and service loads during their first year. Establishing scheduled time for new faculty to meet informally as a support group would provide them with an environment where they feel safe to express thoughts and feelings without fear of repercussion. With the help and support of peers who have similar concerns they could work out how to maintain both professional and personal lives.

To eliminate confusion and uncertainty over new faculty work roles, college deans and department chairs should provide detailed, written information regarding their workload and

performance expectations to new faculty before they arrive to begin their new jobs. They should have a current faculty handbook that states the exact procedures and timelines regarding evaluation, promotion, and tenure. To alleviate the pressure to perform that new faculty feel, administrators could organize meetings with new faculty members to discuss the contents of the handbook so that they understand expectations regarding evaluation, retention, tenure, and promotion.

Beyond the department level, the university should sponsor professional development workshops and seminars for teaching and research, as well as supportive resources in the area of technology, grant-writing, and project development. Upper level administrators of the university should demonstrate their commitment to nurturing and developing new college faculty in order to gain the support necessary at the college or department level for successful implementation of socialization strategies.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

Because this study was limited to a small number of FCS teacher educators, a replicated study in other FCS content areas or vocational areas might provide useful comparisons. Research could be conducted on the features and quality of the doctoral degree granting programs in FCS teacher education to determine if there is a relationship between the participants who had positive socialization experiences and the programs where they earned their doctorates. Gender differences related to the socialization process should be examined to determine if male teacher educators have similar or different experiences associated with the socialization process of new college faculty. Research should be done involving the identification of the participants' personality types and coping behaviors in combination with their socialization experiences because personality differences could have an impact on the way certain individuals experience organizational socialization. Research could be done on an international level to examine the socialization experiences of new FCS teacher educators. Replicating the study in other countries could reveal similarities and differences in the socialization process and could provide valuable insights into how to improve the socialization process of new college faculty.

### References

- Boice, R. (1991). New faculty as teachers, *Journal of Higher Education*, 62(2), 150-173.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boice, R. (Summer, 1992). Lessons learned about mentoring. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and junior faculty: New directions for teaching and learning*, 50, 51-61. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bragg, A. K. (1981, March). *The socialization of academic department heads: Past patterns and future possibilities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, DC.
- Buchanan, R. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Chadderdon, H., & Fanslow, A. M. (1996). *Review and synthesis of research in home economics education*. Columbus, OH: Center for Research and Leadership Development in Vocational Technical Education.

- Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(1), 20-43.
- Corcoran, M., & Clark, S. M. (1984). Professional socialization and contemporary career attitudes of three faculty generations. *Research in Higher Education*, 20(2), 131-153.
- Dirsmith, M. W., & Covaseski, M. A. (1985). Informal communications, non-formal communications and mentoring in public accounting firms. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 10(2), 149-169.
- Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 433-452.
- Feldman, D. C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(2), 309-318.
- Fink, L. D. (1984). *The first year of college teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 4, 101-145.
- Freedman, M. (1979). *Academic culture and faculty development*. Berkeley, CA: Montaigne.
- Gibbs, G., Gold, J. R., & Jenkins, A. (1987). Fending for yourself: Becoming a teacher of geography in higher education. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 11, 11-26.
- Gritzmacher, J. (1997). Reflections on future actions and issues, an informal survey of family and consumer sciences teacher educators. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education*, 15(1), 65-75.
- Henderson, C. G. (1994). *Naturals, placeholders, and the unbonded: Organizational entry and organizational socialization of community college faculty*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Hipps, G. M. (1980). Senior faculty to junior faculty. In W. C. Nelson & M. E. Siegel (Eds.), *Effective approaches to faculty development* (pp. 43-48). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Kellett, C. E., & Beard, W. R. (1991). The status and future of home economics teacher education. *Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education*, 9(2), 15-25.
- Kreutzer, J. (1999). *The national directory of the family and consumer sciences division of the American Vocational Association*. National Association of Teacher Educators for Family and Consumer Sciences Division, American Vocational Association, Alexandria, VA.
- Levinson, D. J. (1979). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Louis, M. R. (1980a). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.
- Louis, M. R., Posner, B. Z., & Powell, G. N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 857-866.

- Mezei, K. E. (1994). *On becoming a college teacher: A qualitative study of new faculty members' transitions into full-time college teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A. M. (1995). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Myers, I. B. (1980). *Introduction to type*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Nelson, H. Y. (1982). Home economics education. In H. Mitzel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (pp. 817-827). New York: Free Press.
- Redick, S. S., & Gritzmacher, J. E. (1986). *Home economics education: A review and synthesis of the research* (5th ed.). (Information Series No. 313). Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
- Reynolds, A. (1992). Charting the changes in junior faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(6), 637-652.
- Roueche, J. E., Baker, G. A., OmahaBoy, N. H., & Mullins, P. (1987). *Access & excellence: The open-door college*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Roueche, S. D. & Rouche, J. E. (1993). *Between a rock and a hard place: The at-risk student in the open-door college*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Schein, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Sloan Management Review*, 30(1), 53-65. Reprinted in 1988. *Industrial Management Review*, 9, 1-15.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1988). Satisfactions and concerns of new university teachers. *To Improve the Academy*, 7, 121-135.
- Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Series Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 50, 27-37. Developing new and junior faculty. (pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). *Faculty socialization as cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 93-6. Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the beginning: The concerns and needs of new faculty. *To Improve the Academy*, 6, 41-55.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 209-264.
- Van Maanen, J. (1975). Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 207-228.
- Wanous, J. P. (1980). *Organizational entry: Recruitment, selection, and socialization of newcomers*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Whitt, E. J. (1991). Hit the ground running: Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. *Review of Higher Education*, 14(2), 177-197.

Williamson, K. M. (1993). A qualitative study on the socialization of beginning physical education teacher educators. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 64(2), 188-201.

### **About the Authors**

Maggie Lichty is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences at the University of California Long Beach, Long Beach, California. Daisy L. Stewart is an Associate Professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning at Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia.