

Spring 2007

Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study

Patricia Sims Tresey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Tresey, Patricia Sims, "Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study" (2007). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 296.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/296>

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies at Georgia Southern Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Georgia Southern Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

EXPERIENCES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP FACULTY IN THE FIRST
YEAR OF THE PROFESSORIATE: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

by

PATRICIA SIMS TRESEY

(Under the Direction of Abebayehu Tekleselassie)

ABSTRACT

The researcher's purpose of this study was to describe and explore the experiences of educational leadership faculty in the first year of the professoriate. A qualitative, phenomenological methodology was used to illuminate the lived experiences of these new faculty members.

Research instrumentation and data collection consisted of three separate instruments used in three phases. First was a focus group interview given to three new educational leadership faculty from a regional university campus located in the Southeastern part of the United States. The second instrument was an individual, in-depth interview with the three new professors. The third and final instrument was individual in-depth, interviews with three other faculty members in the same department known as key informants. This secondary population was made up of two were junior educational leadership professors and their department chair.

The researcher recorded the interviews and analyzed the data into meaningful units exposing differences and commonalities, or "essences." The educational leadership faculty were chosen through convenience sampling. Of the six participants, five were Caucasian, one was African, four were male and two were female. The researcher assured

the participants that their identities would remain confidential; therefore, each participant was given a pseudonym.

Major findings from this study included (1) demographically, most the educational leadership professors at this university were from the ethnic majority – white, male, older in age, former school teachers and administrators and not tenured, (2) there was no formal mentoring program for new professors yet the new faculty were involved with informal mentoring, (3) the educational leadership professors felt pressure to produce research but were frustrated with the lack of support and time to spend on such endeavors, (4) the new faculty experienced stress from the sheer enormity of the job and/or time constraints and two new professors reported stress from a change in status from school district VIP to novice professor, (5) the new faculty little instruction on what they needed to know and be able to do as educational leadership professors and graduate teachers, and (6) the new faculty experienced a transcendent collegiality, a unique intra-collegiality shared with each other and espoused to be instrumental to their first year success.

INDEX WORDS: Educational leadership, Higher education, Phenomenology, New faculty, Professoriate, Mentoring, Stress, Collegiality, Diversity

EXPERIENCES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP FACULTY IN THE FIRST
YEAR OF THE PROFESSORIATE: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

by

PATRICIA SIMS TRESEY

B.S., The Ohio State University, 1982

M.Ed., Miami University, 1995

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2007

© 2007

Patricia Sims Tresey

All Rights Reserved

EXPERIENCES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP FACULTY IN THE FIRST
YEAR OF THE PROFESSORIATE: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

by

PATRICIA SIMS TRESEY

Major Professor: Abebayehu
Tekleselassie

Committee: Lucindia Chance
Terry Diamanduros

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2007

DEDICATION

In honor and memory of Carol Annis Sims

(September 18, 1926 – December 24, 2003)

To her unconditional love and support of me to be the woman I am.

and

In honor of my two men, Joe and Patrick, who did not always understand what I was

doing but steadfastly supported my efforts to accomplish my goal.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation has become a reality because of the support and encouragement of the following people:

Dr. James Burnham

There are so many things to thank you for. First, I thank you for the idea of this study – you are the inspiration. Thank you for your wisdom and experience in educational leadership and sharing it so genuinely with others. Thanks for your humor and positive attitude which added to the climate in the educational leadership program so dramatically. I thank you for your friendship and camaraderie. But most of all, I appreciated your dogged support of me and guidance which was instrumental in the achievement of this degree.

Dr. Ababayehu Tekleselassie

To my chair and methodologist of my dissertation committee, I owe my sincere appreciation and esteem for your expertise and guidance. You were my constant source of support and my go-to person in any matter. I appreciated your genuine kindness and manner of business which always made me feel valued and competent.

Dean Lucindia Chance

To a valued committee member who challenged me to complete the best study I could. I thank you for your kindnesses and accessibility. Most of all, thanks for “going the extra mile” to see that I accomplished this task.

Dr. Terry Diamanduros

To a wonderful committee member who had firsthand knowledge of what it was to be a first year faculty member. Your insights were most helpful. I appreciated your support and understanding of my unpredictable life.

Dr. Edna Levernier

To my dearest friend and “comrade in arms,” thank you for enriching my life on a daily basis. You made it a joy to come to work everyday. Your support and experience benefited me immensely as I followed in your footsteps in accomplishing my terminal degree. I cannot thank you and your family enough for all the kindnesses you bestowed upon me in good times and difficult ones while I was in Statesboro.

The faculty/staff of the Department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development

Thank you for two wonderful years that I spent with you all. I thank you for your unwavering support of me from the first day I stepped in as a graduate assistant. You all helped me through tough times with humor, good advice, and a lot of love. Each one of you touched my life in a special way which proved to be the cornerstone to my success at GSU.

My three new educational leadership faculty members

I thank you for your wealth of information and the commitment to share it with others. I appreciated your candor, humor, and overall eloquence in retelling your stories of your first year in the professoriate. You three were a pleasure to work with and the reason for the success of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	7
LIST OF TABLES	13
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	14
General Introduction.....	14
History of Educational Leadership and the Professoriate	14
Research on the First Year of the Professoriate	22
Statement of the Problem	23
Research Questions	24
Significance of the Study	25
Procedures	26
Delimitations	28
Limitations.....	28
Definitions of Key Terms.....	29
Summary	30
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	32
Introduction	32
History of the American Professoriate	32
Today's Professoriate	45
Today's Professorial Issues	50
Studies of the Professoriate	55

		10
	Studies of Educational Leadership Faculty	57
	Studies of New Faculty	59
	Summary	61
3	METHODOLOGY	69
	Introduction	69
	Research Questions	69
	Research Design	70
	Population.....	72
	Instrumentation.....	73
	Data Collection.....	75
	Data Analysis	76
	Treatment of the Data Collected	77
	Summary	78
4	FINDINGS.....	79
	Introduction	79
	Data Analysis	80
	Personal and Professional Characteristics of the Educational Leadership Faculty	82
	Personal and Professional Characteristics of the Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description	85
	Daily Life of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty	85
	Daily Life of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description.....	92

	Diversity of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty	92
	Diversity of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description.....	97
	Mentoring of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty	97
	Mentoring of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description.....	101
	The Beginning of the Tenure Process for the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty	102
	The Beginning of the Tenure Process for the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description	109
	Stress Factors Experienced by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty	110
	Stress Factors Experienced by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description	114
	Perceptions of Collegiality by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty	115
	Perceptions of Collegiality by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description	119
	Summary	120
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	127
	Introduction	127
	Discussion of Findings	130
	Conclusions	140

	12
Implications	148
Dissemination.....	150
Recommendations for Further Study	151
Concluding Thoughts	152
REFERENCES	155
APPENDICES	161
A SURVEY INSTRUMENTS	162
B CONSENT FORM.....	170
C IRB APPROVAL.....	173

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Studies of the Professoriate	65
Table 2: Studies of Educational Leadership Faculty	66
Table 3: Studies of New Faculty.....	67
Table 4: Studies of Specific Professorial Issues	68

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

“The academy is not paradise. But learning is a place where paradise can be created” (hooks, 1994, p. 207)

The enterprise of education in the United States of America is ever-changing. Professors of educational leadership hold a key role in this fluid enterprise. Society has given professors the admirable task of preparing the future educational leaders in both the P-12 and higher education arenas alike.

Along with the preparation of school leaders, societal pressure for educational improvement and accountability has placed added responsibilities on faculty in educational leadership. Once again the professors of educational leadership have been thrust to the forefront to not only lead change but prepare others for such an endeavor.

With the “graying” of the faculty in the academy and college enrollments increasing, the demand for educational leadership professors is keen. Each year, new educators take on the responsibilities of an educational leadership professoriate. With this new career change comes lived experiences distinctive to each individual. Yet, these women and men share many common personal and professional events as they manage their new lives as professors. It may be of interest to all stakeholders of the education enterprise how these professors uniquely navigate their “new world” of educational leadership.

History of Educational Leadership and the Professoriate

Compared to professorships in other fields or disciplines, the educational leadership professorship is a relatively new practice. At the turn of the 20th century,

specialization of the American professoriate continued and higher education was regarded by society as the research axis for new knowledge to improve America, both socially and economically (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Spring, 1997). Colleges of education were one of the many new fields being established in universities. Along with these colleges came graduate schools. Spring reported, “By 1899, departments or chairs of education had been established at 244 American universities” (p. 276).

Many proposed that the most influential professor of education at this time was Ellwood P. Cubberly (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Kaestle, 1983; Lucas, 1994; Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Spring, 1997). Cubberly received his initial training in education and developed an expertise in management of school and school systems. Cubberly became one of a group of leading educational professors known as the “educational trust.” The educational trust formed a unique alliance with business, superintendents, and the universities.

Cubberly did something else which would influence education in both the P-12 and higher education arena. Cubberly embraced the scientific management revolution and fought to make graduate schools leaders in the new scientific study of education. Spring (1997), in his book, quoted Cubberly,

Within this period of time entirely new means of attacking educational problems have been developed through the application of statistical procedures, the use of standardized tests, and the devising of scales for the measurement of the intelligence of school children (p. 276).

Educational administration, as it was known, was born and the new educational administration professors enjoyed the benefits of status as superintendents sought out their expertise in the management of schools and businesses sponsored their research. Tyack and Hansot (1982) referred to professors as falling into one of two groups, “the *locals* who had a strong sphere of influence in their region and the *nationals*, persons who spoke and consulted across the nation...” (p. 142).

The stock market crash marked the end to American economic stability and the dominating use of the theory of scientific management in educational leadership (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Spring, 1997). The economic crisis pitted teachers against school administrators. The National Educational Association (NEA) strengthened as teachers searched for ways to improve wages, working conditions, and seniority policy. Coalitions were formed and politics became the basic means of educational change. As the Depression worsened, the educational community grew wary of the ties between business and education. Scientific management gave way to the new human relations movement. Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Bennion noted the change with a quote from Jesse H. Newlon, a professor at the Teachers College of Columbia University, “the control of education is one of the major social problems of our times and that educational administration is, in the broadest sense, essentially a branch of politics, an applied social science” (p. 177).

Educational administration research at this time reflected two schools of thought. As by-products of the scientific management movement, the majority of research focused around business and fiscal administration. Contrastingly, Newlon and his followers

stressed the importance of helping future leaders develop ethically, intellectually, and socially.

In the last half of the 1940s, educational administration grew rapidly creating the need for the profession to come together to examine the field of study. This time in history was coined by Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Bennion (1987) as the Theory Movement. In 1947, the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) was established. Out of this conference came a proliferation of new ideas and practices regarding preparatory programs for educational administrators. One such idea was the possible institution of administrative internships for those seeking certification in educational administration.

The NCPEA played a key role in the creation of the Cooperative Project in Educational Administration (CPEA), a 3.5 million dollar initiative for the study and practice of educational administration. Over 300 publications were produced from this initiative and the Theory Movement was in full swing. Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Bennion (1987) purported that, “CPEA projects also attracted significant new talent to the field of educational administration, built new bridges between study and practice, and stimulated the growth of in-service training” (p. 182). Lastly, the CPEA, in turn, created the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).

The UCEA became the professional organization that educational administration programs most wanted to affiliate with and heavily influenced preparatory programs throughout the United States. Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Bennion (1987) wrote, “UCEA’s leadership was expressed particularly through the initiation and sponsorship of the *Educational Administration Quarterly* (1965) ... and through annual or semiannual

career development seminars for professors and graduate students” (p. 183). UCEA was the dominant force in shaping the study and teaching of educational administration.

As America’s population grew, so did schools and ultimately, so did the field of educational administration. By the 1970s and early 1980s educational administration studies cut across different sections of the social sciences and professors continued to carve individual paths of specialization.

More scholarly activity by professors produced more theory and more followers. Ironically, with more theoretical approaches brought the conclusion of the Theory Movement. Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion (1987) quoted Willower, a fellow researcher, who described the ideal professor as an, “explorer, creator, critic, and deliberate used of theories and methods, not as an unthinking devotee of one [theory or method]” (p. 186).

In the last twenty years, educational administration has made many changes besides welcoming in the 21st century. One of the foremost changes has been in the demographic make-up of the professoriate. Reflecting the trends in the American school population, educational administrative faculty faces have changed in gender and color. Once a bastion of the white male, the ivory tower has slowly seen diversity become a way of life in the hallways and classrooms.

Another change in educational administration has been a theoretical one. Throughout most of the history of educational administration, professors proposed a “top-down” concept of organizational administration. With the theoretical movements like scientific management and human relations, educational organizations were thought to be self-contained entities. But desegregation, federal mandates like IDEA and NCLB, and

other state and local policy reforms, brought about the popularity of the open-systems concept to explain the existence of external factors as well as internal factors. Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion (1987) assert that “it now seems clear that the behavior of educational organizations can be explained adequately when factors both external and internal to the organization are taken into account” (p. 199). The open-systems view explicated the increasing complexity of the job of school administrators.

Research of the Modern Educational Leadership Professoriate

Since the 1960s, there have been several large studies that shed light on the life of the educational leadership professor (Campbell & Newell, 1973; Willower & Culbertson, 1964; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1988; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). Willower and Culbertson, in their book, *The Professorship in Educational Administration*, presented several studies that described the life of faculty in educational administration. Originally presented as papers at a career Seminar of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), these studies focused on the preparation, recruitment and working environment of the educational administration professor. The authors described an educational administration faculty that was white, male, and middle-aged.

Willower and Culbertson (1964) also found that most professors lacked research competence even though they heavily espoused the use of research in their professional lives. Likewise, the professors also reported that in terms of promotion, teaching ranked above research, writing, field service and advising of students. Lastly, the researchers reported the tension between preparing practitioners and preparing professors. Willower recommended,

The professorial and practitioner roles ought to be brought into closer congruence, and the relationship of the universities and the field should be broadened and strengthened. The relationship will be a more honest and genuine one when professors offer practitioners information based on general relationships rather than recipes, and when the practitioner is treated as a partner in the reflective application of theory to practice (p. 105).

In 1973, Campbell and Newell published the book *A Study of Professors of Educational Administration*. This study was also developed for the UCEA and became an important and comprehensive study on the educational administration professoriate. The researchers wanted to know five basic questions about educational administration professors: (1) who were they? (2) Where were they? (3) What do they do? (4) What do they believe? And, (5) what were their role orientations? Using the role orientations suggested by Merton and Gouldner, Campbell and Newell surveyed nearly 2,000 professors and placed them

into three distinct role orientations with the professoriate – a group of cosmopolitans who had a national reference group and high interest in theory and research, a second group with primary loyalty to their own universities and to the teaching and advising of graduate students, and a third group consisting of faculty members whose primary interests and identity were with practitioners (p. 184).

The researchers' findings also replicated Willower and Culbertson's in that professors of educational administration were still not engaging in many scholarly activities.

In 1983, McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, and Iacona replicated the Campbell and Newell study noted above. With noted differences, namely more time was being spent by the average professor in scholarly activities and more faculty felt that research and teaching were interdependent. This comprehensive study of the educational leadership professoriate was conducted again by McCarthy and Kuh in 1994. Published in 1997 as *Continuity and Change: the Educational Leadership Professoriate*, this study exposed many changes within the profession. The demographic characteristics of the educational leadership professor changed significantly when focusing on gender. According to McCarthy (1999), “between 1972 and 1994 the percentage of women increase tenfold” (p.130). Another key demographic change was the age of new professors. McCarthy and Kuh found that “the mean age increased from 48 in 1972 to 54 in 1994” (p.130). Faculty were older upon entering the professoriate.

Other important changes from the study noted by McCarthy (1999) focused on new teaching orientations of educational leadership faculty. McCarthy purported that most educational leadership programs had relatively remained unchanged, but several proactive programs had “redesigned the content of their preparation programs based on a concept of leadership that shifts the focus from plant manager to educational leader” (p. 126). She also found a shift in curriculum philosophy “from a positivist to a constructivist paradigm, emphasizing multiple perspectives to address complex school issues that include some traditionally excluded perspectives (such as feminist views)” (p. 127). Lastly, McCarthy highlighted pedagogical shifts in educational leadership programs like cohort grouping of students, seminars or modules instead of traditional courses, distance learning and team approaches to instruction.

Research on the First Year of the Professoriate

Much of what has been researched about new faculty exploits can be found buried in studies that focus on certain parts of academic life or in how-to manuals for the newly hired. Many researchers have concentrated their efforts in studying the perils of those that attempt to gain tenure (Glazer-Raymo, 2000; Moody, 2004; Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1994; Silverman, 2004; Tierney, 1999). Tierney, in his study of faculty productivity, examined many factors such as race, age, gender, salary attributing to the success or failure of those that work for tenure. Moody, in her book, *Faculty Diversity*, specifically addressed new faculty of color and their experiences. Glazer-Raymo wrote about women in the professoriate. Silverman focused on the importance of collegiality as part of the tenure and promotion process. Lastly, Schoenfeld and Magnan wrote, *Mentor in a Manual*, a guide for individuals new to the professoriate.

Specific knowledge of new faculty experiences has been primarily based on several important studies conducted in the last two decades (Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli and Austin, 1992; Menges, 1994, 1999). Out of his study of first year faculty, Boice found that loneliness was first year faculty's most salient complaint. From his findings Boice created a theory of basic skills for professoriate success called IRSS theory, an acronym for involvement, regimen, self-management and social networking.

Sorcinelli and Austin (1992) found several factors common to first year faculty experiences. The first significant factor was stress. Sorcinelli and Austin found that the concern "about lack of time and balance [was] the most consistent source of stress over time" (p.28). They also found that lack of collegiality amongst professors in a department was also a significant factor in first year faculty experiences.

The most comprehensive of all the studies on first year faculty life has been accomplished by Robert Menges. Menges (1994, 1999) instituted the New Faculty Project in 1992 and studied ten colleges and universities throughout the United States over a five year period. Menges identified five factors problematic to new faculty life that he believed consistent with other studies. The three factors that were inter-related were anxiety, pressure, and stress. Menges found that anxiety about surviving the job was coupled with "...taking time from important professional activities and from meaningful personal pursuits in order to meet demands...of teaching" (p. 20). Along with Boice, Menges also concluded that new faculty members suffered from isolation. "They find fewer connections with colleagues than they expected..." (p.20). Lastly, Menges inferred that new faculty experience dissonance about the rewards they receive for their work. Most of the faculty members' time is spent on teaching and related activities yet they soon learn that tenure and promotion depend heavily on research and scholarship.

Statement of the Problem

The life of an educational leadership professor is a challenging and changing one. Being a part of an organization that is heavily influenced by external and internal forces, the educational leadership professor is often caught in the middle. According to researchers, the career of the educational leadership professor is changing in significant ways. The population of educational leadership professors is growing older and more diverse. Often times, new professors are veteran school administrators.

The role of the educational leadership professor is also changing. New emphasis on leadership as opposed to management along with the call for innovative teaching and thinking has placed new demands on educational leadership professors. Lastly, the

demand for exemplary scholarly activity from educational leadership faculty has not waned but continued to grow as society demands accountability from all educational arenas – higher education and P-12.

The first year of the professoriate can prove to be daunting. Researchers have described the life of the first year professor as lonely and stressful. High expectations for scholarly activity are replaced by the reality of teaching and service responsibilities. Often, first year professors encounter dilemmas common to their gender or race. New faculty find that collegiality is espoused but rarely practiced. The common graduate student support systems like mentoring and teaming are conspicuously missing.

With all of the above in mind, it is clear that there is still much to be learned about the life of the first year educational leadership professor. While insightful in many ways, the past studies of educational leadership professors have been largely descriptive. Conversely, rich studies of new faculty focusing on social and cultural issues facing professors have not included the educational leadership discipline. Therefore, it is not known whether first year educational leadership faculty face the same issues as those in other disciplines. Therefore, it was the researcher's purpose in this study to specifically illuminate the experiences of educational leadership faculty in their first year of the professoriate.

Research Questions

Through this study, the researcher addressed the following overarching research question: What are the lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty? The below sub-questions will also be considered:

1. Who are the people that choose to be first year educational leadership faculty?

2. What are the differences in the lived experiences among first year educational leadership faculty?
3. What are the commonalities in the lived experiences among first year educational leadership faculty?

Significance of Study

The perception of the researcher was that there were defining experiences that were shared by first year faculty as they transition from practitioner to professor of educational leadership. It was a goal of this researcher to become an educational leadership faculty member. Therefore, the illumination of these defining experiences may inform and enhance the professional lives of future new faculty including the researcher.

The researcher's findings from this study may also benefit current as well as aspiring faculty of educational leadership as they navigate through the waters of new professional responsibilities and challenges. Defined experiences of first year faculty would give new members valuable insight into their higher education world. Knowledge gained from these data would afford first year faculty support to create new professional opportunities or steer clear of pitfalls. Lastly, the researcher's recommendations could strongly influence future educational leadership faculty success.

With the educational leadership faculty in the academy growing older, the timing of the findings of this researcher could immediately impact higher education institutions in recruitment and retention practices. The researcher's findings may provide essential information about first year faculty preferences that could strategically shape higher education recruitment policies and procedures. The researcher's findings could provide knowledge about a first year professor's professional struggle that could then inform

changes to educational leadership programs to assist new professors in succeeding. Educational leadership department chairs would especially benefit from these findings when planning and scheduling new faculty orientation programs. Furthermore, the researcher's findings could be of value to all higher education decision-makers, not just educational leadership.

Procedures

The design of this study was a qualitative, phenomenological analysis of the personal and professional experiences of first year educational leadership faculty. Phenomenology, first introduced by Edmund Husserl around 1900, is the "science of the general essences of consciousness and its various structures" (p. 56). Johnson and Christensen (2004) stated, "the purpose of phenomenological research is to obtain a view into your research participants' life-worlds and to understand their personal meanings ... constructed from their "lived experiences"" (p. 364). As a phenomenological researcher, this researcher focused on discovering lived experiences that are both unique and common. As Johnson and Christensen (2004) purported,

Phenomenologists generally assume that there is some commonality in human experience, and they seek to understand this commonality. This commonality of experience is called an essence, or invariant structure (p. 365).

The primary population for this study is three first year educational leadership faculty from a southeastern regional university in the United States. This study also included a secondary population of individuals called key informants. The key informants were existing educational leadership junior faculty from the same university who recently had been through the first year process. Another key informant was the educational

leadership professors' department chair. It was expected that the key informants would support any descriptive data or meanings given by the primary population.

The researcher employed three different instruments in data collection, using the research questions as foundation. In the first phase, the focus group interview, the questions were open-ended and focused on gathering reflective, descriptive-rich lived experiences from the first year educational leadership faculty. The focus group interview served the dual purpose of gathering participant testimonials and refining open-ended questioning techniques. In the second phase, the in-depth, one-on-one interviews, the researcher used semi-structured, open-ended questions to guide participants in describing their personal and professional experiences focused around specific issues found in the first year in the educational leadership professoriate. In phase three, the key informant in-depth interviews, another open-ended interview instrument was used in interviewing the three junior educational leadership faculty and their department chair. It was hoped that their insights would support the "life-world" experiences of the first year participants. The researcher expected to find essences (commonalities) in lived experiences of all educational leadership faculty.

In all phases of this study, participants were recorded by the researcher. The researcher transcribed all interviews. After the interviews, the participants were given the opportunity to read and clarify their answers to all questions.

The researcher employed a three stage process for data analysis. In phenomenological research, these stages were also known as reductions. In the first stage, the researcher created rich descriptions of the first year phenomenon based on all faculty experiences. In the second stage, the researcher performed a reduction of the observation

notes, transcripts and documents for significant statements. These statements, or meaningful units, captured the meaning of the experiences of first year educational leadership faculty (McMillan, 2004). At the third and final stage, the researcher searched for themes or essences in the data. Johnson and Christensen (2004) purported that “it is here that the researcher describes the fundamental features of the experience that are experienced in common by virtually all the participants” (p. 368).

Lastly, the researcher of this study employed the expertise of Dr. Ababayehu Tekleselassie, methodologist, to independently go through the three stage process to further validate the researcher’s data analysis.

Delimitations

The delimitations of the study were as follows:

1. The focus of this study was on educational leadership first year faculty in a Southeastern regional university in America.
2. Experiences of educational leadership first year faculty were explored using phenomenological research methodology and theory. This qualitative research method was the best method for answering the research questions and capturing the phenomenon.

Limitations

The limitations of the study were as follows:

1. In all three phases of data collection, the researcher used face-to-face interviewing if possible, but due to budgetary constraints, telephone interviews will be utilized. The researcher acknowledged that telephone interviews for qualitative research purposes are not optimal.

2. This study may be limited in that the researcher may not be successful in eliminating her own bias in the data analysis phase.
3. Initially, it was the intention of the researcher to include a quantitative section of this study that would encompass the experiences of other first year educational leadership faculty from around the nation. This idea turned out to be impractical. Therefore, the participation of only educational leadership first year faculty from one university eliminated the ability to make comparisons between first year faculty in other educational leadership programs across the nation.
4. The utilization of some committee members as participants was studied and the consideration was made that the benefits of these professors in such a dual purpose far outweighed the limitations.

Definitions of Key Terms

1. *Bracketing* – the suspension of any preconceptions regarding a phenomena. Johnson and Christiansen (2004) refer to it as experiences the phenomenon “as it is.”
2. *Educational Leadership* – also refers to the study of educational administration in this study. According to McCarthy and Kuh (1997), educational administration began to be known as educational leadership in the early 1990s.
3. *Essence* – an invariant structure of the experience. According to Johnson and Christiansen (2004), the part of the experience that is common or consistent across the research participants.
4. *Professoriate* - also known as the professorate or professorship. Can be singular or plural (Webster’s Dictionary).

5. *Phenomenology* – According to Wiersma and Jurs (2005), is the study of phenomena; it stresses the careful description of phenomena from the perspective of those experiencing the phenomena.
6. *Reduction* – According to Kockelmans (1994), means a change in attitude by virtue of which one learns to see things in a more original and radical way, to penetrate into things and see there the more profound layers of meaning behind those which first appeared.

Summary

The life of the educational leadership professor is a complicated one. With sweeping systemic changes in both the P-12 and higher education arena, educational leadership faculty are either on the cutting edge or the chopping block of education. With that in mind, the need for well prepared, productive professors is apparent.

The first year in the professoriate can either make or break an educator's career. It has been documented in other disciplines the pitfalls that first year faculty encounter. It would behoove the educational community to examine such issues along with all experiences that first year educational leadership professors endeavor.

A phenomenological approach was used to illuminate the experiences of educational leadership faculty in the first year of their professoriate. A three phase process of interviews was conducted to gather individual experiences of first year faculty. Analysis consisted of three steps or reductions to richly describe educational leadership life-worlds and discover common experiences of new educational leadership professors.

In this study, the researcher hoped to make a significant contribution to educational leadership in the higher educational setting. It was also the researcher's intent

to influence higher education institutional policy and practice regarding the support of first year faculty throughout the disciplines.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The higher education enterprise in the United States of America is ever-changing (Blau, 1973; hooks, 1994; Menges, 1999; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). Blau (1973), in his seminal book, *The Organization of Academic Work*, wrote, “Academe, the grove where Plato developed his influential philosophy in discourse with disciples, continues to provide not only the label but also the romantic ideal of academic work” (p.1). Blau’s work illuminated the stark differences between proverbial Academia and higher education as it is known today.

The world of higher education has been met with more demands from its community for accountability and other issues. Criticizing universities and colleges may seem like a new pastime but, in reality, is an old one at best. Discourse revolving around higher education fiscal responsibility, curriculum reform, and academic freedom has been repeated throughout the educational history of United States. And, at the center of the higher education world has been the professoriate.

History of the American Professoriate

One might assume that the role of the professor began with Plato in the before mentioned grove of trees on a hill in Greece. Teaching as a profession can be traced back throughout antiquity (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion 1987; Lucas, 1994). For the sake of this study, the researcher will explore the history of the professoriate as it pertains to the development and growth of colleges and universities in the United States of America.

Universities before the New World

One cannot delve into the American professoriate without considering its roots in Europe. Besides religious institutions, universities were regarded as the oldest institutions in Western culture (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987). Most universities declared their origins in the twelfth century and by 1400 A.D., Europe claimed fifty universities. Many of these universities were established by the Catholic Church to educate the clergy. But, in 1231 A.D., Pope Gregory IX sanctioned the autonomy of professors at the University of Paris thus beginning the practice of faculty control over curriculum and degrees which still exists today.

American Colonial Colleges and Universities

Shortly after the Mayflower landed in Plymouth, the Massachusetts Colony General Court established the first college, Harvard, in the president's living room. In an effort to create the world left behind in England, colonists longed for the affluence of education. To illuminate this fact, two educational historians included the following quote from the pamphlet, *New England's First Fruits*, in their highly regarded books. Lucas (1994), in his important work, *American Higher Education*, and Spring (1997), in his book, *The American School 1642-1996*, report

“After God had carried us safe to New England, and we had built our houses, provided necessaries for our liveli-hood, rear'd convenient places for God's worship, and settled the Civil Government: One of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance Learning, and perpetuate it to Posterity” (Lucas, pp.103, 104; Spring p. 13).

Harvard had two goals, to educate young men for the ministry and to prepare others for the responsibility and leadership of a cultured society.

There were eight other colleges founded during the Colonial times. According to Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion (1987), the College of William and Mary (founded in 1693); the Collegiate School at New Haven (chartered in 1701 and later renamed Yale College); the College of Philadelphia (founded in 1740 and later renamed the University of Pennsylvania); the College of new Jersey, 1746 (renamed Princeton College); King's College, 1754 (renamed Columbia University); the College of Rhode Island, 1764 (renamed Brown University; Queen's College, 1766, (renamed Rutgers College; and Dartmouth College, founded in 1769 all subscribed to the common goal of raising up pious and literate men. According to Campbell, "educational leadership was exercised by respected clergymen-scholars"(p. 152).

With most of the universities founded by various religious denominations, the tension of separation of church and state was first realized. With funding being a key issue for the persistence of higher education, most institutions welcomed secular money and students. This blurring of the status of "public" and "private" schools was common. Ironically, with universities and colleges steeped in Anglo-aristocratic tradition, institutions were surprisingly caste-less. Lucas (1994) cited early records from Harvard and other colleges that list the majority of students being sons of clergy, merchants, master mariners, attorneys but also inclusive of sons of artisans, servants, and poor farmers.

Professors were torn at the time, wishing to buy into the new American notion that privilege was suspect and individual accomplishments were paramount but still

upholding the traditional educational curriculum of the European aristocracy. Colonial academicians, no matter their denomination, believed that classical learning would produce successful professionals. Greco-Roman literature and languages were regarded as benchmarks for those destined to conduct the affairs of church and state. It was not until the onset of the Revolutionary War did the secular subjects of mathematics, modern literature, and natural sciences begin to be woven into the college curriculum. Lucas (1994) wrote, "At King's College in 1754, it was announced that henceforth modern geography, history, navigation, surveying... and everything that would contribute to... true happiness would be offered" (p. 110).

Colleges and Universities after the Revolutionary War

As might be expected, American colleges and universities were embroiled in America's war for freedom. Many institutional facilities were damaged, looted, and destroyed in the revolution. Some institutional presidents, considered to be Tories, fled the land in fear of their lives. At the end of the war, the fate of the colleges and universities of the colonies and now the new nation were questionable at best. Many statesmen, like Noah Webster, called for systems of education to create wise and virtuous men to lay a foundation for the new government (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Kaestle, 1983; Lucas, 1994; Tyack & Hansot, 1982; Spring, 1997). Lucas espoused, "The question was whether schools of higher learning, heretofore adapted to life under a monarchy and wedded to essentially aristocratic notions of leadership, could be adjusted to serve the emerging American democratic order" (p.113).

Thomas Jefferson would be the first to push for democratization of education. He advocated the Northwest Land Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 which provided for higher

education as well as public schools. With the passing of the ordinances came a plethora of new institutions. Historians argued over the outcome of this phenomenon (Lucas, 1994; Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987). Lucas espoused that some historians viewed “the post-revolutionary period as an age in which anti-intellectual evangelicals displaced traditional academic educators, causing a serious debasement in the value of higher education” (p. 116). While other historians believed that popular interest in education was paramount to the success of a newly arising nation.

The 19th Century Growth of Higher Education

Not only did new states garner great civic pride with every new college, their coffers increased handsomely. Lucas (1994), reported, “In 1819, supporters of the proposed University of Vermont hit upon a winning argument when they pointed out the state had lost an estimated \$14 million to neighboring states because it lacked a public institution of higher learning” (p.117).

The craze for new colleges continued on until the inception of the Civil War. As the United States expanded westward, transplanted New Englanders worked to “settle” the frontier and schools of higher education sufficed. To attract such enterprises, towns began to “market” themselves as classic places of learning. For example, in Ohio, the two towns that were awarded public institutions were aptly named, Oxford and Athens. Other towns in other states caught on used the same premise with great success. Lastly, to add to the overbuilding of colleges and universities in the newly formed United States of America, Lucas (1994) noted, “In a few cases, legislatures awarded a college as a sort of consolation prize to a town that had lost out in the competition for a penal institution or insane asylum” (p.118).

With the rapid growth of colleges and universities came the demand for those to lead and teach (Lucas, 1994). For the most part, colleges had two types of instructors – tutors and professors. The tutor, typically a recent graduate awaiting a church assignment, would hear student recitations and oversee scholarly activities. The professor, a man possessing some post-baccalaureate training, would come to the profession after serving several years in a non-academic endeavor, often the ministry. Professors had no specialization and would teach all subjects from Latin and Greek Literature to mathematics and geography. The tutors and professors alike were assigned the task of student discipline which put them in direct opposition to the students who regarded them as “the enemy.”

Each college or university had a president, also known as chancellor, provost, rector or even principal. At the time, the president was usually a very successful businessman or statesman, not an academic. Lucas (1994) quoted Samuel Eliot, a Harvard historian in 1849, who inscribed, “Gentlemen almost exclusively engaged in the instruction and discipline of youth are not, usually, in the best condition to acquire that experience... in the management of the exterior concerns of a large literary institution” (p.125). Thus, the power structure of these institutions lent the presidents full authority to manage, answering only to a board of regents or governor, made up of their own “kind.” With such an arrangement in place, power struggles involving faculty control over student admissions, academic standards, and curricular issues were common between the president and the professors.

During this higher education growth era, the most significant academic struggle between faculty, presidents, and their communities was curricular reform. Lucas (1994)

argued that “America’s college’s course of study was never rigid, and it evolved continuously over time in both form and content” (p. 131). The Age of Enlightenment and free inquiry began to shape curricular efforts. Lucas noted, “modern languages, applied Mathematics, and courses in political economy were allowed to substitute for classical studies in several institutions, including Ohio University, Lafayette College, Union, Hobart...and Columbia...” (p. 131). Even at Thomas Jefferson’s University of Virginia, students were allowed to choose from different course offerings. Administration and community alike watched with anticipation as the experiment in choice molded what famous statesmen as, Ralph Waldo Emerson would declare, the “American Scholar.”

The argument over the quintessential course of study would dominate the higher education world for the next several years. The most infamous example of curricular struggle was chronicled by the *Yale Report*. In 1827, the president of Yale University formed a committee of college fellows to draw up a position paper regarding the elimination of “dead languages.” The document was amended the next year and addressed many curricular issues including the accommodation for the business inclination of the new nation. The *Yale Report* became the most powerful educational document of its time. The *Yale Report’s* most telling phrase was quoted by Lucas (1994),

“Is it not desirable that men of wealth and influence should be men of superior education, of large and liberal views, of those solid and elegant attainment, which will raise them to higher distinction than the mere possession of property; which will not allow them to hoard their treasures, or waste them in senseless extravagance; which will enable them to adorn society by the learning, to move in the more intelligent circles with dignity, and to make such an application of their

wealth, as will be more honorable to themselves and the most beneficial to their country?" (p.134).

Classicists rallied around the report which so eloquently defended traditional learning. They appealed to the true mission of college which was to foster a *paideia* experience of common learning to enrich people's lives. Their views were not held by all.

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

In the last half of the 19th century, researchers espoused that there were two significant events that shaped the direction of all colleges and universities in America (Campbell, Fleming, Newell, & Bennion, 1987; Lucas, 1994; Spring, 1997). First was the passing of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The acts marked the beginning of the federal government's role in supporting a more inclusive role for higher education. According to Spring, "The Morrill Act of 1862 specifically dealt with the issue of educating the industrial classes" (p. 272). The legislation was coordinated to give money to institutions prepared to teach subjects in agriculture and mechanical arts to advance those students in pursuit various professions in life. Interestingly, due to the fact that this legislation was during the Civil War, course offerings in military tactics were offered.

The second key event was the exodus of American students to be educated abroad in Germany. These students were then returning from Germany and organizing graduate schools similar to German universities. Spring (1997) purported that, "German academics believed that the pursuit of truth required absolute freedom of inquiry, so that any avenue of investigation could be followed" (p. 273). This freedom of inquiry was manifested in concepts known as *Lernfreiheit* and *Lehrfreiheit*. *Lernfreiheit* referred to the concept of students choosing their own courses of study. *Lehrfreiheit* referred to the academic

freedom that university professors were given to lecture and report on their research as well as other pertinent knowledge related to their study.

Both of these events led to the creation of a paradoxical life for the university professor. The new status of expert brought professors valued relationships with the industrial and agricultural worlds. But expected student demand for the many land grant institutions went unanswered. Those called to the task of educating the masses were often caught in a struggle between financially pressed state legislatures and federal demands. Lucas (1994) reported at the University of Arkansas, “professors by the scores were forced to resign, then immediately rehired – but only at a fraction of their former salaries” (p. 149).

As professors became more widely accepted as experts, professional specialization emerged and another concept, unique to American colleges and universities was born. Spring (1997) described the concept of social service as, “the general ideology of placing the expert in charge and of service to society” (p. 270). The notion of higher education at the center of expert service to society represented the end of the popular classical education and the birth of what we regard as higher education today.

The Early Twentieth Century

The 1900s brought many changes to the makeup and life of the average college student. The average undergraduate was a white male of middle to upper-middle class status. To most undergraduates at the turn of the century, college years were meant for frivolity and post-childhood fun. Lucas (1994) reported that, “generally students did not expect to work hard; they rarely studied any more than was minimally necessary; and regular attendance in class was the exception rather than the rule. Professors who held

students to high standards were deeply resented...” (p. 200). Extracurricular activities such as fraternities, athletics, theater groups, campus newspapers and other social clubs ruled the lives of college students.

The twentieth century brought about a great evolution in higher education for women. Most post-secondary education opportunities for females were merely academies also known as finishing schools. They were non-academic in manner and were designed to ready young ladies to be suitable wives. At the end of the 1800s, a call for reform led to an increase in academic rigor at these institutions. Lucas (1994) wrote, “...the establishment of so-called “coordinate” colleges, separate but affiliated with established colleges, marked an important step in enhancing women’s access to higher education: Radcliffe at Harvard, Barnard at Columbia...” (p. 155).

Concurrently, the coeducational movement was taking hold on large university campuses. The Middle West land-grant institutions led the way in enrolling women. College administrators and the community alike were tenuous about the possible hazards of putting women and men on the same campus. Many pundits believed that such academic rigor would cause serious damage to female reproductive systems and render young ladies unfit to be wives and mothers. Others purported that such constant contact would make women more aggressive and men more effeminate. But after several decades of coeducation, the fervor died down. Lucas (1994) quoted the president of The Ohio State University, who claimed that all of the dire predictions of calamity when young men and women were instructed together had proven unfounded, said, “this inter-training and equal training takes the simper out of the young women and the roughness out of the young men” (p.157).

At the same time that women were making headway in entering America's colleges and universities, so was another marginalized group. African American colleges sprung up in the North in the middle 1800s. Southern schools followed after the Civil War. Sadly, most of these institutions of higher education were far from academically rigorous. Even with the *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of 1896 which constitutionally created the "separate but equal" principle, African American higher education institutions were a long way from being academically equal. Lucas (1994) included a quote from W.E.B. DuBois regarding the state of black colleges. DuBois, in his 1903 piece, *The Negro Problem*, espoused,

Men of America, the problem is plain before you. Here is a race transplanted through the criminal foolishness of your fathers. Whether you like it or not the millions are here, and here they will remain. If you do not lift them up, they will pull you down (p. 165).

Colleges and universities continued to grow in number and size in the twentieth century. As enrollment increased, so did the need for more professors. Between 1920 and 1966, the number of institutions grew from 1041 to 2230, and the number of faculty members from 50,000 to 600,000 (Blau, 1973). The end result of this extreme growth was the introduction of the modern multi-university. These multi-universities serviced tens of thousands of students and required thousands of professors.

Twentieth Century University Woes

Twentieth century colleges and universities quickly became excellent examples of bureaucratic organizations. "Top-down" administration took care of all decision-making so as to free up teachers and researchers to do their jobs. Full-time administrators were

put in charge of everything from janitorial operations to athletics and student affairs. Professors in the early 1900s did not take kindly to the new hierarchical structure of higher education. Most scholars felt the covert presence of big business which had already adopted the concept of bureaucratization years before. With mild complaint, the faculty did not wish to get rid of the bureaucratic principles altogether. They enjoyed the benefits of not having to collect tuition, register students, and raise endowment money (Lucas, 1994).

In sharp contrast to the obvious benefits of a bureaucratic institution, professors were still struggling with two interrelated issues. Academic freedom and job security were at the forefront of each faculty member's mind. The concept of *Lehrfreiheit* or academic freedom, referred to earlier, was under serious compromise with the new bureaucratic organization. With the business community and administration having more of a say in what universities' missions were, professors felt enormous pressure to conform. Lucas(1994) stated popular sentiment at the time, "if corporate business interests or their agents were allowed to dictate what a professor might profess, so it was argued, the integrity of all scholarship within a college or university was directly threatened (p. 195).

As certain faculty made the choice not to be dictated by big business or administration, the result was the second issue, job security. Many defenders of academic freedom raised concerns of ethics and principles. But all arguments for job security linked to academic freedom fell on the deaf ears of university administration. Lucas wrote,

so far as many university trustees were concerned, an errant professor was an employee of the institution, no more, no less. If his conduct was displeasing to management, officials were entitled to give him his walking papers as readily as business executives might fire any factory hireling (p. 197).

The argument continued well into the twentieth century when a special American Association of University Professors (AAUP) committee presented the AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles. Lucas (1994) proposed that this document so widely read and discussed. The AAUP's 1940 Statement of Principles became the set of general standards to which grievances were handled.

The professor's academic freedom took another big hit with the onset of WWII. The cold war brought on deep fear that communism was fast engulfing the world. Interestingly, America looked to higher education as communist sympathizers. Lucas (1994) recounted that, "Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, chair of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, proposed that the government redouble its efforts not just to clear the groves of academe of all 'communists' but of suspected 'communist thinkers' as well" (p. 225). Many universities, feeling pressure from government and business alike, "cleaned house" and many professors lost their positions and careers.

Campus life in postwar America was again marked with rapid growth. Thanks to the Readjustment Act of 1944, more widely known as the G.I. Bill, the federal government began to play an important and influential role in universities' fiscal livelihood. Federal funding was also supporting research grants and construction loans. Lucas (1994) pointed out that

the federal government's overall investment in higher education for 1947 was \$2.4 billion; that total had jumped dramatically by the late 1950's; and it increased still further over the next four decades, though it was accompanied over time by major shifts in spending categories (p.233).

Many critics thought federal funding came at the price of academic freedom. For universities, the dependence on federal dollars was a trend that would never go out of style.

Along with federal governmental funding, federal courts were also influencing universities' life. After the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education*, desegregation began on campuses across the nation. By the late 1960s, and not without much strife, desegregation was a way of life. Lucas (1994) stated that "by 1987, for the first time in American history, black students were more likely to matriculate at predominantly white institutions than at traditionally black schools" (p. 242). Unfortunately, enrollment strides made by African Americans were shadowed by poor persistence rates, academic achievement and overall social adjustment.

Today's Professoriate

The academic life of today's professor has evolved over the generations into a dynamic and challenging career. Though each faculty career is unique, there are common professional responsibilities found in higher education institutions both large and small. These professorial responsibilities can be explained in terms of three roles: teaching, research, and service. Marshall (1999) espouses "the academy's age-old litany of teaching, scholarship, and service holds something in common with a three-legged stool ... no leg being more important or less important than another" (p. 113). Metaphors

aside, higher education institutions expect new faculty members to contribute uniquely and significantly in each one of these areas (hooks, 1994; Bianco-Mathis, 1999; Fletcher & Patrick, 1999; Menges, 1999; Tierney, 1999).

The three roles of the professoriate play an integral part in the future of every faculty member. It is the ability to successfully maneuver each role which will, in the end, lead to the granting of tenure to a perspective professor. Tenure provides a faculty member job security and the academic freedom that all professors strive for. Menges (1999) believes, “the tenure decision decision is perhaps the most important point in a faculty member’s career” (p. 281). Tierney (1999) delves into the faculty work model (teaching, research, and service even further. Tierney believes that this model is problematic because

First, we need a model that tries to conjoin, rather than isolate, activities.

Second, one’s work in an organization’s culture ought not to be indirectly related to the mission and goals, but central. And third, different faculty will have different work profiles (p. 49).

Tierney then purposes his own model for today’s faculty work. His portrayal puts missions and goals of the institution in the center. The roles of teaching research and development are not isolated but joined together and areas of discretion help to individualize each model a specific faculty member.

Menges (1994) is in agreement with Tierney. He proposes his model for Faculty Academic Life as foundation for the New Faculty Project. Menges also includes the concept of professional growth in his model.

It should be noted that the discussion of the different models of faculty life is indicative of the changes that the today's professor is facing. The nexus between tenure and the three professional roles of a professor; teaching, research, and service, prove to create a unique challenge for each new professor.

Teaching

It has been written that teaching is the center of the professoriate (hooks, 1994; Fletcher & Patrick, 1999). The ability to successfully transfer knowledge from professor to student in an organized and clear manner is a skill that can take years to perfect. Fletcher and Patrick state that, "an excellent teacher also understands the interrelationships between the subject under discussion and other fields of knowledge and is able to articulate those connections to students" (p. 19). Hooks takes the skill of teaching even further by espousing,

that [the] learning process comes easiest to those of us who teach who also believe that there is an aspect of our vocation that is sacred; who believe that our work is not merely to share information be to share in the intellectual and spiritual growth of our students (p.13).

For how vitally important teaching is in the life of a new professor, not many opportunities are afforded to aspiring faculty to hone the skill before entering the workforce. Menges (1999) purports, "graduate school provides teaching opportunities and research experience, but useful as they may be for preparing us for faculty life, these are foremost the experiences of graduate education, not the experiences of faculty status" (p. 2). Lastly, what also accompanies teaching is the responsibility of student advising which graduate students never have a chance to experience let along master.

It has also been reported that new faculty find their teaching responsibilities overwhelming and stressful (Boice,1992; Sorcinelli,1992). New professors obsess over student evaluations and teaching improvements. Most new faculty feel they have no support or time to explore new teaching methods or hone their skills as a teacher. Hence, less time is spent on class preparation and more on other activities. Austin and Sorcinelli (1992) state “the message is clear: junior faculty need opportunities to learn about teaching” (p. 97).

Research

Research, also referred to as scholarship, is considered to be the most challenging role for today’s professor (Menges, 1999; Fechter, 1999; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Tierney, 1999). Tierney asserts that “no one could have predicted in 1900 that research would play such a fundamental role in academic life” (p. xv). New professors come from a wide variety of research experiences which can either aid them in future research or leave them lagging behind. Some confusion about research simply lies within its definition. Fechter states,

scholarly activity is typically demonstrated by evidence of sustained inquiry in an area of a discipline encompassing, but not limited to, publications or, as appropriate, artistic works and performances; receiving research grants and participating in funded research projects; and presentation of research findings at professional meetings (p. 98-99).

Semantics or not, scholarly activity is a clear focus for all higher education institutions.

Tierney reflects this in his claim that

evaluative criteria that have been developed over this century have seen a

drift toward a “research model” where one’s productivity gets measured in terms of research output rather than other criteria such as teaching, service, or direct work in the community (p.44).

A new professor meets many challenges while attaining meaningful scholarly activity. Researchers refer to publishing strategies, politics and exposure to grant-writing as trials that all professors, new and old must experience. Menges (1999) points out one especially unique challenge:

Perhaps the most vividly frustrating aspect of being a faculty newcomer is that although a new faculty member is a specialist in a discipline and has been hired for expertise in a specialization, that very same newcomer is also a rank amateur on the new campus (p. 3).

Women and minorities find research difficult to accomplish. Glazer-Raymo (1999) reports that women do more teaching in higher education and contends, “teaching may be the major priority, but criteria for reappointment rely heavily on research potential and scholarly productivity” (p. 56).

Service

Of the three roles that a professor has, service is the enigma. Most would agree that service relates to the professor’s field of expertise and the mission of the institution (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002; Menges, 1999; Marshall, 1999; Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1994). Examples of service often overlap one of the other “legs” of the stool – scholarship or teaching, such as involvement in professional organizations and university workshops. Schoenfeld and Magnan categorize the service role into three dimensions: public service, institutional service, and professional service. Public service can be

characterized by outreach activities which enlist the professor's expertise and resources in response to a community's need. Institutional service largely revolves around the participation of a faculty member in university governance or functions. Lastly, professional service is contributions by a faculty member in organizations or professional groups that help to elevate her/his profession or discipline.

Researchers find that most faculty believe that service is the third and least important role of a professor. Marshall (1999) contends, "although it can never outweigh teaching and scholarship, its absence can seriously compromise the socio-political milieu that enters the peer-driven tenure review process" (p. 114).

Today's Professorial Issues

Like all careers, the professoriate is not without its challenges. Professionals want to be successful in their career endeavors and academic faculty are no different. Many researchers have explored specific issues that face professors in today's world (Jacoby, 2005; Moody, 2005; Armenti, 2004; Premeaux & Mondy, 2002; Gappa, 2000; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Menges, 1999).

Tenure-Track

One of the most studied issues in the life of the professor is tenure (Jacoby, 2005; Premeaux & Mondy, 2002; Gappa, 2000; Menges, 1999). As eluded to in the discussions above, tenure is the pinnacle in the career of a professor and one of the few perks that comes with expertise in the field. Throughout recent history, tenure has been regarded as job security or protection for those professors who exercised their beliefs in academic freedom and taught or published controversial ideas.

Many have tried to clarify the criteria for tenure which still remains nebulous in nature. Tenure requirements like how many publications, how well classes are taught, and how much service to the community remains to be largely a departmental and institutional decision. Though considered to be problematic by the public and academia alike, professors still wish to continue the practice (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002).

Tenure appears to be alive and well on American campuses. Premeaux and Mondy (2002) remark, “despite elimination efforts, tenure remains a strong shield of lifetime faculty protection at virtually all universities” (p.335). What does seem to be a compelling trend is the reduction of tenured and tenure-track professors across the nation. Much of this is the result of part-time and non-tenure track hiring. Gappa (2000) reports that “faculty members ineligible for tenure are found in significant numbers in all types of institutions and in most disciplines”(p. 77). Jacoby agrees with Gappa and found most part-timers aspiring to tenure-track positions. Jacoby (2005) also adds,

this is manifest not only in the number of part-time faculty who have secured the equivalent of full-time loads, whether at one or more institutions, but also in the number of faculty who have struggled to put together part-time work across institutions for lengthy periods (p. 146).

Diversity

Professors of different race, gender, and age from the norm can find campus life uniquely challenging. Moving into the 21st century, enrollment of minority students have increased while minority faculty has remained under represented (Moody, 2004). When asked, most higher education administrators point to a lack of professorial candidates as reason for this under representation. The issue appears to be much more complex than

that. Moody, in her book, *Faculty Diversity: Problems and Solutions*, gives an astute explanation for the dilemmas that those that are marginalized contend with on higher education campuses:

The dominant majority group in an organization or society determines what customs, laws, language usage, and norms will be observed, saluted, and maintained....A minority group possesses far less political power and finds not only that its interests are not sufficiently nurtured by the society's political, economic, and educational institutions, but also that its social status is kept relatively low by the majority group (p. 8).

The largest minority faculty population is women. On higher education campuses, women are the majority in student enrollment and degrees granted with the exception of terminal degrees. Data from 1994, indicates that women have increased their share of earned doctorates with 38.4% with faculty representation about the same. Interestingly, most of these placements are as associate or assistant professors (Armenti, 2004; Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Women also spend more time teaching and less time in research. Glazer-Raymo reports, "women faculty in both new and senior faculty cohorts reported less equity for women and minority faculty and far less job satisfaction than their male colleagues (p.56).

People of color find faculty life hard to attain and maintain. Moody (2004) points out that "...like people hire like people. Employers tend to hire those who look, think and speak like themselves, unless they become conscious of this evaluative bias and concentrate to over come it" (p. 31). Academic institutions are fraught with alumni advantages and token number disadvantages. Additionally, minority scholars find their

minority research agendas devalued. Yet, when a member of the majority undertakes a similar agenda, the value rises dramatically (Moody, 2004). Antony and Taylor (2001) agree that minorities have a more difficult time establishing themselves in the halls of academe. After studying African American graduate students, they discovered that some students made “the decision to not pursue an academic ...they felt would be characterized by the continual threat of being reduced [by others in the academy] to the stereotypes commonly attributed to minority professors” (p. 190).

Stress

Another issue that researchers continue to study is stress related to the professoriate (Dinham, 1999; Menges, 1999; Sorcinelli, 1992; Boice, 1992). Researchers report two types of stress; work-related and nonwork. Work-related stress includes teaching load, scholarship demands, committee and faculty meetings, and the tenure process along with other evaluation. Nonwork sources usually revolve around personal time and home responsibilities (Menges).

Researchers find that stress continues at a high level but shifts in emphasis (Menges, 1999; Dinham, 1999; Sorcinelli, 1992; Boice, 1992). For example, new faculty tend to stress over teaching responsibilities more at the beginning of their appointment. Scholarly activities are fuel for stress later in professoriate. Sorcinelli purports that, “findings suggest that new faculty continue to experience stresses and strains due to the demands of work and nonwork roles throughout the years before tenure” (p. 34).

Collegiality

Several researchers believe that collegiality plays an integral part in the success of professors (Silverman, 2004; Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992). Faculty candidates value

collegiality and look for the presence of it when interviewing. Sorcinelli lists collegiality (or the lack there of) as a key stress point in new faculty life. Boice proposes that the lack of collegiality leads to feelings of isolation by new faculty. Lastly, Silverman relates collegiality to being a team player and warns, “while a reputation as a team player is unlikely to compensate for a weak teaching or publication record in promotion and tenure decisions, not have one can nullify an adequate, but marginal, publication and teaching record...” (p. 1).

Mentoring

Related to collegiality and an issue widely investigated is mentoring of new professors (Mullen, 2005; Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1994; Boice, 1992). Mullen states, “issues of mentoring for dissertation candidates and for junior professors are two primary areas of interest in higher education” (p.3). She describes mentoring “as a personal or professional relationship between two people – a knowing experienced professional and a protégé or mentee – who commit to an advisory and nonevaluative relationship that often involves a long-term goal” (p.2). Schoenfeld and Magnan purpose that there are four types of mentoring relationships – friend, career guide, information source, and intellectual guide.

Though considered a “buzz word” in higher education, researchers have discovered that mentoring faculty is not widely done (Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1994). Mentoring is often perceived as not needed by either the new faculty member or the administration (Bode,1999). In contrast, one researcher found that 86 percent of faculty wanted some form of mentoring (Boice, 1992). According to Boice, “mentoring is becoming a more popular part of plans and programs for new faculty”(p. 51).

Studies of the Professoriate

Many researchers have chosen to study one aspect or issue of the professoriate as illustrated in the discussions above. Several researchers have chosen to do large scale studies which seek to understand the professional life of faculty in academia. One of the most comprehensive studies of the professoriate was the seminal work by Blau. In 1968, Blau collected data from 115 campuses across the United States. He and his colleagues interviewed administrators, faculty and compiled data. Focusing on the bureaucratic nature of higher education institutions, Blau found that the large academic institutions tended to be less bureaucratic than small institutions. It was harder to recruit good faculty to highly bureaucratic structures and students were less attracted to them. Faculty left jobs due to extrinsic factors and joined a department for intrinsic factors. Faculty qualifications were found to be related to the age of the institution and its amount of specialization. Finally, professors preferred smaller institutions to large but the benefits of a larger institution (like higher salary and opportunities for advancement) could outweigh this preference.

In 1999, Fairweather produced a study which focused on the definition of a highly productive faculty member. Using data from the *National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF 1993)*, he examined a representative sample of full and part-time faculty. He found that a small percentage of faculty were defined as highly productive in both teaching and research simultaneously. Interestingly, Fairweather found that the more hours spent in the classroom, the more likely the professor would achieve high levels in both teaching and research. Lastly, Fairweather recommended that:

- (1) the work assignment must emphasize instructional productivity –

greater hours in the classroom...; (2) high levels of other types of research productivity must be attained; and (3) the individual faculty member must believe in the importance of research (p. 92)

Tierney (2001) also studied faculty at work in academia but focused on faculty of education during the reform movement. Using various educational data banks from the 1990s as resources and conducting twelve site visits, he reported descriptive data on faculty along with recommendations. As far as the descriptive data was concerned, Tierney found that full-time faculty of education were evenly split between men and women. A fact that was not present in any other discipline in higher education. Tierney also found that education had the highest number of African American faculty, measuring a little less than ten percent. Lastly, he reported the faculty of education were getting older with the average age of a faculty member being just under fifty. Once again, colleges of education had the oldest faculty across campuses.

Tierney reported data about education faculty work. A dramatic statistic was the drop in the percent of full-time faculty. Tierney (2001) stated, "In 1987, 78 percent of education faculty were full-time; in 1992, that percentage had dropped to 59.2" (p. 87). He also reported the trend of decreasing tenure track faculty. According to Tierney, education professors spent 53.8 % of their time in teaching as opposed to 13.1% on research. They ranked last in comparison with other fields in research time but first in time spent on administrative duties. Tierney's conclusion was "the field of education is not in a period of robust growth, but it is in a time of dynamic change" (p. 101).

Studies of Educational Leadership Faculty

In 1957, Campbell and Gregg, sponsored by the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), introduced the largest collection of research about educational administration. It had been a mere ten years since the NCPEA's inception and the discipline was securing its future. Campbell and Gregg (1957) wrote in *Administrative Behavior in Education*, "from the beginning the authors have sought to prepare a volume which would synthesize and interpret research and experience dealing with factors affecting administrative behavior" (p.ix). Mostly theoretical in nature, it set the tone for further scholarship in educational administration. Seven years later, editors Willower and Culbertson (1964) published another collection of studies called, *The Professorship of Educational Administration*. The evolution of scholarly research was evidenced. Willower purposed, "the professorial and practitioner roles ought to be brought into closer congruence, and the relationship of the universities and the field should be broadened and strengthened" (p. 105)

In 1973, Campbell and Newell produced the most comprehensive study of the educational leadership professoriate of its day. Funded by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), the researchers sent out a seventy item questionnaire to 2400 educational administration faculty across the nation. Utilizing the data from this questionnaire, Campbell and Newell painted the first real picture of the average educational leadership professor. He was white, male and from a rural Midwest town. Most professors received their doctorate after 40 and were tenured with 97% of them in full-time positions. As might be expected, the majority of the faculty's time was spent in teaching activities. Scholarly research varied widely but most spent less than

20% of their time on research. Interestingly, only eleven percent of the professors thought research was of primary importance. Most of the professors were satisfied in their positions but wished for higher salaries. The researchers noted, “it seems fair to say that the professors were not very concerned about problems facing the academic field of educational administration and some had difficulty in differentiating their roles from practitioners in the field” (p. 133).

Around fifteen years later, McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, and Iacona (1987) revisited the Campbell and Newell study. The population for the study was the total educational administration professoriate in the nation along with their departmental chairs. The researchers found compelling differences from the Campbell and Newell study. The number of women faculty members had increased dramatically but women and minorities were still underrepresented. Full-time faculty positions had decreased and it was predicted that half of the population would retire by the year 2000. More educational administration professors were engaging in scholarly activity. The authors’ posited, “the interest in research probably reflects more rigorous promotion and tenure standards as well as a commitment – especially on the part of female and younger faculty – to rigorous examination of problems and effective practices in the field” (p. 167).

Lastly, in 1994, McCarthy and Kuh, sent out their survey to the educational administration professors and their chairs. Again, women and minorities made great strides in obtaining faculty positions though still continued to be underrepresented. In 1994, the average faculty member was older and more likely to have been school administrators in the past. Similar to past studies, professors were spending the lion’s

share of their professional time in teaching activities. Interest in research had continued to increase and, of note, professors of color listed research as their primary interest.

Studies of New Faculty

Since the early 1990s, researchers have increasingly focused on the life of the new faculty member (Wulf & Austin, 2004; Gappa, 2000; Menges & associates, 1999; Boice, 1992; Dinham, 1999; Olsen and Sorcinelli, 1992). Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992) reported findings regarding their longitudinal study of new faculty from 1986 through 1991. In the beginning of the study, new professors were spending more time on teaching and preparation and less on research. Faculty found teaching to be less stressful than research but also less rewarding. As junior faculty progressed through their professorial appointments, time spent on teaching decreased and time and stress associated with research increased. Faculty also encountered less collegiality and support as the years passed. Overall, junior faculty wanted more support and recognition for teaching especially in the tenure process. The new professors also wanted a more collegial atmosphere characterized by guidance and support from senior faculty members.

Sorcinelli (1992) conducted another study of new professors specifically focusing on stress. The researcher found five major reasons for stress in new faculties lives, (1) not enough time; (2) inadequate feedback and recognition; (3) unrealistic expectations; (4) lack of collegiality; and, (5) Balancing work and life outside of work. As might be expected, these stressors did not decrease over time and those that were non-tenured were more stressed than tenured faculty. Along with Sorcinelli, Dinham (1999) did studies on new faculty and stress. In her qualitative study, Dinham found the same stressors as Sorcinelli. Her participants instituted time management skills to best reduce some of the

stress. Dinham purposed that more discussion regarding stress should be addressed in higher education institutions.

Another researcher who focused his study on new faculty was Robert Boice. He interviewed four cohorts of newly hired professors over four years. Boice found loneliness to be the most common complaint from first year faculty. Related to loneliness, collegiality was another issue that new professors confronted. The novice faculty felt senior faculty were non-supportive and critical of new faculty's interests and ideas. Boice gave many recommendations for making new faculty welcome and successful. He contended that, "handled properly, retention and tenuring become interdependent" (p. 232).

The New Faculty Project was the brainchild of Robert Menges in 1991. Menges wrote, "we hoped that the New Faculty Project would lead to better understanding of faculty experiences and provide a basis for easing faculty transitions into new jobs" (p. 20). Menges surveyed 225 new faculty in full-time, tenure-track positions. Of this population, the researcher interviewed approximately 50% once a year over a three year period. One of Menges' key findings was trends in stress experienced by the new faculty. Stress from teaching load was highest in the first year and diminished after. Stress related to research and publishing demands remained high over time. Stress from lack of personal time also rose from one year to the next. Another key finding was related to job expectations. Many times new faculty were not clear on what their roles and responsibilities fully entailed. The researcher presented this scenario, "if, as is often the case, department chairs emphasize attention to teaching duties, colleagues emphasize scholarly productivity, and students emphasize faculty accessibility, what is a new faculty

member to do?” (p. 32). The last key finding was related to evaluation and feedback. Like job expectations, new faculty were not sure what to expect. Most all participants in the study felt that undue time and effort was required by the review process with little return.

Summary

The educational leadership professoriate has indeed developed into a multifaceted and challenging career. Through its rich history, the professoriate has played an important part in the advancement of all segments of the American society. Faculty of higher education have evolved from baby-sitters of elite young adults to experts in a specialized field which contribute to the betterment of their community.

Some issues that professors grapple with today have roots in the past. Academic freedom and job security are concerns that have plagued the professoriate since the 1800s.

Curricular reform has always been a hot topic for discussion in academia and the public arena alike. Lastly, the struggle for education by marginalized groups often placed higher education in the forefront for the advancement of others.

Today’s educational leadership professoriate is comprised of three roles – teaching, research, and service. There is much discussion on the criteria and importance of each of these roles. Researchers and practitioners alike will agree that teaching is the most significant responsibility that a professor has. The act of teaching is considered almost sacred and much is written about what and how to teach. For new professors, teaching can be the one source of much of their frustration as they develop and hone skills. The role that research plays in the life of the professor can be quite variable.

Pressure to “publish or perish” has steadily increased over the years. New faculty are often unsupported in their efforts to find time, resources and ideas to form a research agenda. Universally considered to be the least important of the three roles, service criteria are nebulous at best. New professors must be careful to give service its due or pay the socio-political price.

As mentioned above, the professoriate has its share of difficulties. Probably the most discussed and researched issue is tenure. Tenure provides faculty with job security and protection of their academic freedom. The shrinking numbers of tenure-track positions and tenured professors has also garnered much attention in research. A new professor’s angst over tenure revolves around the lack of clear expectations and constructive review processes.

The entrance of minority groups into the professoriate has been another struggle documented by researchers. Though strides have been made, women and people of color still remain underrepresented as experts in the hallways of higher education. New faculty from marginalized groups carry unique battle scars as they climb the academic ladder.

Another commonly researched issue is professorial stress. Demands for teacher and scholarly excellence produce high levels of stress for faculty. New professors often find teaching responsibilities overwhelming causing them to reduce their efforts in research and service. Related to stress is the new professor’s need for collegiality and mentoring. Researchers reports that new faculty members look for both formal and informal support from senior faculty and administration. Organized mentoring programs can aid in retention of the newly hired.

Studies of the professoriate produced information about the life of a professor. Early studies focused on higher education bureaucracy and its effect on faculty. As colleges and universities grew, so did bureaucracy. Professors grew to prefer the security and opportunities that a large, hierarchical organization could offer. Other studies reported on faculty productivity. As demands for more time to be spent in scholarly activity and curricular reform, full-time and tenure-track positions were decreasing. Though more productive, the professoriate was changing with diversity and age.

As educational administration moved toward legitimacy as a higher education discipline, research also evolved. Early research focused on theoretical perspectives of educational administration. Much discussion centered on the preparation, roles, and orientations of the new educational administration professor. The 1970s brought about the first comprehensive study of the professoriate. The educational administration professor was a white, male, rural Midwesterner who held a tenure-track position. The need for scholarly activity was minimal and these men considered themselves practitioners. Other comprehensive studies followed in the 1980s and 1990s with contrasting findings. By the last study, the face of the educational administration faculty member had changed. More women and minorities had entered the professoriate. Many were older and former administrators from the P-12 arena. These educational leaders were also more interested in scholarly activity but still loved being in the classroom.

Research of new faculty members has increased in the last two decades. Probably due to the graying of the professoriate, retaining faculty has increased in importance. Most studies on new faculty focus on the trials of the first year and eventual tenure promotion. Stress over the lack of time, no collegiality, unclear expectations and

inadequate feedback cause new faculty to re-evaluate their decision to advance in the professoriate.

It is apparent that much has been researched about the educational leadership professoriate and new faculty. Along with descriptive data, researchers have explored the issues that confront new faculty. What is clear to the researcher of this study is the lack of research narrowly focused on the new educational leadership professor. With professional demands and the age of the professoriate increasing, the need for further knowledge about the unique person who chooses the educational leadership professoriate seems warranted.

Table 1

Studies of the Professoriate

STUDY	TOPIC	METHDOLOGY	OUTCOMES
Blau (1968)	The professoriate and bureaucracy	Quantitative; questionnaire	Bureaucratic institutions give professors more opportunities for specialization and advancement
Fairweather (1999)	To define the highly productive faculty member	Quantitative; Analysis of data from NSOPF, 1993	Small % of professors could be defined as highly productive in both teaching and research. More hours spent in classroom, more likely the professor would achieve high levels of both teaching and research.
Tierney (2001)	Faculty work in colleges of education	Quantitative; Analysis of data from NCES in the 1990s; interviews on twelve collegiate campuses	Full-time faculty had decreased. The educational professoriate was more diverse and older than other disciplines. Education faculty spent more time on teaching than research.

Table 2

Studies of Educational Leadership Faculty

STUDY	TOPIC	METHODOLOGY	OUTCOMES
Campbell & Gregg (1957)	Educational Administration	Theoretical discourse	Conceptual analysis of educational administration. Preparation and curriculum of educational administration.
Willower & Culbertson (1964)	Educational Administration	Theoretical discourse	Conceptual analysis of educational administration. Preparation and curriculum of educational administration.
Campbell & Newell (1973)	Educational administration professoriate	Quantitative; Surveyed entire ed. administration faculty	Average professor of educational administration is white, male, from a rural Midwestern background. Professorial role is mainly teaching. Not much interest in research. Satisfied and not concerned with problems in the field.
McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona (1988)	Educational administration professoriate	Quantitative; Surveyed entire ed. administration faculty and chairs	Revisitation of the Campbell & Newell study. Full-time and tenure-track positions have decreased. Women and minorities are increasing. Scholarly activities increasing.
McCarthy & Kuh (1997)	Educational administration professoriate	Quantitative; Surveyed entire ed. administration faculty and chairs	Revisitation of the Campbell & Newell study. Full-time and tenure-track positions have decreased. Women and minorities are increasing. Professors are older. Scholarly activities increasing especially with minorities.

Table 3

Studies of New Faculty

STUDY	TOPIC	METHODOLOGY	OUTCOMES
Olsen & Sorcinelli (1992)	New faculty	Quantitative; Longitudinal survey	New faculty found teaching overwhelming in the first year. New faculty wanted increased collegiality and support from senior faculty.
Sorcinelli (1992)	New Faculty	Quantitative; Longitudinal survey	5 major reasons for new faculty stress: 1. not enough time; 2. inadequate feedback and recognition; 3. unrealistic expectations; 4. lack of collegiality; and, 5. balancing work and personal life.
Boice (1992)	New Faculty	Qualitative; In-depth interviews over four years	New faculty battled loneliness in the first year. Lack of collegiality and mentoring other issues. Recommendations were heavy.
Menges & Associates (1999)	New Faculty	Qualitative; In-depth interviews over three years	The New Faculty Project. Trends in stress like teaching load and scholarly demands. Lack of personal time increased over time. Job expectations and tenure review unclear to new faculty.
Dinham (1999)	New Faculty Stress	Qualitative; Discussion through email	Found same stressors as Sorcinelli. Participants discussed coping techniques like time management.

Table 4

Studies of Specific Professoriate Issues

STUDY	TOPIC	METHODOLOGY	OUTCOMES
Premeaux & Mondy (2002)	Tenure-Track and full-time status of professors	Quantitative; Data Analysis of NCES	Reduction of tenure-track and full-time professors across nation. The practice of tenure under fire but professors still want it.
Gappa (200)	Tenure-Track and full-time status of professors	Review of the literature	Reduction of tenure-track and full-time professors across nation. Part-time professors would like full-time positions.
Antony & Taylor	African American graduate students	Quantitative; Data Analysis of NCES	Minorities have a difficult time establishing themselves in the professoriate. Grad students have fear of being stereotyped.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Much of the research done to date addressing educational leadership professors has encompassed all faculty at every stage of their professional careers (Campbell & Gregg, 1957; Willower & Culbertson, 1964; Campbell & Newell, 1973; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1988; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997). Other studies have focused on new faculty in other disciplines across higher education (Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli & Austin, 1992; Menges, 1999; Gappa, 2000). Therefore there appeared to be a need for research narrowly focusing on educational leadership professors in the first year of the professoriate. The researcher's purpose for this study was to illuminate the lived experiences of educational leadership faculty in the first year of the professoriate. The researcher collected from new educational leadership professors their own unique descriptions of their professional lives and to a lesser extent their personal lives. The researcher discussed the common experiences that educational leadership professors find in their first year. The researcher, through a phenomenological study, sought to make meaning from these lived experiences of the participants.

Research Questions

The researcher designed a phenomenological inquiry process to answer the overarching research question: What are the lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty? The following sub-questions were also considered:

1. Who are the people that choose to be first year educational leadership faculty?

2. What are the differences in the lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty?
3. What are the commonalities in the lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty?

Research Design

The researcher's primary purpose was to illuminate the lived experiences of first year educational leadership professors. Throughout the study the researcher examined the unique stories which make up the life-world of each participant. Because the nature of this study was dependent on the respondents' descriptions of their first year as a professor, the researcher utilized a qualitative research model. Creswell (2003) defined assumptions of the qualitative paradigm "as an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants... (pp. 1-2).

Phenomenology as Methodological Framework

To fully explore first year educational leadership professors' lived experiences, the researcher chose the phenomenological research method. Phenomenology, as a research method, was created and espoused by Edmund Husserl around the turn of the twentieth century. Husserl was a mathematician by profession and a philosopher by passion. His main concern was finding meanings and essences in knowledge (Moustakas, 1994). Interestingly, his lifetime goal was to create a link between philosophy and formal inquiry-based science. That is why phenomenology is viewed both as a philosophy and a research method today.

To buttress phenomenology as scientific inquiry, Husserl introduced several key concepts. First, was the concept of intentionality. Intentionality referred to the relationship between the perceiving of a phenomenon (noema) and the actual phenomenon itself (noesis). Moustakas (1994) explained further, “in the grasping of the meaning of experience, we are engaging in a process of functioning intentionality; we uncover the meanings of phenomena, deliver them from the anonymity of the natural attitude, move them toward an inclusive totality of consciousness” (p. 31).

The second key concept in phenomenological inquiry was Epoche. Epoche, like intentionality, was related to perception or judgment of a phenomenon. Moustakas (1994) wrote, “in the Epoche, the everyday understandings, judgments, and knowings are set aside, and phenomena are revisited, freshly, naively, in a wide open sense, from the vantage point of a pure or transcendental ego” (p. 33). This concept, again, spoke to separating “what is perceived” from “what is actual.” Intentionality and Epoche set up a social science inquiry by requiring the researcher to remove all biases and pre-conceived judgments before formal investigation begins.

The third key concept found in the phenomenological approach to research was reduction. Kockelmans (1994) purported that

reduction means a change in attitude by virtue of which one learns to see things in a more original and radical way, to penetrate into things and see there the more profound layers of meaning behind those which first appeared (p.14).

Phenomenology incorporates several phases of reductions. The first reduction features the tool, “bracketing.” Bracketing, as explained by Denzin & Lincoln (1998) was

the “setting aside one’s taken-for-granted orientation....then focus on the ways in which members of the life work themselves interpretively produce the recognizable, intelligible forms they treat as real” (p.139). In a second reduction, the researcher performed a reduction focusing on significant statements. These statements, or meaningful units, captured the meaning of the experiences of first year educational leadership faculty. At this stage, McMillan (2004) predicted that “descriptions of what was experienced are separated from how it was experienced” (p.274).

The third reduction required the researcher to investigate all of the variations of a phenomenon and look for “essences.” Essences are commonly held experiences. Johnson and Christiansen (2004) described an essence “or invariant structure, [as] a part of the experience that is common or consistent across the research participants” (p.365).

Specific to this study, the research design included key phenomenological concepts in each part of the research process. Intentionality was the foundation for collecting each participant’s lived experiences as first year educational leadership professors. The concept of Epoche helped to frame the questions that were asked of participants in each phase of data collection. Lastly, reductions guided data analysis as the researcher sought to illuminate each participant’s description of her/his life-world and then explored further the essences or commonalities shared by all participants as first year educational leadership professors.

Population

The primary population of this research was first year educational leadership faculty from a southeastern regional university in the United States. It was to be noted that first year educational leadership faculty was defined as those new professors who

have never been employed as a full time professor and had just completed her/his first year in 2005-2006 academic year. For the first phase of data collection, the focus group interview, the researcher utilized this primary population. For the second phase of data collection, the same sample was interviewed. For the third phase and last phase of data collection, the researcher interviewed the secondary population of educational leadership faculty defined as key informants. These key informants were three professors from the same institution that were now considered junior faculty having been employed for two to four years at the time of the interviews. Lastly, another key informant was the department chair for all of the educational leadership professors. In total, there was six participants involved in the study.

Instrumentation

The researcher employed a different instrument for each phase of data collection. The foundation for each instrument was the research questions. In the first phase, the questions were open-ended and focused on gathering reflective, descriptive-rich lived experiences from the primary population of first year educational leadership faculty. As Johnson and Christensen (2004) simply state, “for research participants to explore their experience, they must be able to relive it in their minds, and they must be able to focus on the experience and nothing else” (p. 367). The researcher’s interview questions prompted participants to relive and retell their experiences in relation to key events and issues encountered throughout their first year as educational leadership professors. The researcher developed the instrument after a comprehensive examination of the related literature, relying heavily on the studies accomplished by Boice (1992) and Menges (1999). Due to the importance of meaning and interpretation required in

phenomenological study, the researcher also relied on questioning techniques outlined by Moustakas (1994).

In the second phase, the one-on-one in-depth interviews, the researcher used semi-structured, open-ended questions to guide the same three participants of the focus group in describing their unique personal and professional experiences around the first year in the educational leadership professoriate. In this phase, interview questions had gone through one round of reductions. Questions were specifically tailored to each participant allowing for optimal in-depth sharing of educational leadership first year faculty “life-world” experiences focused around common issues discussed in the literature.

In phase three, to buttress themes and meanings found in the first two phases of interviews, the researcher incorporated the questioning of a secondary population of professors known as the key informants. These key informants were defined as those individuals that have observed or participated in key lived experiences of the first year educational leadership faculty. The key informants also had fresh insights as they too had recently gone through the first year process. They were able to corroborate and support events described by the primary population of first year educational leadership professors. Questions were semi-structured and open-ended focusing on common issues illuminated in the literature. The goal of the researcher at this phase was to find common “life-world” experiences over time.

As described above, instrumentation and procedures for data collection conformed to a three phase process. The researcher designed this process specifically to meet the concerns for qualitative research credibility. In each phase, a similar but slightly

different research methodology was used to provide methods triangulation. As described by Johnson and Christensen (2004),

the logic is to combine different methods that have non-overlapping weaknesses and strengths. The weaknesses (and strengths) of one method will tend to be different from those of a different method, which means that when you combine two or more methods, you will have better evidence” (p.254).

Another credibility issue addressed in this three phase process was reliability. “Reliability,” as stated by McMillan (2004), “is the extent to which what has been recorded is what actually occurred”(p. 278). To ensure accuracy, the researcher used audio-taped recordings along with field notes. Additionally, the method of member checking was utilized. Member checking allowed the participant to give feedback on anything written about her/him.

Data Collection

In the first phase of data collection, the researcher asked three first year educational leadership professors from a single university to form a focus group interview. The focus group session was administered by the researcher who personally collected the data by field notes and audio-tape methods. The researcher employed the open-ended interview instrument discussed above hoping to construct preliminary meaning of the first year educational leadership lived experiences.

In phase two, each first year faculty member took part in an individualized in-depth interview. The interviews were conducted in person by the researcher. At this phase, the researcher employed a more refined open-ended, semi-structured interview

instrument and focused on issues specific to each participant. All interviews in the second phase were audio-taped and the researcher took field notes.

In the third phase, the key informants were individually interviewed. The key informants were contacted in person or by phone. A time and place for the interviews were determined. The interviews were conducted in person by the researcher. Using a different semi-structure, open-ended instrument, the researcher focused on issues facing the first year educational leadership faculty. All interviews were audio-taped and the researcher took field notes.

In summation, all data was collected by the researcher at each phase. At the end of the three phases, it was the intent of the researcher to employ observation, focus group interviews, and in-depth semi-structured interviews of both first year faculty and key informants to ensure research credibility. With this variety of data collection methods, the researcher was able to compellingly expose the life-world experiences of the all participants.

Data Analysis

In all phases of this study, participants were recorded by the researcher. The researcher employed a transcriptionist to help in transcription of all interviews. Additionally, the participants were given the opportunity to read and clarify their answers to all interview questions.

The researcher then employed a three stage reduction process for phenomenological data analysis. In the first stage, the researcher reported the participant's rich descriptions of their first year experiences as educational leadership

professors. McMillan (2004) recommended selecting “statements that show how the participants experience the phenomenon” (p. 274).

In the second stage, the researcher performed a reduction of the notes and transcripts for significant statements. These statements, or meaningful units, captured the meaning of the experiences of first year educational leadership faculty. At this stage, McMillan (2004) predicted that “descriptions of what was experienced are separated from how it was experienced” (p.274).

At the third and final stage, the researcher searched for themes or essences in the data. Johnson and Christensen (2004) purported “it is here that the researcher describes the fundamental features of the experience that are experienced in common by virtually all the participants” (p. 368).

Lastly, the researcher of this study employed the expertise of Dr. Ababayehu Tekleselassie, methodologist, to independently go through the three stage reduction process to further validate the researcher’s data analysis.

Treatment of the Data Collected

The researcher followed all guidelines for qualitative research required by the Georgia Southern University institutional review board (IRB). The focus group and semi-structured interviews were recorded by the researcher and transcribed assisted by a transcriptionist. All interview tapes were securely stored and locked in the home of the researcher, except while with the transcriptionist. To insure accuracy and privacy, the researcher employed member-checking to give participants the opportunity to read and review transcriptions and identify any inaccuracies or further elaborate on earlier comments. Participants were also given the opportunity to delete any information from

the transcriptions. The researcher protected anonymity of participants by assigning pseudonyms.

Lastly, after the completion of the study, all audio-taped interviews, transcriptions, and other un-coded materials were destroyed by fire. The researcher destroyed confidential material no later than one month after the completion of the study.

Summary

The researcher employed a qualitative, phenomenological design to explore the life-worlds of first year educational leadership faculty. The researcher collected data using a three phase process which included a focus group interview and in-depth interview instruments of both the primary population of first year faculty and the secondary population of key informants. The researcher recorded the interviews and transcribed the tapes. To analyze data, the researcher followed a three step reduction process. To validate the findings, the researcher utilized the expertise of Dr. Ababayehu Tekleselassie to also put the data through the reduction process. After analyzing the results of the study, the researcher used the findings to illuminate the meanings and essences of those who completed the first year of the educational leadership professoriate.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

If educational leadership faculty are going to survive the phenomenon of the first year in the professoriate, they must successfully assimilate the roles and responsibilities that come with the career. However, these roles and responsibilities can be massive and overwhelming. To further understand the unique challenges of the first year of the educational leadership professoriate, an exploration of its “life world” is necessary.

In this study the researcher examined the “life world” experiences of first year educational leadership faculty. Research questions were broadly focused to gather as many aspects of the first year phenomenon as possible. The overarching research question of the study was the following: What are the lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty? The following sub-questions were designed to support the overarching question and illuminate defining experiences of first year faculty:

1. Who are the people that choose to begin a career as first year educational leadership faculty?
2. What are the different lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty?
3. What are the common lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty?

Chapter four presents the analysis of data collected through interviews with three first year educational leadership faculty (primary population) along with two of their junior faculty colleagues and department chair (secondary population). The researcher employed a phenomenological research approach to discern more information about the “life worlds” of these professors. Using the research questions and five common areas of research in the literature, the interview questions were arranged topically to gather experiences in:

1. Personal and professional characteristics and attitudes of the educational leadership faculty
2. Daily life of the first year educational leadership faculty
3. Diversity of the first year educational leadership faculty
4. Mentoring of the first year educational leadership faculty
5. The beginning of the tenure process for the first year educational leadership faculty
6. Stress factors experienced by the first year educational leadership faculty
7. Perceptions of collegiality by the first year educational leadership faculty

Data Analysis

The researcher chose three first year educational leadership participants through convenience sampling to be the primary population. Two of the first year faculty members were Caucasian females and one was male and of African birth. The researcher chose a secondary population of existing faculty to be key informants. These key informants were interviewed as support for experiences of the primary population. Initially, the secondary population consisted of four professors. After the member-

checking phase, one professor chose to opt out of the study. Three professors remained. These existing faculty were all Caucasian and male. The researcher protected the professors' identities by assigning pseudonyms and editing transcript references to eliminate any reference to actual universities, cities, counties, states and countries to avoid revealing identifiable information. The only other pseudonym used was in reference to the university where they all worked. In transcription, brackets [] were used to show where the researcher eliminated specific names of institutions, etc. and replaced them with general terms.

For data analysis of the phenomenon of the first year in the educational leadership professoriate, the researcher began by placing verbatim responses to the interview questions organized under the seven topic areas of experiences. Using a modification of Moustakas' (1994) analysis for phenomenological data, the researcher created Individual Textural Descriptions from each participant for each topic area experience. To provide an analysis summary, the researcher concluded by developing a Composite Structural Description, comprised from the findings of the Individual Textural Descriptions, to expose the meanings and essences of the separate topic experiences.

The interview questions themselves were designed specifically for the two different faculty populations. Questions for the primary population of first year educational leadership faculty were refined from the focus group interview to the second phase in-depth interview. The refinement of questions aided the researcher in gathering deeper descriptions and meanings to the new faculty's lived experiences. The interview questions posed to the secondary population of key informants were designed to support the lived experiences of the first year faculty. This last phase of questioning focused

around the perceptions of these existing junior faculty and department chair. They were asked to share their insights on how the first year faculty were adjusting to professorial life and what changes, if any, existed between the new faculty experiences and those of the existing professors in their initial year of the professoriate.

Personal and Professional Characteristics and Attitudes of the Educational Leadership Faculty

Interview questions invited all participants to reveal their personal and professional paths that led them to the professoriate. Brief demographic information, as well as, personal attitudes about the professoriate gave the researcher a background foundation to assess responses. Professors Morris, Seagle, and Asfaw are from the primary population, the first year educational leadership professors. Professors Wilson, Fredericks, and Davis, known as the key informants, are from the secondary population of existing junior faculty and department chair. The following are the individual textural description for each participant.

Professor Morris

Professor Morris, was a Caucasian female, who recently retired from public education in a neighboring southern state. “I spent thirty-one years as a public high school teacher and administrator.” Professor Morris was also the first female head high school principal in her county. After receiving her doctorate three years ago, she worked with principal fellows for a local university and “was able to see a career of teaching at the university level because of that experience.” Professor Morris was attracted to Dixie Eastern University because it was a regional university similar to the university Professor

Morris had graduated from and “it was not too far from [my home state]...it was important to maintain my ability to get home.”

Professor Seagle

Professor Seagle was a Caucasian female from a small southern school system where she retired after serving as assistant school superintendent for instruction and personnel. Of the three first year faculty members, Professor Seagle had her doctorate the longest. “I have actually taught as adjunct faculty for the last twenty years in various colleges and universities. Professor Seagle had always aspired to be a professor but “college teaching was not an area I thought I could afford to do until after I retired from public school – I actually took a 55% cut in pay.”

Professor Asfaw

Professor Asfaw was born and raised in a poor, rural family in Africa. In his native country, Professor Asfaw taught high school and was a principal after he graduated from college. As a principal, he developed an interest in training and nurturing educational leaders. Professor Asfaw then moved on to higher education. “I worked as a lecturer and chairman of the department of educational research at the university before I came to [the United States] to pursue my Ph.D. degree.” Professor Asfaw had been in America for six years where he spent time gaining his terminal degree from a university in the North. He chose Dixie Eastern because he felt it would maximize his opportunities in research and teaching. “...This was an institution that was encouraged by my research and that’s what I liked...”

Professor Wilson

Professor Wilson was a Caucasian male from a small town in northern United States. He retired from a small rural school district where he served as teacher, administrator and finally, superintendent. “I was a public school teacher, administrator for over thirty-five years...” After getting his doctorate he had taught at the university level since 1970. “I just enjoy the classroom and I knew that when I retired that that’s what I wanted to do...” Professor Wilson took the job with Dixie Eastern University three years ago because he had a friend that encouraged him to do so. “I very much enjoyed the location, the facility, the people, etc.” Professor Wilson’s relationship to the first year faculty was an important one because he was the search committee chair. “I was their point of contact for talking about the position, encouraging them to come, helping to set up the interview, and was involved with them in various stages of the process.”

Professor Fredericks

Professor Fredericks was a Caucasian male from a town in the Midwest. Education was his second career after spending several years in architecture. He graduated in elementary education from a Midwest university then moved south to teach and later become an elementary principal. Professor Fredericks spent five years as principal before retiring from the county and pursuing his terminal degree. “I went to the university on a doctoral studies fellowship. I completed my doctoral studies there in educational administration and then came to Dixie Eastern in the fall of 2002 as an assistant professor.” Professor Fredericks believes his relationship with the first year faculty is positive and one of guidance. “I work with them a lot on the administrative side of what it takes to run a doctoral program ...I help them through that process.”

Professor Davis

Professor Davis was a male Caucasian who was department chair at Dixie Eastern University for the last three years. He graduated from one of the military academies and served in the military for over twenty-five years. Professor Davis enjoyed teaching during his military stint and "... figured then I would become a professor at some point in my life." Even though he is the first year faculty's department chair he does not come from the same program area. Professor Davis's area of expertise is instructional design. Professor Davis has been instrumental in the first year educational leadership faculty's lives. "I'm their department chair, if you were to look at a line structure...they report directly to me."

Personal and Professional Characteristics and Attitudes of the Educational Leadership

Faculty Composite Structural Description

Aspirations to be a new faculty member brought many different people to the professoriate. The professors represented different areas of the United States – north, south, and mid-west. One new faculty member was from Africa. Two out of the six professors were female. Both females represented new faculty. One out of the six professors was black; born in Africa. All of the professors had held other jobs before choosing the professoriate. Five faculty members had been school administrators. The last faculty member had been in the military. Five out of the six professors had retired from their positions. Only the department chair was a full tenured professor.

Daily Life of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Interview questions invited the first educational leadership faculty to comment on their typical work weeks. The new professors were also asked to describe their first days

on the job and their first classroom experiences. These revelations helped the researcher to identify what was important to the professors and how they spent their time on a daily basis. The following are the individual textural descriptions for each participant.

Professor Morris

From the beginning, Professor Morris was focused on the teaching aspects of her new career. “My first day on the job, I remember being in a faculty meeting and desperately wanted my teaching schedule so that I could work on what to teach and find out how to get books for students, that kind of thing.” Professor Morris commented on the diverse situations she was presented with in her two initial classes. The first night of the Politics of Education course went well. “I remember we went through the chapters in Joel Spring’s *Politics of Education* and they were just very engaged, very articulate and wanted to go in depth with several topics – it was very exciting!” The next night, in the Principalship course, was quite a contrast. “I remember being just a little nervous. It was ironic because I knew more about the principalship than any other subject in the world. I had been student of the principalship, I had taught the principalship, and I had been a mentor for aspiring principals for ten years.” Professor Morris’ nervousness resulted from finding that the students’ expectations differed from her expectations. “I realized that their expectations and the course syllabus didn’t match and I had to gear the class to what they really needed and wanted in this leadership course. It really opened my eyes...”

As time went on Professor Morris found that she spent a large part of her time on coursework. “The first semester, my typical week was planning for instruction. I’m going to say that eighty percent of my time was planning. I really wanted both courses in that first semester to provide some in-depth experience and knowledge for the candidates. So

planning for class, really by assessing and getting ready for quality feedback, that's where I spent most of my time."

Towards the end of the first semester, Professor Morris was confronted with new challenges. "I was asked to serve on some [doctoral] committees and I was not expecting to do that my first year." She re-prioritized her work week to try to acquaint herself with the advisement of all students – masters level and doctoral. "I really wanted to get into advisement - to look at our program more as a deep developmental program rather than a training program. I wanted to see how our assessments could transcend the courses...it brought about some good discussions with our faculty about the process, program of study, and advisement."

With this new knowledge of advisement came added responsibilities. By the end of the second semester, Professor Morris was overwhelmed by doctoral student demands. "I have seventeen (doctoral committees) that I am chairing and I don't know how that happened!" Due to faculty attrition and more students, the new faculty member found herself burdened with needy doctoral students.

At the end of the first year, Professor Morris was still enthused about her new career as an educational leadership professor. "I love learning, and I love reading, and I really enjoyed the whole dynamic of learning. I think the most rewarding has been trying to bridge the gap between research and practice...what impact I might be able to make in that area."

Professor Seagle

Professor Seagle came into her new full-time career as an educational leadership professor with prior higher education experience. "I've always loved teaching and I've

taught as adjunct faculty over the years for different colleges and universities. I've always known that teaching was my big thing." At first, like Professor Morris, she also found herself mired in faculty meetings and staff development and longing for the classroom. "I really thought during that first week...I had made a mistake... because if I was going to have to do all this other stuff rather than just teaching, I needed to be doing something else."

Professor Seagle's first week of classes reaffirmed her career decision. "I taught my very first class in general school administration and that was wonderful fun. I think leadership candidates are more assertive than regular students and that is all the more intriguing to me. You don't have a whole lot of "kissing up" to the professor. These are people who in their own rights have made a place for themselves. They are in Maslow's level of self-actualization and so it easy to see where they are and I love that!"

Professor Seagle found her work week filled with course planning and student feedback.

In her first semester, she taught three new classes which required three new preparations. Professor Seagle enjoyed the variety and felt it better prepared her for student advisement. "Our program managers wanted us to settle in and become 'gurus' in one or two classes. That was OK but I like variety...it worked nicely for me to have multiple lesson plans and classes going on at one time." Professor Seagle maintained that her teaching schedule required two to three days of intense planning.

Professor Seagle reported that she spent a couple hours each day advising students. "Every morning I checked email, responded to email, and answered phone calls from students...and students didn't mind calling on Saturday or Sunday! I've got to get a handle on that." Like Professor Morris, Professor Seagle had also taken on student

advisement duties. She found that dissertation meetings had cut tremendously into her time for planning and student feedback.

At the end of her first year as an educational leadership professor, Professor Seagle felt it had been harder than she thought but still where she wanted to be. “So when I see the candidates growing and learning and absorbing and taking it back and sharing...I just beam. I’m right where I ought to be.”

Professor Asfaw

Professor Asfaw had similar experiences regarding his first day on the job as an educational leadership professor. “My first day was unorganized...I was given an office and told that I was teaching three classes and that I should prepare for those classes ... there was no clear vision.” He was also frustrated with the university orientation which seemed to be focused to those who had never been in the classroom. “I gave credit to the university for at least having an orientation but it was too broad and too general...when it came to what I was supposed to do as an educational leadership professor, there was no orientation.”

Again, like his new faculty cohorts, Professor Asfaw had a very successful start to his educational leadership teaching career. “This was my first class in this country...I had never conducted a class on my own [in the United States].” Professor Asfaw felt personally and academically prepared but was nervous that his accent might pose a problem for his students’ comprehension. That was not the case and he found the class to be most receptive to him. “I started to build more confidence seeing that the students were responsive and motivated.”

Professor Asfaw's typical work week started out with daily morning dialogs with students through email or phone. "Most of the emails were from my students that I was helping as methodologist on their dissertations." Like his counterparts, Professor Asfaw responded to the need for student advisement early in the first semester of his initial year. Because he was known for having research expertise, Professor Asfaw was sought out by many students who were looking for a methodologist for their dissertation committee. "I currently have over twenty students that I am helping as their methodologist. Being a methodologist is just as challenging as being a doctoral chair... sometimes more."

Professor Asfaw believed that the majority of his week was spent reading and providing feedback to his students. "So most of the time I spent was in providing feedback for my students. Then I prepared for class and if I had some free time I wrote a paragraph or two for one of my publication projects."

Professor Asfaw felt strongly that his first year in the educational leadership professoriate was a great opportunity. "This kind of scenario, being a first year faculty member in this environment gave me a unique opportunity. I don't think in any other university, first year faculty chair doctoral dissertations. So by directly being on the firing line, the challenge was immense but I learned a lot of things." Professor Asfaw believed he had been given a fast track to the professoriate. "I didn't regret taking this job at all. As difficult, as challenging, as stressful as it was, I still felt it was a rewarding experience."

Professor Wilson

Professor Wilson supported the fact that the new educational leadership faculty had been given responsibilities that most first year professors did not have. "...they served

on doctoral committees and did some other advisement which was time consuming.”

Professor Wilson also went into detail about the added responsibility of the quality and quantity of graduate student work, especially doctoral students. “...it’s the time to evaluate what [the students] turn in that takes longer for doctoral students...reviewing not just format and content, but also references, the synthesis of ideas, etc. that you are not going to do for masters level or EDS students and especially not undergraduates.”

Professor Fredericks

Professor Fredericks felt that the new faculty members had adjusted nicely to their new careers as educational leadership professors. “I think they have very quickly become positive contributors to the overall program.” He purposed that the faculty had adjusted in three specific areas; scheduling their day, team demands, and travel. “...they have come to realize there is a lot to the job besides preparing a lesson plan and going to teach...they have been very participative in the NCATE review...and they have done well with the travel or what we call windshield time to other campus locations.”

Professor Davis

Professor Davis, as the first year faculty’s department chair, had a unique view of the professors’ daily lives. He believed that they had achieved a balance. “I believe that they understand what is required and I believe that they are developing a plan to get from year one to tenure.” Professor Davis also thought that initially, the first year faculty was focusing their efforts on teaching but had stepped in to advisement responsibilities. “I’ve seen them getting more involved in the advising. We initially tried to isolate them, to fence them off from advising issues during their first year but...we were forced to

transition them to doctoral chairs because of the number of faculty to [student] distribution.”

Daily Life of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description

The three first year faculty members found their daily lives as educational leadership professors challenging ones. All three had similar experiences with their first days on the job. The professors were frustrated with the lack of specific instruction on just what they needed to know and be able to do as educational leadership professors. All three professors focused on preparation for their first classroom experiences. And, again, all three had favorable responses to their initial teaching.

Each new faculty member found their professional time shift from class planning and preparation to student advisement. Much of their daily routines involved comprehensive feedback to students, especially doctoral students. The secondary population of professors supported this claim. These faculty members also thought that the new professors had successfully met the day-to-day challenges of their new careers, especially with those issues of student advisement normally considered to be seasoned professorial responsibilities.

Diversity of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Interview questions invited all participants to comment on the uncommon fact that all three new faculty members were from minority status. Questions for the new professors were designed to gather specific information about their own thoughts and experiences with being a minority. The secondary population was asked their opinions on the addition of these minority faculty members as far as possible changes to climate and

culture and the degree of commitment to diversity of the educational leadership program. All of these questions helped the researcher in assessing the past, present, and future program climate in relation to diversity. The following are the individual textual descriptions for each participant.

Professor Morris

The issue of diversity and being a member of a minority group was a new concept for Professor Morris. “It registers no meaningful significance to me to be a minority hire. I don’t even know, conceptually, how to think about that.” As she reflected back on her career as a school administrator, the only significance that she could identify with was the fact that she had been the first woman head principal in her school district. “I never really experienced any barriers or problems, advantages or disadvantages in that career.”

Professor Morris did not expect to find any personal diversity issues becoming one of the few women professors in the educational leadership program. “As a female coming into higher education in a university setting, teaching educational leadership, there are many woman principals now ... there really are more women in our educational leadership programs than men.”

Interestingly though, Professor Morris had chosen to explore the issue of women in leadership more in her first year of the professoriate. “...several students wanted to study the issue of the female administrator...the barriers to females at the superintendent’s level...because of their interests, I developed an interest as far as developing my own research agenda.”

Professor Seagle

Professor Seagle also felt that she had not been confronted with any issues involving her minority status at Dixie Eastern. "...maybe that is because I am of the ethnic majority and that is why I don't feel it as much as being a woman of an ethnic minority. It is true that females do not constitute a large percentage of educational leadership faculty but I have always felt like everybody has made me feel like a vital part of the team." Professor Seagle did share that she had encountered bias toward her as a women in her past. "I fought that battle 20 years ago when I served three terms as an elected county commissioner."

As a school administrator, Professor Seagle, like Professor Morris, had not encountered sexual discrimination. "I believe it had to do with leadership faculty who worked around females in their professional lives and it was just not an issue... The other thing about it was I have always made sure that I was part of the group. If I heard males say that they were going to go eat, I came out of my office and asked to go with them."

Professor Seagle believed that her students received her well as a women administrator and professor. "I have been in a lot of positions in school settings and I bring a lot of experience to the table and so I don't feel that I have less to offer."

Professor Asfaw

Not only being a minority but from a foreign country, Professor Asfaw had a unique view of professional life and minority status. "The concept of minority in my case is double bound. First, I am somebody from another country. Secondly, I am a black person." Because Professor Asfaw had, throughout his life in his native country, persevered against many obstacles, he believed that hard work had allowed him to

circumvent bias that he has experienced. “I am proud to have finished my degree, gotten a job and become a minority faculty member. I have strong qualifications and am successful in my job. I have not felt any stigma or sense of inferiority nor been excluded by students or faculty. My minority status does not hold me back from anything that I want to be.” Professor Asfaw also believed his unique minority status can be valuable to the university community. “I want to capitalize more on my experience outside of the United States. I bring to this faculty more diversity in my international experience than just my color.”

As far as his students are concerned, Professor Asfaw has been pleasantly surprised with their openness and acceptance of him. “Most of my students look at me in terms of my teaching – they respect me and appreciate my scholarship.” Professor Asfaw reports that between 95 – 99% of his students give him very positive evaluations. Any complaints involve his verbal communication which, he added with humor, that he was not aware that different parts of the United States had different accents until he moved to Dixie Eastern. “I try to inform my students to get beyond what I am to what I can offer. The students that can’t do that, I believe, have never been outside this area and opened themselves up to diversity and to appreciate what diversity offers.”

Professor Wilson

Being the chair for the search committee that hired the three new faculty members, Professor Wilson was quick to note that there was a concerted effort to bring minorities to the educational leadership program at Dixie Eastern. “We noticed that most of the applicants tended to be people who were white males – not too much of a diverse pool. So we made an effort...to try to encourage people who would be diverse to come

and take a look at Dixie Eastern.” Professor Wilson announced that the new faculty members had added immensely to the quality of the program. “I think each one has brought his/her own uniqueness and exceptional talents and abilities. They have also broadened the understanding that our students have about things as they happen from various minority perspectives.”

Professor Fredericks

Professor Fredericks echoed Professor Wilson’s commitment to diversity. “...when you go through the search process, you always look for diversity within your program especially leadership. Contrary to the private sector, we have a lot more females and minorities in leadership positions in education as assistant principals, principals, supervisors and superintendents – far, far outside the norm of the private sector. So it is extremely important to have that kind of representation in the faculty.” Professor Fredericks also believed that the new faculty hires had been good ones. “They added a lot of richness...it’s very beneficial for our students to see those kinds of role models.”

Professor Davis

As department chair, Professor Davis was dedicated to finding the best fit for the educational leadership program. “My belief was, number one, we ought to hire the best person for the job. Given that we also needed to look at attracting a diverse faculty because for too long we had been a faculty of all white guys and it built a culture that was not healthy for the program.” Professor Davis was in agreement with the junior faculty members that much had been gained with the new faculty members. “...the people we hired were the best people and they just happened to be...two women and a foreign

minority, an African man...it's added to the diverse culture within the department and with the programs.”

Diversity of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite Structural Description

The three new faculty members in the educational leadership program at Dixie Eastern were two women and one African male. Not one of the new professors reported that they had encountered any disadvantages or advantages related to their minority status. Each felt they had much to offer to their program and students. The two female faculty members reported that they had never experienced any bias in the educational setting. Professor Asfaw, the African male, had experienced many obstacles throughout his life but chose to take them on as challenges. Professor Asfaw believed any bias that he encountered at Dixie Eastern could be attributed more to his foreign status than his race. All three new faculty members reported positive evaluations from their students.

The secondary population of the two junior faculty members and department chair were in agreement that the addition of minorities to the program was a positive one. There appeared to be a concerted commitment to diversify the faculty by those that were already members. All three were happy with the new faculty members and felt that they brought new experiences and richness to the educational leadership program.

Mentoring of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Interview questions were designed to explore the role of mentoring in the lives of the new educational leadership faculty members. The three new professors were asked about their experiences with mentoring, either formal or informal, at Dixie Eastern. Questions asked of the secondary population focused on both the mentoring of the new

professors and the mentoring experiences of their own. All of these questions helped the researcher in assessing the overall commitment to mentoring. The following are the individual textual descriptions from each participant.

Professor Morris

Professor Morris described mentoring as “a one-on-one relationship with somebody who has experiences and qualifications of success (in your program area). A person that would share and offer advice and give you feedback...go into your class, talk about your syllabus, and give you feedback.” Professor Morris reported that there was no such formal training in the educational leadership program at Dixie Eastern. She did say that the new faculty members were required to go to a series of university-wide workshops. “...they selected what they thought were some generic kinds of issues that first year faculty would need to know and had professors make presentations.” Professor Morris remembered one professor offering her services for advisement but nothing formal. Overall, she felt that the university’s “mentoring” sessions missed the mark concerning what she thought a graduate level professor needed to know. Lastly, Professor Morris profoundly commented, “[looking at the mentoring process] in educational leadership, do we model what we teach as good practice? I don’t think we do.”

As far as informal mentoring was concerned, Professor Morris divulged that she was approached by a senior faculty member in the winter of her first year. “One professor sort of took us under his wing at some point in January/February and said, ‘I want to help you grow and develop.’ He really took on that mentor role and structured it to what we needed to do and how he could help...that was invaluable.”

Professor Seagle

Professor Seagle had a similar definition of mentoring as Professor Morris. “I think of mentoring as a program where you actually partner with somebody, some veteran on the force that really comes in and shows you the ropes and tells you the stuff that’s not always in black and white right there on the page.” She also believed that the university had fallen short in what she referred to as orientation meetings. “The university really felt like it was a mentoring program by having the orientations once a month and giving us information.” When it came to Professor Seagle’s impression of the lack of mentoring in at the program level she offered a unique viewpoint. “As far as a real process of moving us along and teaching us the ropes...a true mentoring process, I don’t think that exists here. But, I never felt like I couldn’t go in and ask for help. I think people thought that I knew all this already because I’ve been in the education business and they did not want to give me advice – it might offend me - which, of course, was not the case.” Professor Seagle conveyed that she would have benefited greatly from a formal mentoring process.

Professor Seagle also spoke of the senior professor who had offered his expertise. “There was not a formal mentoring process, but there definitely was an informal one.” Professor Seagle reported that most of this informal mentoring came while the two professors shared windshield time going back and forth to class in another town.

Professor Asfaw

In his interview, Professor Asfaw discussed formal mentoring as a program, run by administration, where a new professor is set up with another, more experienced faculty member. He confirmed that there was no such program in the educational

leadership program. Professor Asfaw did bring up the sessions held by the university for novice professors. He was in agreement that these sessions were not as helpful as he had hoped or needed. "I don't believe there is a formal mentoring process available here..." Professor Asfaw also went into detail about his informal mentoring relationship with the senior faculty member that the other two had named. Professor Asfaw believed that this professor wanted to especially focus on the scholarship area of their jobs. "He went out of his way and approached me and my colleagues to work with him on some research agendas. He anticipated that because of the amount that we were working we may be removed from scholarship which counts most in terms of getting tenure...He was trying to teach us the game..."

Professor Wilson

As a junior faculty member, Professor Wilson's experiences with mentoring at the higher education level were minimal. He mentioned the university level sessions as the only formal mentoring program that he was aware of. "I know I was a part of some of those. Unfortunately, they scheduled a lot of meetings when we taught because it was driven by an undergraduate orientation...that's all well and good for those people, but we start our day at five o'clock at night." Professor Wilson had not taken part in any informal mentoring experience either as a protégé or mentor. Contrastingly, Professor Wilson made the following comments regarding mentoring. "The research on it illustrates that those who participate in mentoring have a greater potential to stay within the organization. Because you are developing a close personal relationship, you can tell stories about the organization, the culture, you can make those connections and you can help someone grow and develop as a professional. That is very valuable."

Professor Fredericks

Professor Fredericks' experiences with mentoring as an educational leadership professor were similar to Professor Wilson's. He referred to the university level mentoring as a one year induction program. "...[it consisted of] here is what you need to know and if you have any questions come see me and I will share with you, etc."

Professor Fredericks also reported that he had not been a part of any informal mentoring experience. Lastly, he was not aware of any formal or informal mentoring program for the new faculty members. "I'm not involved in any formal mentoring program with them."

Professor Davis

As department chair, Professor Davis had poignant thoughts about mentoring at the higher education level. "I believe in mentorship not only in professional life but in personal life, as well. It provides direction to the person being mentored in a non-threatening environment. It provides an opportunity to bounce ideas off and provides accountability." In response to the lack of a formal mentoring program in the educational leadership program, Professor Davis remarked that the issue had been one he had struggled with as a department chair. "We are weak in that area. Mentorship takes time, mentorship takes shared experiences, and one of the things that our faculty, in all our programs not just in educational leadership, are strapped for, is time."

*Mentoring of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty**Composite Structural Description*

The issue of mentoring of first year educational leadership faculty seemed to be an elusive one at best. Both old and new faculty members were articulate and enthusiastic

about mentoring and its benefits. All three new professors reported that Dixie Eastern had provided a mentoring program but felt that it had fallen short of what they needed to know as graduate level professors. Conversely, all three mentioned the informal mentoring relationship they had experienced with a senior member of the faculty which they found invaluable. The junior faculty members also reported that they had been involved in the university level mentoring program. One professor had referred to it as more of an induction process. Neither junior faculty members reported an informal mentoring relationship. Lastly, the department chair, voiced his belief in a structured mentoring program and expressed that the professors lacked the time not commitment to such a project.

The Beginning of the Tenure Process for the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Interview questions invited all participants to reveal their thoughts and experiences regarding the higher education tenure process of educational leadership professors. Questions were structured around the three components of tenure – teaching, research or scholarship, and service. All of these questions helped the researcher in assessing the overall depth of understanding of the tenure process of both the primary and secondary populations. The following are the individual textual descriptions for each participant.

Professor Morris

When asked about the tenure process, Professor Morris felt she had a clear understanding of the expectations for teaching, research or scholarship, and service. “...our department chair met with me early on and talked about...the pre-tenure review

and expectations as far as research publication...they expect us to be quality teachers and those ratings that are on your student evaluations will be a player in the whole tenure process.” She went on to discuss the process after three years and after six years and pointed out that it was well defined in the handbook for professors.

Professor Morris believed that the role of teaching was first on her list of priorities. “It is the one that dominates the time... there is a lot of planning involved because of the way we have our program structured here. I have enjoyed the teaching and I have enjoyed the experience of working with the development of online courses ...but it has been very time consuming.”

Professor Morris spent a large part of the time speaking about research and scholarship. “I would define scholarship in this tenure process as studying in a formal setting the issues that relate to educational leadership.” When asked about where Professor Morris was in the terms of scholarship she revealed several projects in the submission, presentation and formulation stages. She articulated a comprehensive research agenda.

Professor Morris was less comfortable discussing the service component of the tenure process. “I think that service is working on committees at the departmental and university levels.” She purposed a novel thought. “I think of time spent with students as service...the quality of time you spend with students in the doctoral program is very time consuming and unique to any doctoral program at the university level. Do people know how much time educational leadership professors spend with their candidates? You have to listen, think through the construct of their conceptual framework, and get to know

them as scholars and researchers. I think there is a lot of service we as researchers and scholars give to students in a doctoral program.”

Lastly, Professor Morris shared her tension with the struggle of prioritizing her teaching and scholarship responsibilities. “I hear our department chair say quite often that whatever you do, take care of your students. I can appreciate [the thought] coming from a public school arena and having that mind set and philosophy myself. But, I think about this new career for me, I want to do well at it. I want to be a scholar. I want to conduct research, write and publish. I feel that teaching, with planning, number of students, and the way our program is structured, is too demanding and scholarship, I am afraid...has been difficult for me.”

Professor Seagle

Professor Seagle agreed with Professor Morris that their department chair had done an excellent job of defining the tenure process especially expectations for research and publication. “ My department chairman was the one who made it crystal clear about what we needed to do...he made a couple of good recommendations...then directed me to other people who gave me some down and dirty information ...that was great.”

Professor Seagle seemed to be most confident in fulfilling her teaching requirement for tenure. Her love of teaching was apparent. Because she had been an adjunct for many years, “I am really into my teaching and it will be no problem for me. It takes an awful lot of my time but it is something that I love.”

Professor Seagle spent a lot of time talking about research but was less sure of her research agenda and how to go about it. “The one issue for me is scholarship.” Professor Seagle acknowledged that being a former English teacher that her writing skills were

keen. She believed it was more an issue of time than anything else. “I would really like to do some original research on my own. But one of my assets is not patience and it is very hard for me to look at the publication process and research...at the university level it is not instant gratification. It is just like you keep writing and sending it out and working on it ...that is not my strong point.”

Like Professor Morris, Professor Seagle had a different view of the service component of the tenure process. “My definition of service was not the same as how the university defined it. When I came here I thought that service was doing things for the university, in the name of the university in schools and the community.” Professor Seagle had volunteered time at the P-12 level and was told that this kind of service was not what the university was looking for. It was explained to Professor Seagle that service was related mostly to serving on university level committees. “Because I am new and not known, I do not get asked to serve on university committees. My department chair said that [opportunities] will come with time.”

Professor Asfaw

Professor Asfaw’s thoughts on the tenure components of teaching, research, and service were unique and thought provoking. He echoed his two cohorts that the university’s expectations for the tenure process were clearly stated. As far as the teaching component was concerned, Professor Asfaw believed that teaching at the graduate level was different from teaching undergrad. “At the undergraduate level, the role of the professor is more the imparting of knowledge. At the graduate level, especially with educational leaders who already have a wealth of information from practice, the role of the professor is to help them see those practices through theoretical lenses to see the

larger picture. The professor must be armed with different theories, practices and research innovation. The responsibility of the professor is to conduct research and create a nexus between research and practice...”

Professor Asfaw looked at both research and teaching components of the tenure process as interconnected. “The boundary between research, practice and teaching is blurred for me.” Professor Asfaw articulated a strong commitment to research and publishing which he had already begun as a graduate student. “Even if it was not required by the institution to produce publications, I would do it anyway. I have the skills to produce so I can meet those expectations.”

As far as the service component for tenure was concerned, Professor Asfaw purposed a different definition from the university. “I think the service component should not be a set one but one based on the uniqueness of the individual. I am from an international background so my service should be framed in such a way that I can allow my background to be a meaningful contribution. Assigning people to different committees simply to fill the tenure criteria is...dispersing energy elsewhere.”

Lastly, Professor Asfaw echoed the same concerns about the demands of the teaching and scholarship that Professor Morris had. “When I see the expectations for scholarship and teaching for new faculty, I see a mismatch. The teaching is too demanding with the amount of courses and students combined. Producing something for scholarly publication is very demanding also. As new faculty members I think we need support for such endeavors but all we get is more responsibilities that normally senior faculty has. The mismatch is between expectations for tenure and the support system which is not available.”

Professor Wilson

Professor Wilson, as a junior faculty member, was well into the tenure process and shared his journey with the researcher. Professor Wilson believed that teaching should be the main focus of the educational leadership professor. "...everyone wants to succeed as a classroom teacher. This is still a teaching college...we spend a lot of time with students...the program is very student-oriented. Unfortunately what happens as you go through the process of evaluation you find that it is not just teaching but it is also research and service. With all the time that we spend with teaching it is difficult to continue with your own research agenda." The struggle between research and teaching demands voiced by the new faculty was also reality for Professor Wilson.

Professor Wilson thought that the new faculty members were doing well with their tenure requirements. "I know we are all trying to encourage them in terms of research and service." He felt that the majority of the new faculty members' time was spent on teaching. "I am sure that seventy percent of their time is spent on teaching, twenty on service and ten percent on research."

Professor Wilson believed that the service component was comprised of service to the university, service to the community and service to the profession. He recognized the efforts of the new faculty members to get involved. "I think they do as much as they can be expected to do..."

Professor Fredericks

Professor Fredericks was articulate as he expressed his views on the tenure process and its components. "I have some very different ideas on the tenure track. I think there is more than one way to achieve tenure." Like Professor Wilson, Professor

Fredericks felt that the university orientation was geared toward teaching success. "...we were told in no uncertain terms, concentrate on the teaching. Period...we will worry about the other stuff later." Professor Fredericks also shared with the researcher that his struggle with accomplishing his research goals was further compounded when he accepted the extra responsibility of doctoral program coordinator.

Professor Fredericks reported that he had many conversations with the new faculty regarding the tenure process. "I have been very vocal with them on the importance of learning to teach but also the importance of having a publication agenda. [I believe] when it is all said and done, you can get moderate to uncomplimentary teaching evaluations and they will have very little to do with your tenure promotion as long as you have published." When asked whether he believed the new faculty were moving in the right direction as far as tenure was concerned, Professor Fredericks related, "I think initially they were totally involved in the teaching aspect. I think now, because I have witnessed it, I have seen them working with other colleagues putting together research articles and agendas."

Professor Davis

As department chair, Professor Davis reported that he began communicating with the new faculty members the expectations for tenure in the interviews. "I started during their interviews when we were recruiting them...during the first week before classes, I held an orientation for our departmental new faculty...where I talked about departmental policies...I specifically went over the promotion of tenure process and the faculty evaluation review."

The Beginning of the Tenure Process of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty
Composite Structural Description

Tenure track status brought to the new educational leadership faculty a sense of structure. All three professors agreed that their department chair had been clear on the university expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service. Each new faculty member expressed a strong commitment to teaching success. The professors also believed that they had been hired at a research institution so each had individual research agendas and plans for publication. Professor Asfaw had the most experience with research and publication having done so in his native country and as a doctoral student. The service component proved to be the most nebulous for the new professors. Each knew what the university defined as service but all three professors shared a unique view of what they believed service should be. Lastly, all three expressed the struggle with the demands from teaching and research. One professor defined the struggle as a mismatch between tenure expectations and the lack of a support system to help achieve such expectations.

In comparison, the junior faculty related their journeys with the tenure process. Both professors believed they had been hired at a teaching college and teaching success was foremost in the tenure process. The junior faculty were frustrated and surprised after their third year review when research and publication seemed to be more of a defining issue than they had thought. Professor Fredericks, because of this experience, strongly articulated to the new faculty the importance of their research publications along with teaching.

Stress Factors Experienced by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Interview questions invited all participants to reveal their personal and professional struggles as first year faculty members in educational leadership. All of these questions helped the researcher in assessing the key stressors of new professors and whether those stressors changed over time. The following are the individual textual descriptions for each participant.

Professor Morris

Professor Morris shared that the majority of her stress was self-imposed. Her first stressor was centered on the pressure to be an excellent teacher. “I think my biggest source of stress for me, personally and professionally, is the need to be a great teacher. I want to provide for the students in our program with quality teaching.” Professor Morris felt that the planning and development of a variety of experiences to create educational leaders was exhausting. Related to the first stressor was the need to feel professionally competent and respected. “I was at the top of my game when I was principal of the year and people in my state respected me as an educational leader.” In her first year as an educational leadership faculty member, Professor Morris felt less adequate. Her feelings of inadequacy were multiplied by the amount of students that Professor Morris was responsible for with teaching and advising.

The third and fourth stressors in Professor Morris’s life were related. As her first year continued, Professor Morris grew increasingly troubled about her research agenda. “...the stress for me is I need to do this for my own professional growth and I’m not going to get tenure. I am not going to be anywhere close if I do not develop my research agenda.” Professor Morris revealed that her research aspirations were often placed on the

back burner for more pressing commitments. “The stress for me is we do not have time to do it...” Lack of time was the fourth stressor that Professor Morris mentioned. Time constraints seemed to cut across many of the new faculty member’s life increasing her stress level. “I think that the amount of time...time management...is an area I have got to work on because I know I have to spend more time on scholarship and what is that going to mean to my teaching?”

Lastly, when asked what she did to relieve stress, Professor Morris pointed to “getting away.” Spending time with family and friends and being by the water were her favorite ways to balance her life. “Going to the water probably relieves my stress more than anything.”

Professor Seagle

Professor Seagle’s first three stressors related mostly to time issues. First, because of her home being 100 miles from Dixie Eastern, she spends a lot of time in the car. She did purchase a house closer to the university but her family still operated out of the other home. “It is hard for me to juggle my time and get everything done that I need to do. I don’t ever feel like I am caught up and that has been a very stressful thing.” Professor Seagle’s second stressor was the student load. “I have a thousand things to do; emails to answer, dissertations to read, and defenses to get ready for...” Third, she mentioned the lack of time to concentrate on her research agenda.

Like Professor Morris, Professor Seagle felt that her stress was partly self-induced. She also pointed to feelings of inadequacy. “The pressure that I was feeling was coming from within because I felt so inadequate at times. My biggest stress was coming

in [to Dixie Eastern] as a nobody. I was used to being the big dog and making all the plans, calling all the meetings, and being in the loop for everything.”

Professor Asfaw

Professor Asfaw believed that his stressors were related to the magnitude of the job. “The stress comes from learning the game.” First, Professor Asfaw mentioned the pressure of teaching. “...familiarizing yourself with the courses and learning teaching strategies...” Second, Professor Asfaw related his stress with the amount of students he was teaching and advising. He was frustrated with not only having to teach doctoral level courses in his first year but also the amount of students in each. “It is not only the kind of work we are doing but the amount of work that is very stressful. This summer I taught a doctoral core class that had thirty-five students. Imagine grading papers and giving feedback for thirty-five students – it was too much.” Third, like his two cohorts, Professor Asfaw felt with the amount of student responsibilities in and out of the classroom, there was little time left for his research and publication. “...it eats away at my productivity, in addition to being stressful.” Once again, Professor Asfaw pointed to his frustration with tension between expectations and reality. “There is a mismatch between the university’s expectations and the structure of the graduate program...they do not work hand in hand.”

Unique to Professor Asfaw were his stressors around acclimating himself and his family to their new home. “Because I was a professor in a new country, navigating and learning a new culture is a source of my stress.” He mentioned the pressure to create balance between his family life and his professional life. “Coming into the office usually

on the weekends [to work on publications] is at the cost of my family time...if I take work home, it also interferes..."

When asked what he did to relieve stress, Professor Asfaw was at a loss for words. "Honestly speaking, I am doing nothing. When I have some time, the only thing that I do is play with my children...no vacation... it's not feasible."

Professor Wilson

Professor Wilson believed that the overall job expectations were the source of stress for first year educational leadership faculty. "The multiplicity of expectations from people in terms of meetings, service on committees, student advisement, etc. [is stressful]." Because Professor Wilson had been a superintendent, he reported that a lot of his stress came from a lack of clerical support. "We were hiring folks who come out of the public school sector as assistant superintendents or principals where they had one to three secretaries who did the 'administrivia.' Now they are expected to do it on their own." Professor Wilson believed that this administrivia ate away at the finite amount of time that all professors have to give to their students.

As junior faculty, Professor Wilson felt the amount of stress had not changed since his first year. "As I got closer to tenure review, I really hadn't [spent time on] my research because I was devoting more time to teaching and advisement...it still is a time management issue."

Professor Fredericks

Professor Fredericks purposed that learning what was involved in the job, complicated with time issues, was the biggest source of stress for first year educational leadership faculty. "The demands on your time are tremendous. There are committee

functions, meetings, student advisement, class preparation, class travel time, research and publication, and service to the university. Stress may be related to a misunderstanding what is involved in the professoriate and then having to deal with it in a very short order.” Professor Fredericks believed that stress did change as he became a junior faculty member. “As you mature in your job, the stress changes a little...from lesson preparation and delivery to research and publication.”

Professor Davis

Professor Davis maintained that first year faculty stress was related to time. “I think it is about time allocation - priority management.” He felt that until a new professor knows what the job entails it is very difficult to make priorities. “When I have my one-on-one sessions with each one of the faculty, I try to make sure that they have a sense of what their priorities are.”

As department chair, Professor Davis also pushed his faculty to create balance in their lives. “I believe a professor needs to have a life outside the university. They can not spend all their time focusing on what they are going to do tomorrow at work. They need to have a family life... and outside interests.”

Stress Factors Experienced by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Composite Structural Description

First year educational leadership faculty spoke to many stressors in their professional lives. Most of these stressors related to time management and the overwhelming responsibilities of their new careers. All three felt there was not enough time in their day to adequately service the amount of students they taught and advised. Along with student demands, university responsibilities, driving time, and meetings cut

into what little time they had left for research. The three professors confessed their disappointment in not having the time to spend on research endeavors. One new professor purposed that a formal support system should be put in place to help new faculty achieve their tenure expectations.

Two of the new professors maintained that self-induced pressures were also a part of their stress. Their need for competency and respect caused them sleepless nights as they struggled to be masters of their domains. One professor also voiced his struggle with acclimating his family to a new life and culture. The balance of personal and professional life was an issue for all three new faculty members. Only one professor admitted to trying to alleviate stress.

The junior faculty members along with the department chair agreed that learning the job under time constraints was the biggest source of stress for new professors. The junior faculty believed that as a faculty member matured on the job, the source of stress changed from teaching to research issues. The department chair spoke to priority management and balance in both new and older faculty members' lives.

Perceptions of Collegiality by First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Interview questions gave all participants the opportunity to discuss collegiality between the new faculty members and throughout the educational leadership program as a whole. These questions helped the researcher in assessing the level of collegiality demonstrated by all educational leadership professors. The following are the individual textual descriptions for each participant.

Professor Morris

Professor Morris defined collegiality as the “sharing of a common purpose with others in the university setting.” Professor Morris felt that the three new faculty members shared a special collegiality with each other. “We shared our successes and our disillusionment. We have a sort of camaraderie that has really helped me develop...I cannot imagine staying in this career and not staying in touch with them for rest of my career.”

As far program collegiality was concerned, Professor Morris acknowledged that other faculty members shared a common purpose. She did feel that the structure of the program did not help in fostering collegiality among members. “I think you have to have collaboration to [work for] a common purpose...I’m not sure if we are set up to really work together to do that. I see that we are isolated and each person is for themselves.”

Overall, Professor Morris thought highly of everyone in her educational leadership program but felt that more was needed to maximize the collegial nature of other faculty members. Professor Morris theorized that collegiality might be related to Dixie Eastern growing as a research institution. “Because DEU is moving from a traditional undergraduate institution to a research institution, I wonder if that has caused feelings I have perceived through my interactions with others as lack of support or collegiality for graduate faculty like us. When I have gone outside our program, I have not felt a supportive relationship and, maybe, some resentment...”

Professor Seagle

Professor Seagle described collegiality as having “a sense of being part of a team.” She thought that there was a large amount of collegiality within the educational

leadership program. “We are all harnessed and moving in the same direction.” In contrast, she did not feel a high level of collegiality within the department. “I think that [the educational leadership faculty] have a strong sense of who we are and I think that puts people off and probably affects the collegiality. Although, I have never felt that anybody was less than professional or courteous to me.” Professor Seagle summed up her thoughts with “I have no sense of team with anybody outside of my program.”

As far as the collegiality within her cohort of new faculty members, Professor Seagle articulated a strong connection. Like Professor Morris, she referred to their relationship as camaraderie. “Within our program, the three of us are bonded at the hip.” She shared stories of how the three help each other with teaching schedules and publishing. “..it’s give and take and we have found where our strengths lie within each of us.” Professor Seagle spoke about a deeper commitment to her cohorts than the other faculty members. “...it signifies a real friendship that you wouldn’t [have with] the average person who is considered a rider on the ship with you.”

Professor Asfaw

In the academic setting, Professor Asfaw defined collegiality as “working together for a common goal.” Professor Asfaw also believed that collegiality had two components – a social component and a professional component. Socially, Professor Asfaw thought his program colleagues were very collegial. “Personally, my colleagues are really good and very helpful.” What he felt was lacking was the professional component. “Overall, I think that is a piece that is missing in the program. [Collegiality] should be something that brings the program faculty together...to blend together our expertise so that it is beneficial to us and our students.”

Professor Asfaw agreed with the other two new faculty that the collegiality amongst them was special. “We can really read each other easily. We can always understand each other...we are on the same page in many ways. [Our collegiality] is one of the precluding factors to stay here and contribute for years and years.”

Professor Wilson

Professor Morris had a similar definition for collegiality as the new educational leadership faculty. “Collegiality is the belief in each other, the will to accomplish a common goal by working with each other and then the will to help each other accomplish individual goals.” Like Professor Seagle, Professor Wilson felt that the level of collegiality in the educational leadership program was high but very low in the department. He attributed the lack of collegiality within the department as a misunderstanding of what the educational leadership program accomplishes. “It’s a professional jealousy because we have in our programs the educational leaders [the principals and superintendents] who will make up the educational hierarchy and will have the most decision making impact on an institution...so there is a view about us in terms of elitism.”

As far as the collegiality demonstrated with the new faculty cohort, Professor Wilson likened them to “the three musketeers. They are each individually different and unique and bring different kinds of things to the table...but, it is kind of fun to see their own subgroup develop.”

Professor Fredericks

Professor Fredericks described collegiality in terms of support. He felt that everyone in the educational leadership program was supportive of one another. “Keeping

in mind that we all come from leadership positions and we all come with our own ideas...we all seem to get along pretty well.” As far as the new faculty members were concerned, Professor Fredericks shared that “I perceive them to be a lot of their own support group.”

Professor Davis

As department chair, Professor Davis echoed many of the perceptions about collegiality in the educational leadership program as the others. He felt that there was a high level of collegiality within the program. He also spoke to the reputation the educational leadership had for exuding superiority and how it hurt the departmental collegiality. Professor Davis added that he thought the new faculty members and actually helped in this area. He also believed they had a special camaraderie. “I think they have bonded together...sharing experiences and trying to keep their compatriots from making mistakes and wasting time and energy. I think that it has been a good thing.”

Perceptions of Collegiality by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty Composite

Structural Description

Overall, the level of collegiality in the educational leadership program was reported as high by all faculty members. Contrastingly, all faculty members spoke to the lack of collegiality between the educational leadership faculty and other faculty outside of the program. Several faculty members gave possible reasons for this phenomenon. Three professors believed professional jealousy or resentment that they were members of one of only two flagship doctoral programs on campus was to blame for collegiality issues. Other faculty purposed that there was a lack of understanding of what they did as educational leadership professors which led to collegiality issues. Interestingly, the

department chair felt that the collegiality had been improved with the hiring of the new faculty.

Interestingly, all the faculty members spoke to the unique collegiality that was demonstrated between the new educational leadership faculty. The older faculty found it noteworthy and inspirational. The new educational leadership professors believed their collegiality helped them successfully navigate through their first year in the professoriate.

Summary

In this study the researcher examined the “life world” experiences of first year educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University. The researcher explored with three new faculty members and three key informants the roles and responsibilities that make up the career of an educational leadership professor. Research questions were focused around the lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty; how these experiences were unique and how they were common. The researcher also wanted to build a description of the kind of person who chose the educational leadership professoriate.

Through question refinement and upon initial analysis, the researcher discovered that the lived experiences of the first year educational leadership faculty could be organized into seven topical areas.

1. Personal and professional characteristics and attitudes of the educational leadership faculty
2. Daily life of the first year educational leadership faculty
3. Diversity of the first year educational leadership faculty
4. Mentoring of the first year educational leadership faculty

5. The beginning of the tenure process for the first year educational leadership faculty
6. Stress factors experienced by the first year educational leadership faculty
7. Perceptions of collegiality by the first year educational leadership faculty

The researcher used a modification of Moustakas' (1994) analysis for phenomenological data to analyze and report her findings. Individual Textural Descriptions were created to illuminate how each participant experienced the phenomenon. Then, the researcher crafted a Composite Structural Description which included all the participants' thoughts and reported the meanings and essences (commonalities) for each topical area. The following is a summary of the researcher's finding in each of the seven topical areas.

Personal and professional characteristics were gathered from both the new faculty and their key informants. The professors represented different areas of the United States – north, south, and mid-west. One new faculty member was from Africa. Two out of the six professors were female. Both females represented new faculty. One out of the six professors was black; born in Africa. All of the professors had held other jobs before choosing the professoriate. Five faculty members had been school administrators. The last faculty member had been in the military. Five out of the six professors had retired from their former positions. Only the department chair was a full tenured professor.

Scenarios reported by the three first year educational leadership faculty found their daily lives hectic ones. All three had similar experiences with their first days on the job. The professors were frustrated with the lack of specific instruction on just what they needed to know and be able to do as educational leadership professors. All three

professors focused on preparation for their first classroom experiences. And, again, all three had favorable responses to their initial teaching.

Each new faculty member found their professional time shift from class planning and preparation to student advisement. Much of their daily routines involved comprehensive feedback to students, especially doctoral students. The secondary population of professors supported this claim. These faculty members also thought that the new professors had successfully met the day-to-day challenges of their new careers, especially with those issues of student advisement normally considered to be seasoned professorial responsibilities.

The three new faculty members in the educational leadership program at Dixie Eastern University were from minority status; two were women and one was an African male. Not one of the new professors felt that they have encountered any disadvantages or advantages related to their minority status. Each felt they had much to offer to their program and students. The two female faculty members reported that they had never experienced any bias in the educational setting. Professor Asfaw, the African male, felt he had experienced many obstacles throughout his life but chose to take them on as challenges. Professor Asfaw believed any bias that he encountered at Dixie Eastern could be attributed more to his foreign status than his race. All three new faculty members reported positive evaluations from their students.

The secondary population of the two junior faculty members and department chair were in agreement that the addition of minorities to the program was a positive. There appeared to be a concerted commitment to diversify the faculty by those that were

already members. All three were happy with the new faculty members and felt that they brought new experiences and richness to the educational leadership program.

The issue of mentoring of first year educational leadership faculty seemed to be an elusive one at best. Both old and new faculty members were articulate and enthusiastic about mentoring and its benefits. All three new professors reported that Dixie Eastern had provided a mentoring program but felt that it had fallen short of what they needed to know as graduate level professors. Conversely, all three mentioned the informal mentoring relationship they had experienced with a senior member of the faculty which they found invaluable. The junior faculty members also reported that they had been involved in the university level mentoring program. One professor had referred to it as more of an induction process. Neither junior faculty members reported an informal mentoring relationship. Lastly, the department chair, voiced his belief in a structured mentoring program and expressed that the professors lacked the time not commitment to such a project.

The beginning of the tenure process for the new educational leadership faculty held many challenges. All three professors agreed that their department chair had been clear on the university expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service. Each new faculty member expressed a strong commitment to teaching success. The professors also believed that they had been hired at a research institution so each had individual research agendas and plans for publication. Professor Asfaw had the most experience with research and publication having done so in his native country and as a doctoral student. The service component proved to be the most nebulous for the new professors. Each

knew what the university defined as service but all three professors shared a unique view of what they believed service should be.

In comparison, the junior faculty related their journeys with the tenure process. Both professors believed they had been hired at a teaching college and teaching success was foremost in the tenure process. The junior faculty were frustrated and surprised after their third year review when research and publication seemed to be more of a defining issue than they had thought. Professor Fredericks, because of this experience, strongly articulated to the new faculty the importance of their research publications along with teaching.

First year educational leadership faculty spoke to many stressors in their professional lives. Most of these stressors related to time management and the overwhelming responsibilities of their new careers. All three felt there was not enough time in their day to adequately service the amount of students they taught and advised. Along with student demands, university responsibilities, driving time, and meetings cut into what little time they had left for research. The three professors confessed their disappointment in not having the time to spend on research endeavors.

Stress experienced by the new educational leadership faculty was a harsh reality. Two of the new professors maintained that self-induced pressures were also a part of their stress. Their need for competency and respect caused them sleepless nights as they struggled to be masters of their domains. One professor also voiced his struggle with acclimating his family to a new life and culture. The balance of personal and professional life was an issue for all three new faculty members. Only one professor admitted to trying to alleviate stress.

The junior faculty members along with the department chair agreed that learning the job under time constraints was the biggest source of stress for new professors. The junior faculty believed that as a faculty member matured on the job, the source of stress changed from teaching to research issues. The department chair spoke to priority management and balance in both new and older faculty members' lives.

Collegiality in the workplace proved to be an important asset to the new educational leadership faculty. Overall, the level of collegiality in the educational leadership program was reported as high by all faculty members. Contrastingly, all faculty members spoke to the lack of collegiality between the educational leadership faculty and other faculty outside of the program. Several faculty members gave possible reasons for this phenomenon. Three professors believed professional jealousy or resentment that they were members of one of only two flagship doctoral programs on campus was to blame for collegiality issues. Other faculty purposed that there was a lack of understanding of what they did as educational leadership professors which led to collegiality issues. Interestingly, the department chair felt that the collegiality had been improved with the hiring of the new faculty.

Interestingly, all the faculty members spoke to the unique collegiality that was demonstrated between the new educational leadership faculty. The older faculty found it noteworthy and inspirational. The new educational leadership professors believed their collegiality helped them successfully navigate through their first year in the professoriate.

The "life worlds" of the three new faculty at Dixie Eastern University opened up an in-depth look into the phenomenon of the first year in the educational leadership professoriate. Though their pathways to the professoriate were as unique as their

individuality, the new faculty members shared many common experiences in their daily lives. Through this study, the researcher was able to expose the many meanings and essences of the phenomenon known as the first year in the educational leadership professoriate.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

At the center of today's educational system is the educational leadership professor. Given the task to prepare future educational leaders, professors have a challenging and sometimes overwhelming career. Those who have newly taken on the job of educational leadership professor can experience pitfalls throughout the journey. Even though these men and women who choose to be educational leadership faculty are unique individuals, they share many common experiences in their quest for a successful new career.

Introduction

The roles and responsibilities of the educational leadership professoriate have evolved since its beginning in the early 20th century. Educational administration was born out of the scientific management movement as professors strived to create the new scientific study of education. Educational administration professors were called upon by society to solve educational problems with their expertise in school management (Spring, 1997). By the beginning of WWII, educational administration professors were also given the task of readying future leaders ethically, intellectually and socially. Now, as the nation's educational system welcomes in the 21st century, educational leadership faculty have expanded their expertise to meet the needs for guidance in management, leadership, policy-making and curriculum.

These responsibilities, combined with the traditional pressures of tenure expectations and rising college enrollment, have put more demands on the job of the educational leadership professor. Additionally, the need for new faculty increases as those in the educational leadership grow older and retire (McCarthy and Kuh, 1997). With such high stakes, it is no wonder that the educational leadership professoriate is so challenging to new faculty and the administration that desires to retain them.

The researcher's purpose was to illuminate the experiences of educational leadership faculty in their first year of the professoriate. The researcher selected a qualitative, phenomenological methodology for data gathering and analysis. Phenomenology, as a research method, focused on lived experiences that are both unique and common. The researcher utilized one focus group interview initially then followed up with in-depth, semi-structured interviews of participants to gather key individual lived experiences of educational leadership faculty as they completed their first year in the professoriate.

The researcher chose six higher education faculty from the same research university in the Southeast. The participants were placed into two populations – primary and secondary. The primary population was made up of three first year educational leadership professors. The secondary population, also known as key informants, included existing junior faculty from the same educational leadership program and their department chair. The populations represented a diverse demographic group: three were Caucasian males, two were Caucasian females and one was an African male. All of the participants had become professors as a second career; five had retired from another career.

The researcher collected data using a three phase process for interviewing. The first phase was a focus group interview with the primary population of first year educational leadership faculty. The second phase was individual in-depth interviews with that same population. The third and final phase of data collection was individual in-depth interviews with the secondary population of existing junior faculty and the department chair. All interviews were recorded via audio tapes and transcribed by the researcher and another transcriptionist. To ensure anonymity, the researcher gave participants pseudonyms, provided the university with a pseudonym, and omitted any specific names or references to actual people, schools, and locations. Following phenomenological analysis, the researcher created individual textural descriptions to expose meanings to the participants' experiences. The researcher then used composite structural descriptions to refine meanings and essences from the lived experiences of the educational leadership faculty. In Chapter 5 the researcher has utilized the meanings and essences as findings to draw conclusions and propose implications pertaining to the overarching research question and sub-questions from the study. The overarching research question was the following: What are the lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty? The three research sub-questions were the following:

1. Who are the people that choose to begin a career as first year educational leadership faculty?
2. What are the different lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty?
3. What are the common lived experiences of first year educational leadership faculty?

Discussion of Findings

The researcher's purpose in this qualitative study was to examine the lived experiences of educational leadership faculty in the first year of the professoriate. The phenomenological research design allowed the researcher to delve into the "life-worlds" of the faculty through the process of in-depth interviews. The responses to the interview questions were topically arranged and reported in Chapter IV. In this chapter, the researcher used the findings from the topical areas to submit conclusions and present implications from the study.

Institutional Profile

Dixie Eastern University is a regional institution located in a small town in Southeast United States. DEU was founded in 1908 as an agricultural and mechanical school for secondary education. In 1924, Dixie Eastern University changed its name and focus as it took on the challenge of preparing teachers for a growing American population. The last name change came in 1990, when the higher education institution chose Dixie Eastern University to represent the largest and most comprehensive universities in the southern part of the state (The New Georgia Encyclopedia).

In 2003, DEU had over 15,000 students from forty-nine states and eighty nations. The student population exhibited a large minority contingency of twenty-five percent. There were seven colleges where students pursued both undergraduate and graduate degrees. Two doctoral programs were both located in the college of education (The New Georgia Encyclopedia).

In 2006, in response to its growth, Dixie Eastern University's Carnegie classification changed to doctoral/research institution. This classification is the entry

level tier to the research institution classification and criteria focuses on the awarding of at least twenty doctoral degrees per year. The other two doctoral research classifications are distinguished by high research activity (Wikipedia). Dixie Eastern University's doctoral programs are both Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) terminal degrees in educational administration and curriculum. The university has also spearheaded "The Campaign for National Distinction" which will be used to fund six major areas. One of these areas is includes funding for scholar chairs, faculty excellence programs, graduate assistantships and fellowships.

It appeared to the researcher that Dixie Eastern University has committed to taking the institution to new levels of higher education success. Though still largely a regional university serving its surrounding constituency, DEU is striving to establish itself among the top institutions of high education in the United States. With this comprehensive change growing pains challenge students, professors and administration alike.

Specifically, the educational leadership program is centered on the DEU main campus but holds classes on four other satellite campuses. The student population represents a higher minority population than that of the undergraduate program, especially on one satellite campus. Estimates of students who are of minority (this includes women) status are as high as fifty percent on the main campus and eighty percent on the other satellite campus.

Personal and Professional Characteristics and Attitudes of the Educational Leadership Faculty

Discussion

Because this study, *Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study*, focused on the phenomenon of the first year in the lives of educational leadership faculty, the researcher recognized the need to know who these individuals were who chose such a career. From the 1950s through the 1990s, studies had continued to report that the face of the average educational leadership professor was white, male, and older (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1987; Campbell & Newell, 1973; Willower & Culbertson, 1964; Campbell & Gregg, 1957). Such was the case of the researcher's secondary population of junior faculty and department chair. Contrastingly, the researcher's primary population of first year educational leadership faculty represented a more diverse group; white and black, female and male, older and younger. Similar to the findings of McCarthy and Kuh (1994), the researcher's demographic findings pointed to an increase in underrepresented populations being hired as educational leadership professors.

Several other demographic descriptors found by the researcher of this study were similar to McCarthy and Kuh's (1997) findings. First was the fact that most professors were likely to have been school administrators in the past. All five of the new and junior educational leadership faculty members had been school administrators with four retiring from their previous positions. Secondly, the earlier study reported that the professors' main interest was in teaching. All five of the educational leadership faculty professed a love for and commitment to the role of teacher. Thirdly, McCarthy and Kuh purposed

that interest in research had increased for all faculty with professors of color listing research as their primary interest. This researcher's findings discovered that the new faculty members were keenly focused on their research agendas with the African male professor possessing the most research expertise and publications.

Finally, Tierney (2001) reported several trends in education faculty demographics that were replicated by the researcher of this study. Tierney stated that fully tenured faculty population had dropped while the age of faculty increased. According to the researcher's findings, only one faculty member was fully tenured. Also, as discussed above, all participants but one had become professors after retiring from other positions.

Daily Life of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

The lives of first year educational leadership faculty were full ones to say the least. Earlier studies of first year faculty found professors struggling with many key issues (Menges & associates, 1999; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Boice, 1992). Olsen and Sorcinelli discovered that new faculty spent much more time on teaching and preparation than research. As the first year continued, time and attention shifted to research concerns. This researcher also had similar findings. Dixie Eastern new professors were first mired in class preparation and teaching but later had to find time for increased student advisement. Even though the new professors felt that they did not have enough time for research they were actively thinking about it.

In his studies of first year faculty, Menges and associates (1999) found new faculty were not clear on what their roles and responsibilities fully entailed. The new educational leadership professors at Dixie Eastern expressed the same sentiments. They

reported to the researcher frustration with the lack of specific instruction on just what they needed to know and be able to do as educational leadership professors.

Boice (1992) purported that loneliness and lack of support from senior faculty as the most common complaints of first year faculty. In contrast, this researcher received no reports of loneliness from the three new educational leadership professors. Also, all three gave high marks to the other educational leadership faculty for support and encouragement.

Diversity of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Discussion

Studies of the diversity of higher education faculty have increased (Moody, 2004; Anthony & Taylor, 2001; Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Moody believed that higher education employers tend to hire those most like themselves unless they become conscious of this evaluative bias and commit to do something about it. The researcher in this study found this phenomenon to be the case. After speaking with the department chair, search committee chair and other existing faculty, the researcher discovered a concerted effort to change the complexion of the faculty. This effort could be attributed to the concern mentioned by several professors as to adequate representation of the faculty to the student population. One professor claimed that up to eighty percent of the educational leadership student population was women. Another spoke to the large African American population on one of the satellite campuses. As a result, two women and one African man were hired to a faculty of mostly white men. The two junior faculty and department chair also were in agreement that the addition of the minorities to the program was very positive.

Studies in diversity also pointed to the difficulties women and other minorities encounter as marginalized populations (Moody, 2004; Anthony & Taylor, 2001; Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Anthony and Taylor purported that many minority scholars find their minority agendas devalued and often decided to leave higher education due to the continuous threat of being thought of stereotypically. The researcher found contrary situations to the above findings. The two female new professors in the Dixie Eastern educational leadership program reported that they had never encountered any sexual bias in the educational setting, especially the university. The African male professor felt he experienced little bias and attributed it to his foreign status more than his race. All three new professors had received high marks from students and administration alike.

Mentoring of the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Discussion

Mentoring, a popular practice in education today, has been readily investigated (Mullen, 2005; Bode, 1999; Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1994; Boice, 1992). Mullen, a prolific researcher of mentoring, claimed that mentoring of new professors is one of two primary interests in higher education. Schoenfeld and Magnan agreed with Mullen but found that mentoring of faculty is rarely done. Bode, in her study, believed that mentoring was perceived as not being needed. All the above statements were found to be true by this researcher. All of the participants agreed that there was no formal mentoring program for the new educational leadership faculty. The faculty members defined and articulated the benefits of a formal mentoring program. Lastly, one new faculty member voiced her perception that the other faculty members might have thought the new professors did not need mentoring.

To the contrary, all three new educational leadership faculty members reported that they had all been a part of an informal mentoring process. A senior faculty member had “taken them under his wing” and the new professors found the experience invaluable. What they did not find valuable was the university wide mentoring program mandated by Dixie Eastern. The new professors believed the program, described more like an induction program, fell short on information necessary for life as a graduate professor. Boice (1992) found that 86 percent of the faculty he studied wanted some form of mentoring. This researcher discovered that both new faculty, junior faculty and the department chair wished for a comprehensive mentoring program.

The Beginning of the Tenure Process for the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Discussion

One of the most discussed issues pertaining to the life of a professor has been tenure. Tenure is crucial in the career of the educational leadership professor. Tenure requirements like how many publications, how well classes are taught, and what counts as service to the university is largely a departmental and institutional decision. Studies have shown that these decisions have hardly been standard, much less clear, in the past (Menges, 1999; Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992). This researcher found that all three new educational leadership professors felt that their department chair had been clear on the university’s expectations for teaching, scholarship and service. A difference in clarity was noted between the new and junior faculty. The new faculty all believed that they had been hired at a research university where both junior faculty members voiced that they had been hired at a teaching college.

Teaching has often been reported by researchers as overwhelming to new faculty (Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992). Sorcinelli purported that new faculty needed more time to hone their skills and explore new teaching methods. Although the three new educational leadership faculty reported that they spent the majority of time on class planning and preparation, they considered themselves seasoned teachers.

Through the years, many researchers have purported that scholarship, or research, was the most challenging role for the new professor (Menges, 1999; Fechter, 1999; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Tierney, 1999). In one study, Tierney claimed that tenure requirements have moved to a “research model” where a professor’s productivity was measured more by research output than teaching or service. The researcher found that they junior faculty spoke to this kind of model. They were surprised when, in their third year review, research took center stage. Because of this experience, the junior faculty was adamant with the new faculty to refine a research agenda and get working. The new faculty felt the pressure to produce publications but were frustrated with the lack of time to spend on such endeavors.

The service component of the tenure process has been the least studied and discussed (Premeaux & Mondy, 2002; Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1994). Schoenfeld and Magnan believed that service was comprised of public service, institutional service and professional service. One junior faculty member gave a similar definition of service. But, within this study, all the educational leadership professors had unique ideas of what constituted service even though they all knew the university’s definition of it. For example, the new professor from Africa purported to the researcher that his international

experience should be uniquely utilized by Dixie Eastern and constitute part or all of his service component.

Stress Factors Experienced by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Discussion

Many researchers have studied the effects of stress on new faculty (Menges, 1999; Dinham, 1999; Sorcinelli, 1992; Boice, 1992). Menges reported two types of stress – work-related and non-work. Two of the new faculty members spoke to non-work stressors of family pressures. The professor from Africa voiced his struggle with acclimating his family to a new life and culture. All of the participants noted the importance of balancing both personal and professional life.

Most of the discussion of stress was work-related. Researchers found that stress continued at high levels but shifted in emphasis from teaching responsibilities to scholarly activities (Sorcinelli). This researcher reached a similar conclusion. Both the new and junior educational leadership faculty reported this shift in stressors. The junior faculty were especially focused on research stressors.

Sorcinelli (1992) studied several other stressors that this researcher also exposed. Lack of time was a key stressor mentioned by Sorcinelli. All of the participants in this study mentioned time issues which appeared to be related to most of the other stressors. Sorcinelli's findings also reflected the new professor's need for recognition. This was especially espoused by two new educational leadership faculty. The women reported being at the top of their game in their former administrative jobs and to come into a new position as a novice created stress. They believed the need to be respected and viewed as competent in their new career was self-induced stress. Lastly, Sorcinelli spoke to the

stress of unrealistic expectations which this researcher found as the new faculty expressed their frustration with the sheer enormity of the job.

Perceptions of Collegiality by the First Year Educational Leadership Faculty

Discussion

Researchers have professed that collegiality can play an integral role in the success of first year faculty members (Silverman, 2004; Boice, 1992; Sorcinelli, 1992). Silverman believed collegiality was essential and faculty members should view their status as being part of a team. The researcher found the educational leadership professors to possess high levels of collegiality within the educational leadership program. The junior and new faculty alike felt that they all were “on the same page” and committed to a common goal – the students. With this high collegiality, two of the new professors wished for more collegiality focused on research and professional development of the educational leadership faculty. Interestingly, the researcher noted a lack of collegiality with outsiders of the program. Educational leadership faculty attributed it to professional jealousy while those outside of the program blamed the lack of collegiality on educational leadership professors’ “air of elitism.”

Boice (1992) and Sorcinelli (1992) espoused that the lack of collegiality lead to stress and loneliness for new faculty members. Interestingly, this researcher found no relationship between collegiality and stress and, as mentioned before, loneliness was never expressed by the three new faculty members. In comparison, the three new educational leadership professors demonstrated and articulated a unique collegiality which they believed was invaluable to their success as new faculty. Using terms like “the

three musketeers” and “bonded at the hip,” the other faculty members found this collegiality exceptional and inspirational.

Conclusions

The intent of the researcher in this study was to explore and expose the lived experiences of educational leadership faculty in the first year of the professoriate. The purposeful design of this phenomenological study afforded the researchers with rich findings that were both convergent and divergent in nature to previous studies of educational leadership professors.

Key Convergent Conclusions

Using the findings from the study of new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University and the studies of previous researchers, the researcher purposes the following key convergent conclusions.

Concerning demographic data, the researcher finds several conclusions common to the McCarthy and Kuh (1997) studies. First, the researcher concludes that majority of educational leadership professors at Dixie Eastern University are white, male and older but finds an increase in minority hires in the last several years. Second, the researcher concludes that most of the educational leadership professors at Dixie Eastern University have been school administrators in their past positions. Third, the researcher concludes that there is decrease in fully tenured educational leadership professors at Dixie Eastern University. This is a similar finding to the Tierney (2001) study.

Fourth and final, the researcher concludes that educational leadership faculty at DEU are entering the professoriate at a later age. All of the above conclusions are similar to the conclusions by McCarthy & Kuh (1997) and others reported in the discussion

section of this chapter. The researcher believes these demographics to be especially indicative of educational leadership faculty from level one research universities who do not possess the research endowments to attract research-oriented educational leadership faculty. Additionally, the researcher purports these universities are presented with the double-edged sword dilemma. Level one research institutions are often dependent on personnel pools largely comprised of retired educators who can afford the lower salaries. With their appointment, they bring years of valuable experience to share with future administrators. Conversely, because these faculty are older, they do not spend as much time in the professoriate thereby decreasing the number of faculty who acquire tenure and stay in these positions for many years.

As far as attitudes of the faculty are concerned, the researcher has several common conclusions. The researcher concludes that most of the Dixie Eastern University educational leadership professors' main interest is in teaching even though there is an increased interest in research especially by the first year educational leadership faculty. The researcher believes these conclusions mirror the study by Olsen and Sorcinelli (1992). In addition, this finding may relate to the above demographics. The researcher contends that those professors who have come from the past administrative positions in school systems will be more comfortable with the teaching process and will be less likely to have spent time in research activities and publishing.

The finding related to the daily life of the first year educational leadership professor at Dixie Eastern University, the researcher concludes that, initially these professors spend the majority of their day with teaching and class advisement concerns. This conclusion affirms findings by Olsen and Sorcinelli of first year faculty. Delving

further though, this researcher contends that the new educational leadership faculty at DEU had distinct issues that compounded the teaching responsibilities. The driving to other campuses or “Windshield time” ate away at a lot of the new professor’s time. Also, the lack of educational leadership faculty to cover courses while the student interest and enrollment increased forced the new professors to take on advisement responsibilities not traditionally given to first year faculty.

Regarding diversity issues, the researcher concludes that with a genuine commitment by administration and other faculty, an increase in minority faculty positions at Dixie Eastern University are possible and positive. Like the findings by Moody (2004), the researcher believes that the DEU educational leadership program shared a commitment to represent the diversity of their student population found in their off-campus sites.

The issue of mentoring is convoluted. The researcher concludes there is no formal mentoring program for the new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University but educational leadership faculty value and want a formal mentoring program. This finding mirrors conclusions by Mullen (2005) and Boice (1992), reflecting a need by first year faculty for a mentor. The researcher contends there is an irony in that much of what is taught in the educational leadership program is dependent on a mentoring structure, yet there is not a similar structure for first year educational leadership faculty. In other words, they literally are not practicing what they preach...or teach.

Concerning the tenure process, the researcher finds several common conclusions. First, the researcher concludes that most DEU educational leadership faculty believe that tenure has moved to a “research model” where a professor’s productivity is mostly

measured by research output. Second, the new Dixie Eastern University educational leadership faculty feel the pressure to produce research but are frustrated with the lack of time to spend on such endeavors. Like the conclusions by Menges (1999) and Tierney (1999), this researcher concurs that DEU first year faculty are keenly aware of research responsibilities but lack the support structure to make them successful.

As far as stressors in the life of the first year educational leadership professor, the researcher has several common conclusions with Sorcinelli (1992) and others. First, the researcher concludes, the new Dixie Eastern University educational leadership professors experience stress due to the enormity of the job and/or not knowing what the job entailed. Second, DEU educational leadership professors experience a shift in stressors from teaching responsibilities to research involvement. Third, the researcher concludes from all participants in the study that time constraints are the main components of stress. Lastly, like the new professors in the Menges (1999), Dixie Eastern educational leadership faculty note the importance of balancing both their personal and professional lives.

Key Divergent Conclusions

Using the findings from the study of new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University the researcher purposes the following conclusions which she finds matchless to findings in previous studies of educational leadership faculty and new faculty combined.

Concerning the daily life of the new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University, the researcher concludes that the new faculty were frustrated with the lack of initial, specific instruction on what they needed to know and be able to do as

educational leadership professors. No earlier studies of educational leadership faculty or new faculty address this issue of the unique skill set needed by graduate professors to teach older adult students. For example, most graduate programs are scheduled for accommodation of adult students with jobs. This requires teaching mostly at night and/or weekends, longer than average class duration, and course offerings on satellite campuses. This researcher believes that the lack of instruction given the new professors was indicative of a university that is in the process of change from largely undergraduate education to an institution with more graduate course offerings. It is clear to the researcher that DEU does not fully understand that educational leadership professors, though very experienced in teaching methods, need advanced instruction in areas like adult learning and full day class preparation.

Related to diversity issues, the researcher has two differing conclusions from earlier studies. First, the researcher concludes that the two new female educational leadership professors at Dixie Eastern University have never encountered any sexual bias in the educational setting, especially at Dixie Eastern. Unlike the study by Glazer-Raymo (1999), these female educational leadership professors do not feel marginalized in their positions. Second, the researcher concludes the African male educational leadership professor at Dixie Eastern University has experienced very little bias and attributes it to his foreign status more than his race. Studies by Moody (2004) and Anthony and Taylor (2001) never address issues of bias originating with foreign status. The researcher contends that these divergent conclusions are resultant of two features unique to the DEU educational leadership professors. First, the researcher asserts that the Dixie Eastern University educational leadership student population is predominately female and

possesses a large minority contingency creating a more tolerant environment for the new professors. Second, as mentioned before, DEU educational leadership existing faculty and administration is committed to diversity which led to the hiring and the success of the minority new professors.

Regarding the issue of mentoring, the researcher reaches several conclusions divergent from other research. First, the researcher concludes that the new and junior educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University contend the university sponsored mentoring program fell short on delivering the information necessary for life as a graduate school professor. Second, the researcher concludes that the three new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University were involved in an informal mentoring process which they believed to be invaluable. The researcher's findings portray a faculty that value both informal and formal mentoring. A lack of time was an excuse given to the researcher for why a formal mentoring program has not been implemented yet the faculty did find time to create an informal mentoring process. This reality proves the necessity for a mentoring program. The researcher purposes that this practice can move from informal to formal simply with administrative respect and priority for such a program. In addition, this researcher purports that the university sponsored mentoring program, like the initial orientation, is inadequate for graduate level professors due to the mindset of the institution at this juncture.

As far as the tenure process of new faculty is concerned, the researcher has three divergent conclusions. First, unlike the studies by Menges (1999) and Sorcinelli (1992) that report new professors as confused about the tenure process, this researcher concludes that the department chair is clear and communicative with the new educational leadership

faculty at Dixie Eastern University regarding the university's expectations for teaching, scholarship and service. Second, dissimilar to Boice (1992) and Sorcinelli (1992) conclusions that new faculty need to hone their budding teaching skills, this researcher concludes that the new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University consider themselves to be seasoned teachers and do not need time to improve teaching skills. Third, the researcher concludes that the three new and two junior educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University have unique and individual views of what should constitute the service component of tenure. The educational leadership faculty have uncommon teaching pressures due to the high volume of demand for such instruction. Also compounding educational leadership professors' job are high numbers of students in the doctoral process and education specialist process that requiring excessive amounts of time for advisement with thesis and dissertations. The researcher agrees with the educational leadership faculty that the above exceptional demands should be recognized in the tenure process. In conclusion, this researcher purports that the new educational leadership professors are well aware of the universities expectations for tenure review but wish to individualize some aspects of the process to create a more successful experience for all.

Concerning stress factors experienced by the first year educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University, the researcher presents one conclusion not mentioned in earlier studies. The researcher concludes that the two female new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University experienced stress from the change in status from "top dog" in their former jobs to being a novice in their new career. This researcher contends that new educational leadership professors may grapple

with the unique stress of giving up their “VIP” status when initially becoming a professor.

Regarding collegiality, the researcher reaches two divergent conclusions. First, the researcher concludes there is a mismatch between the measure collegiality found within the educational leadership program and between the program and its department. The researcher reports that all participants in the study of the new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University believe there is a high level of collegiality within the educational leadership program. Conversely, there is a lack of collegiality outside of the program. This mismatch in collegiality is not mentioned in other new faculty studies and the researcher proposes this phenomenon to be unique to the educational leadership professoriate. This researcher considers the lack of collegiality outside of the educational leadership program to be a result of the “VIP” aura that educational leadership professors bring to their positions. Second, unlike the studies by Boice (1992) and Sorcinelli (1992) the researcher concludes that the three new educational leadership professors did not suffer from loneliness and added stress due to the lack of collegiality. The new faculty never reported loneliness and did not mention a lack of collegiality as stressful. The researcher believes the following conclusion explains this divergent phenomenon. Third, the researcher proposes that the new educational leadership faculty at Dixie Eastern University demonstrate and articulate a unique, in-depth concept of collegiality which they espouse to be instrumental to their successful first year. Once again, no previous studies of new faculty reflect this kind of intra-collegial experience. This researcher suggests that this intra-collegial experience of the three new faculty members is reflective of their individual struggles with the first

year multiplied by three, giving the intra-collegiality breadth and depth unlike any other. The researcher also believes that this intra-collegiality shielded the new faculty members from adverse implications like loneliness and created a powerful aura recognized by other faculty members as exceptional. Due to the transcending nature and exponential value of this intra-collegiality to its participants, the researcher purposes this as transcendent collegiality.

Implications

The researcher ascertains that *Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study* contributes to the body of literature concerning first year educational leadership faculty. More specifically, the researcher infers that this study further illuminates the “life worlds” of those that choose to become educational leadership professors.

Based upon the findings of the study, the researcher purposes that those who aspire to be future educational leadership professors become cognizant of the potential struggles that come with the position and identify strategies to overcome them. Institutions also need to have at their disposal strategies and support to help first year faculty as they navigate through their first year of the tenure process.

The researcher advocates for university administration to search for ways to increase and reward minority hiring. Often departments and programs do not value diversity and administration must set the tone and prioritize its practice. Educational leadership faculty, especially, need to reflect the diversity of the population it serves.

The researcher challenges university administration to revisit the tenure expectations for educational leadership faculty. Researchers and practitioners alike call

for multiple models of tenure to be considered. This researcher contends that individualized tenure models increase the educational leadership faculty member's chances for a successful tenure review process. The researcher proposes a new administrative policy where increases in full tenure positions offered are rewarded.

The researcher advises university administration to focus on creating a climate that enables an educational leadership professor to be successful in all three areas of tenure promotion – teaching, scholarship and service. The researcher believes the current structure of the educational leadership program at Dixie Eastern University is not conducive to achievement of tenure by professors. This fact is demonstrated by the lack of fully tenured professors at this time. Possible restructuring of the educational leadership programs to allow for new faculty to adjust is suggested. The researcher gives one possible restructuring practice for example. The educational leadership program at the present has a clinical line position for Masters level courses. The administration could also include a doctoral clinical line position to alleviate course offerings that new faculty have been required to teach. This position could also take over numerous advisement responsibilities, too.

The researcher advocates for university administration to create a staff position to aid new and junior educational leadership faculty in research endeavors. The researcher finds that new professors have a difficult time establishing a research agenda and time to conduct field studies. The researcher suggests that this new staff position would provide valuable assistance with time-consuming “administrivia.”

The researcher gathers that university administration does not recognize the difference between under-graduate and graduate programs in terms of the needs of the

professors to fulfill their specific job responsibilities. Induction and orientation programs, as well as, overall program structure and support at Dixie Eastern University are mismatched with the institution's expectations for graduate professors like educational leadership faculty. The researcher challenges that university administration to revisit these areas and orient focus to what educational leadership professors need to know and be able to do for success on the job.

The researcher advocates for university administration to prioritize and create a formal mentoring program for new educational leadership faculty. The researcher finds that the educational leadership faculty values a mentor-protégé model utilized in their own teaching therefore the mentoring program needs to be reflective of that and supported by the administration.

The researcher advises university administration to provide support and strategies to new educational leadership professors to cope with stress from their new careers. The researcher believes that most of new faculty stress is a function of time and suggests that administration provide individualized time management plans along with other support mechanisms.

Dissemination

Dixie Eastern University educational leadership faculty and those aspiring to be educational leadership should review the results of *Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study*. The participants in this study gave invaluable insight into the "life world" of the educational leadership professoriate. As a result, these faculty members were able to pass along vital information to others in educational leadership. With this information, the

researcher could cogently address the issues and needs that may improve the lives of those who choose to become educational leadership professors.

Dixie Eastern University administration along with other similar institutions should review the findings in order to be cognizant of the issues and needs of new educational leadership faculty. Institutions should also be mindful that findings from this study may apply to other new faculty in the university setting.

Educational leadership program coordinators and department chairs should review the findings of this study regarding specific recommendations to refine program structure, hiring policy, course development, faculty support systems and other areas to create successful environments for new faculty.

Recommendations for Further Study

After an exhaustive examination of the findings from *Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study* and in the effort to continue discourse on the subject, the researcher recommends these follow-up studies:

1. A continued phenomenological study of the same educational leadership faculty during their subsequent years through tenure promotion focusing on the issues of diversity, collegiality, mentoring, and stress.
2. Replication of this phenomenological study, focusing on the issues of diversity, collegiality, mentoring, and stress with other new educational leadership faculty at institutions of varying sizes and demographics.

3. A quantitative study focusing on the issues of diversity, collegiality, mentoring, and stress from first year educational leadership faculty from around the nation.
4. Qualitative studies of first year educational leadership faculty focusing in-depth on the individual issues of collegiality, mentoring, stress, and diversity.

Concluding Thoughts

The researcher's purpose in creating, implementing and analyzing this study was to expose and illuminate the lived experiences for educational leadership faculty in the first year of the professoriate. This phenomenological study, using in-depth, semi-structured interview questioning, was designed to recreate and document the professional "life worlds" of three new educational leadership faculty. These "life worlds" related the participants' everyday experiences with their career highs and lows.

Starting with the initial focus group interview with the new educational leadership faculty, the researcher became keenly aware of the overwhelming challenges these professors were experiencing. Many of these challenges were unique to the world of the educational leadership professoriate. Each new professor brought distinctive talents and personalities to the educational leadership profession. As different as each individual was, the researcher was struck by the similar experiences and orientations that the new professors divulged.

As each new faculty member's story unfolded, so did the common issues of the educational leadership professoriate. The adage "the more things change, the more they stay the same" was true for many such issues. Earlier studies of the educational leadership professoriate along with studies of new faculty paved the way for many of this

researcher's findings. Like those before her, the researcher was able to document the new professors' love of teaching and struggles with research. The new educational leadership faculty valued mentoring but only realized it through an informal not a formal mentoring experience. Like many professors before them, the new DEU educational leadership faculty found themselves stressed from the sheer enormity of the job and the lack of time to accomplish all they wanted to do.

In the process of exposing the lives of the new Dixie University educational leadership professors, the researcher discovered the most powerful findings came from the uniqueness of the faculty's own discipline. Being educational leadership professors brought challenges not seen in other studies of new faculty. Having to serve those students who were not only adults but leaders themselves tested the teaching and advising expertise of the new professors. These professors also had to accommodate their students with different class schedules and different campuses to better serve them. This brought special graduate school issues to the professors' plates often without previous guidance from the university. Because of the different skill set the educational leadership faculty were required to possess, each professor had ideas to individualize the tenure process to reflect such expectations and create a reward system unique to the discipline. Lastly, the unusual stress of going from leader to follower was often overwhelming for the new educational leadership faculty who mostly came from prominent positions in various educational school systems.

After all the interviews, observations and reductions were finished, what proved to be the most exceptional finding by this researcher was the new educational leadership professors transcendent collegiality. Through the challenges, pitfalls, and triumphs, the

new faculty built an extraordinary bond which each held dear and credited to their success in their first year. This intra-collegiality inspired the other faculty and produced a presence that was more powerful than the new faculty's own individuality. To the researcher, this transcendent collegiality became the definitive essence of the phenomenon of the first year of the professoriate. As quoted before in chapter three, Kockelmans (1994) reported that phenomenological reduction results in seeing "more profound layers of meaning behind those which first appeared (p.14)."

In conclusion, through *Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study*, the researcher illuminated the "life-worlds" of three new educational leadership professors. A journey which often times appeared to be an impossible mission for the new professors turned into a successful and invaluable experience for them and the researcher that studied them. Resulting from each professor's story shared and every layer exposed, the riveting meaning and definitive essence of the new educational leadership professoriate was revealed.

REFERENCES

- Antony, J. S., & Taylor, E. (2001). Graduate student socialization and its implications for the recruitment of African American education faculty. In Tierney, W. G. (Ed.). *Faculty work in schools of education: Rethinking roles and rewards for the Twenty-first Century* (pp. 189-209). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Armenti, C. (2004). Women faculty seeking tenure and parenthood: Lessons from previous generations. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34 (1), 65-83.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bianco-Mathis, V., & Chalofsky, N. (Eds.) (1999). *The full-time faculty handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Blau, P. M. (1973). *The organization of academic work*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Blumberg, A. (1989). *School administration as a craft: Foundations of practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Bode, R. K. (1999). Mentoring and Collegiality. In R. Menges *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support* (pp. 118-134). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Campbell, R. F., & Gregg, R. T. (1957). *Administrative behavior in education*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

- Campbell, R.F. & Newell, L.J. (1973). *A study of professors of educational administration: Problems and prospects of an applied academic field*. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (1998). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- Gappa, J. (2000). The New Faculty Majority: Somewhat satisfied but not eligible for tenure. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 77-86.
- Gardiner, M. E., Enomoto, E., & Grogan, M. (2000). *Coloring outside the lines: Mentoring women in to school leadership*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Hammersley, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Social research: Philosophy, politics and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hammersley, M. (1989). *The dilemma of qualitative method: Herbert Blumer and the Chicago tradition*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (1999). Next Generation Methods for the Study of Leadership and School Improvement. In J. Murphy, & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 141-162). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Horton, J. A., & Hintz, S. S. (2002). The new faculty orientation and mentoring program: A strategic approach. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED482193).
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Jacoby, D. (2005). Part-time community college faculty and the desire for full-time tenure-track positions; Results of a single institution case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 137-152.
- Johnson, B. and Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches* (2nd Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kaestle, C. F. (1983). *Pillars of the republic: Common schools and American society, 1780–1860*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.

- Kockelmans, J. J. (1994). *Edmund Husserl's phenomenology*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Lucas, C. J. (1994). *American higher education: A history*. New York, NY: St. Martins Griffin.
- Lucas, A. F. (2000). *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1995). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1999). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programs. In J. Murphy, & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 141-162). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C.M. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The education administration professoriate*. Tempe, AZ: The University Council for Educational Administration.
- McCarthy, M. M. and Kuh, G. D. (1997). *Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate*. Columbia, MO: The University Council for Educational Administration.
- McMillan, J. H. (2004). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (4th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Menges, R. (1999). *Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, Inc.

- Moody, J. (2004). *Faculty diversity: Problems and solutions*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Mullen, C. A. (1994). *Mentorship primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Premeaux, S. R., & Mondy, R. W. (2002). Perspectives on Tenure; Tenured versus non-tenured tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Educational Business*, 77(6), 335-339.
- Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Schoenfeld, A. C., & Magnan, R. (1994). *Mentor in a manual: Climbing the academic ladder to tenure*. Madison, WI: Magna Publications, Inc.
- Silverman, F. (2004). *Collegiality and service for tenure and beyond: Acquiring a reputation as a team player*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (1992). Developing new and junior faculty. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 50,
- Spring, J. (1997). *The American school, 1642-1996*. New York, NY: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- The New Georgia Encyclopedia. (nd). *Georgia Southern University*. Retrieved March 8, 2007, from The New Georgia Encyclopedia online via http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/nge/Article_Printable.jsp?id=h-1419
- Tierney, W. G. (1999). *Faculty productivity: Facts, fictions and issues*. New York, NY: Falmer Press.

- Tierney, W. G. (Ed.). (2001). *Faculty work in schools of education: Rethinking roles and rewards for the Twenty-first Century*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tyack, D. & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Willower, D. J., & Culbertson, J. A. (Eds.). (1964). *The professorship in educational administration*. Columbus, OH and University Park, PA: The University Council for Educational Administration and the College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2005). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (8th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). *Writing up qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wulff, D. H., & Austin, A. E. (Eds.). (2004). *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Wikipedia.(nd). Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education. Retrieved March 8, 2007, from Wikipedia online via http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carnegie_Classification_of_Institutions_of_Higher_Education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

SURVEY INSTRUMENT 1 – FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW

Background Data

Describe your career path which has brought you to this position.

Why did you come to Ivory Tower University? What “sold” you on the school?

Diversity

What does it mean to you to be a minority hire?

Tenure

The traditional model of faculty life is one that contains three roles: teaching, scholarship, and service. What do these three roles mean to you?

Give me a story illuminating each one of these areas

Which area has been the most difficult to achieve?

Which one takes the most of your time?

How clearly communicated have been the expectations for each role from your superiors?
...from your peers?

How are these roles related to tenure?

Stress

Define and give an example of first year faculty stress.

What is your biggest source of stress as first year faculty?

Collegiality

Would you describe your program colleagues as collegial? Would you describe your relationship (the new faculty) as collegial? Give a story that illuminates this.

Mentorship

Define mentoring as it pertains to educational leadership.

Have you ever been in a mentoring relationship – formal or informal? Describe that relationship.

Is there a formal mentoring program for first year faculty?

Follow-up questions

Overall, would you say that you are satisfied or dissatisfied with the decision to take this position? Why?

What is the biggest issue that first year faculty face?

Is there anything else you would like to share?

SURVEY INSTRUMENT 2 – IN-DEPTH NEW FACULTY INTERVIEW

QUESTIONS

Background Data

Why did you want to become an educational leadership professor?

Describe your first day on the job.

Describe your first classroom experience here at Ivory Tower University.

Give me a description of the typical work week for you as a first year faculty member.

Diversity

How much of the decision to take this position hinged on issues pertaining to you minority status?

How did you feel about being a minority hire? Did you feel you would “fit in?”

Were there any advantages or disadvantages about being a minority faculty member?

Have you encountered any difficulties outside of work regarding you minority status?

Tenure

The traditional model of faculty life is one that contains three roles: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Define “teaching” in the professorial setting and give personal examples.

Define “scholarship” and give personal examples.

Define “service” and give personal examples.

Do you feel you have a clear understanding of the expectations for teaching and research performance for your tenure-track position?

Can you describe the tenure review process?

Did you accomplish your goals that you set at the beginning of the year? What were they? Did they change? Explain.

Stress

What do you think has the biggest source of stress for you as a first year faculty member?

Give me an example.

Has the sources of stress changed throughout the first year?

Do you feel you have more stress...or different stress being a minority? Give me an example.

What have you done to alleviate stress? Describe your coping mechanisms.

Collegiality

Define collegiality for me.

Would you describe your program colleagues as collegial? Give me an example.

Are the new faculty members collegial? Give me an example.

Would your colleagues describe you as a team player? How important do you think it is to be a team player?

Mentorship

Define Mentoring for me.

Describe your support structure. Does it include mentoring?

Is there a formal mentoring program for first year faculty? Is there an informal one?

Are you currently OR were you in a mentoring relationship in your first year of the professoriate?

Wrap-Up Questions

What has been the most rewarding part of being a first year faculty member? Tell me about your “crowning” moment as an educational leadership professor.

What has been the most disappointing part of being a first year faculty member? Tell me about your lowest moment as an educational leadership professor...

If one of your students were asked to describe you, what would they say?

If one of your colleagues were asked to describe you, what would they say?

If one of your superiors were asked to describe you, what would they say?

What advice would you give someone who wanted to be an educational leadership professor?

Is there anything else you would like to share?

SURVEY INSTRUMENT 3 – KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Background Data

What is your relationship to the first year educational leadership faculty?

Diversity

How did you feel about all three new faculty being from minority groups? Did you feel they would “fit in?”

Tenure

In terms of the three roles of the professoriate (teaching, research, and service), how do you think the first year faculty are adjusting to professorial life?

How have you communicated to the new faculty program expectations for teaching and research performance for earning tenure?

Stress

What do you think is the biggest source of stress for first year faculty? Give me an example. Has the stress changed since you were a first year faculty member?

Collegiality

Would you describe your program colleagues as collegial? Are the new faculty collegial? Give me an example.

Mentorship

Is there a formal mentoring program for first year faculty? Is there an informal one?

Describe the mentoring that you have observed or participated in.

Wrap-Up Questions

How has the role of the first year faculty member changed since you were one?

What advice would you give someone who wanted to be an educational leadership professor?

Is there anything else you would like to share?

APPENDIX B
CONSENT FORM



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP, TECHNOLOGY, AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EXPERIENCES OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP FACULTY IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE PROFESSORIATE: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

KEY INFORMANT IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT


1. I am a doctoral candidate working with Dr. James Burnham from the department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development at Georgia Southern University. I am conducting research to fulfill requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.
2. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to identify factors related to the success of educational leadership faculty in their first year of the professoriate.
3. Procedures to be followed: Participation in this research will include the completion of in-depth interview with the principal investigator focusing on key issues around the first year of the educational leadership professoriate.
4. Discomforts and Risks: There are minimal risks associated with participation in this study. For example, possible discomfort in dealing with sensitive work or personal issues.
5. Benefits:
 - a. The benefit to participants include having the opportunity illuminate issues and concerns around to first year of the professoriate, hopefully leading to better hiring and retention practices along with tenure success for professors.
 - b. The benefits to society include a more heightened awareness for higher education administrators to the plight of first year faculty, hopefully helping to shape orientation, mentoring, and tenure review practices for the success of future professors.
6. Duration/Time: The interview will be approximately one to two hours in length.
7. Statement of Confidentiality: The researcher will use pseudonyms for anonymity. The researcher will also employ member-checking to give participants the opportunity to read transcriptions and identify inaccuracies or inappropriate information they do not wish printed. However, neither the researcher nor Georgia Southern University can guarantee total anonymity.
8. Right to Ask Questions: Participants have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact Patricia Tresey or Dr. James Burnham, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant or the IRB approval process, contact Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-681-0843.
9. Compensation: There will be no compensation for those who participate in the research.

10. Voluntary Participation: Your participation is voluntary. You may decline to complete this interview or skip any question that you do not feel comfortable answering. The purpose of this research is to gather rich descriptions about the educational leadership professoriate by first year faculty. There are no correct or incorrect responses, the researcher is interested only in your frank opinion.

11. Penalty: There is no penalty for deciding not to participate in the study; if you decide at any time you do not want to participate further you may withdraw without penalty or retribution.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records.

Title of Project: Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study
Principal Investigator: Patricia Sims Tresey, 3005 Hawks Ridge Dr., Statesboro, GA 30461, 912-587-7400, ptresey1@georgiasouthern.edu
Faculty Advisor: Dr. James Burnham, Georgia Southern University, Department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development, P.O. Box 8131, Statesboro, GA 30460, 912-681-5567, jburnham@georgiasouthern.edu


Participant Signature


Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

Investigator Signature

Date

APPENDIX C
IRB APPROVAL

Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs		
Institutional Review Board (IRB)		
Phone: 912-681-5465		Administrative Annex
		P.O. Box 8005
Fax: 912-681-0719	Ovrsight@GeorgiaSouthern.edu	Statesboro, GA 30460

To: Patricia Sims Tresey
3005 Hawks Ridge Dr.
Statesboro, GA 30461

CC: Dr. James Burnham, Faculty Advisor
P. O. Box 8131

From: Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
Administrative Support Office for Research Oversight Committees
(IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: July 10, 2006

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

After a review of your proposed research project numbered: **H07001**, and titled "**Experiences of Educational Leadership Faculty in the First Year of the Professoriate: A Phenomenological Study**", it appears that (1) the research subjects are at minimal risk, (2) appropriate safeguards are planned, and (3) the research activities involve only procedures which are allowable.

Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that the Institutional Review Board has approved your proposed research.

This IRB approval is in effect for one year from the date of this letter. If at the end of that time, there have been no changes to the research protocol, you may request an extension of the approval period for an additional year. In the interim, please provide the IRB with any information concerning any significant adverse event, **whether or not it is believed to be related to the study**, within five working days of the event. In addition, if a change or modification of the approved methodology becomes necessary, you must notify the IRB Coordinator **prior** to initiating any such changes or modifications. At that time, an amended application for IRB approval may be submitted. Upon completion of your data collection, you are required to complete a *Research Study Termination* form to notify the IRB Coordinator, so your file may be closed.

Sincerely,



Julie B. Cole
Director of Research Services and Sponsored Programs