IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Digital Repository

2018

Experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at predominantly White institutions

Zachary Brown
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd

Part of the Agricultural Education Commons

Experiences of Black faculty members within

agricultural education departments at predominantly White institutions

by

Zachary C. Brown

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Agricultural Education

Program of Study Committee:
Theressa Cooper, Co-major Professor
Michael Retallick, Co-major Professor
Sarah Rodriguez-Jones

The student author, whose presentation of the scholarship herein was approved by the program of study committee, is solely responsible for the content of this thesis. The Graduate College will ensure this thesis is globally accessible and will not permit alterations after a degree is conferred.

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my co-committee chairs, Dr. Theressa Cooper and Dr. Michael Retallick, and my final committee member, Dr. Sarah Rodriguez-Jones, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. They have been beyond patient with me throughout this process, and it is truly appreciated.

In addition, I would also like to thank my friends, colleagues, the department faculty and staff for making my time at Iowa State University a wonderful experience. I want to also offer my appreciation to those who were willing to participate in my interviews, allowing me access to their personal lives. Without them, this thesis would not have been possible.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this narrative inquiry study was to explore Black faculty members' perceptions of their experiences within agricultural education departments at Predominantly White Institutions. This narrative study was structured with the use of interviews and was primarily concerned with the content of what the research participants had to say or show. The focus of this study was on the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at predominantly White institutions (PWIs). Research has discussed the experiences of Black faculty members across higher education, but has rarely highlighted the experiences of individual segments of that population.

This research study involved three self-identifying Black professors from multiple universities. These three professors represent a portion of a population of approximately 10 individuals from over ninety institutions with agricultural teacher education programs. The professors; (1) reflected on current experiences within their respective departments, (2) engagement with other faculty members, (3) challenges they faced, (4) successes that they have had, and (5) a variety of other subjects.

The findings of the study provide voice for their experiences, and shows the experiences of Black professors can be varied despite coming from similar circumstances. The findings reveal that some Black faculty members within agricultural education departments face exclusion and isolation within their departments, while others find truly collaborative environments. These findings suggest that further research needs to be done to gain deeper understanding of the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education at PWIs.

CHAPTER 1.   INTRODUCTION

Higher education expands across the United States with over 7,000 postsecondary institutions (NCES, 2016). Agricultural education is just one of the many disciplines that can be found. Agricultural education is often defined as the "scientific study of the principles and methods of teaching and learning as they apply to agriculture" (Barrick, 1988, p. 5). Over a hundred institutions across the United States have programs that are focused on preparing those who wish to be part of the agricultural education discipline (NAAE, n.d.). Within this group of institutions there are a large number of faculty members who are working specifically within the discipline at the higher education level. Each of these faculty members has an experience that is unique and important; they all have a story to tell about their experiences.

These unique experiences are not always limited to a single individual. Groups of people that share some form of identity can also have a shared experience that impacts their specific group. Black faculty members are one such group. In 2013, the National Center of Educational Statistics shared that Black faculty represented only 5.45% of faculty across higher education. Despite this low representation, research has shown that certain aspects of their individual experiences are shared throughout large portions of the group (Anderson, 2002; Branch, 2001; Burden et al., 2005). The majority of research involving Black faculty members is focused on their population as a whole. However, it is important to note that with a narrow focus shared experiences among specific groups of Black faculty members can be identified (Burden, J., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S., 2005). This possibility suggests that shared experiences may be identifiable within Black faculty members of the discipline of agricultural education.

Identifying shared experiences within set groups is still not guaranteed. The Black faculty population within agricultural education is sparse. Seidman (2013) reminds us that every story told is part of an individual's consciousness and provides us with access to their complicated narratives that are based on their concrete experience. Each faculty member has a unique experience due to the differences in their overall institutions, departments, personal lifestyles, or some other factors. These fundamental differences in the concrete experience lead to the possibility that each narrative shared by participants can be vastly different. These differences could prevent shared experiences from occurring.

This study presented the challenge of finding self-identifying Black faculty members. The process of identifying Black faculty members is complicated due to race and ethnicity being ambiguous. It cannot be determined by looking at someone's skin. It requires someone to have public, or private, self-identification to be known. There may have also been Black faculty members who have only recently joined the field, and were not widely known at the time data were gathered. Their relative newness to the field may have prevented their identification. This is in part because a central database does not exist that identifies the ethnicity of each professor across higher education, let alone agricultural education. Lastly, as previously mentioned, research could not be found that specifically addressed the experiences, presence, or existence of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at predominantly White institutions (PWIs). The experiences of this small group of Black faculty members have not been shown in a structured way. Only pre-conceived notions about this group exist that seek to generalize

the experience of all Black faculty members across higher education towards these few faculty members.

Research has been conducted that explores the status and experiences of Black faculty members across higher education in general (Anderson, 2002; Scheurich & Young, 2002; Burden, J., Harrison, & Hodge, 2005; Alexander R., & Moore S., 2008). The research focused on demographical trends within higher education, inequalities in higher education impacting faculty, and the shared experiences of Black faculty at PWIs. Quantitative data were also found that generally accounted for the demographical presence of Black faculty members in higher education, but the information could not be found for the field of agricultural education (JBHE, 2007; NCES, 2009; NCES, 2014). The population of Black faculty members within the discipline could only be identified through professional networks that held knowledge regarding members of the community.

Limited research has created a gap of knowledge that this study helps fill. Exploring the distinctive individual experiences and possible shared experience of Black faculty members within agricultural education is essential. These specific stories allow us to have a better understanding of a limited population within agricultural education, which is a discipline that crosses into almost every state within the U.S. (NAAE, n.d.). The ways that this small group views and interacts within the community of agricultural education is currently unknown.

The purpose of this study was to address this research gap by providing a voice for Black faculty members that engage in the discipline of agricultural education at PWIs. The voice of this small community has the ability to contribute to numerous areas. First,

these stories provide access to voices that have gone unheard due to the limited

population size and lack of research. Having awareness of the experiences of these Black

faculty members allows for the recognition of any challenges or successes currently

impacting this community. Second, identifying any challenges facing this community

allows for suggestions to be made that can help improve their experiences. Third, by

identifying any successes that impact this community, a possible model for improving the

experiences of other Black faculty members can be suggested. Fourth, addressing this

community allows for awareness of their experiences to be accessible to those who wish

to one day become Black faculty members in agricultural education. This is important

due to the majority of universities that have agricultural education departments being

PWIs as shown by the database of colleges provided by the National Association of

Agricultural Educators (n.d). Sharing the experiences of those currently working in these

roles, provides Black students with valuable insight on the profession as seen through the

eyes of a current Black faculty members. Each of these areas of contribution to

knowledge and understanding help to form this study. With the purpose of this study

being to provide voice for Black faculty members in agricultural education departments

at predominately White institutions and the areas of possible contribution in mind, the

following research questions directed the study:

1. How do the individual stories of Black faculty members within agricultural
   education departments at predominantly White institutions compare to the
   theoretical tenants of "Sense of Community?"

2. How do the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education
   departments at predominantly White institutions compare to one another?

CHAPTER   2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research has explored the status and experiences of Black faculty members across higher education. (Anderson, 2002; Scheurich & Young, 2002; Burden, J., Harrison, & Hodge, 2005; Alexander R., & Moore S., 2008). However, research was not found that specifically addressed Black faculty within agricultural education at PWIs. Further data were found that generally accounted for the demographical presence of Black faculty members, but again information could not be found for the field of agricultural education (JBHE, 2007; NCES, 2009; NCES, 2014). The research herewith explored focuses on the following areas; (1) demographic trends within higher education, (2) racial inequalities in higher education impacting Black faculty, (3) the experiences of Black faculty at PWIs, and (4) how Sense of Community (SOC) applies to groups of people.

Representation of Black Faculty in Higher Education

Demographical data have shown that the presence of Black faculty members within higher education has been low over the past decades (Flaherty, 2016). It has remained almost stagnant within higher education. From 2003 through 2007 the percentage of Black faculty in higher education was shown to change from approximately 5.25% to just 5.39% (NCES, 2009). Although the rates show an increase in the total number of Black faculty across all universities, studies have demonstrated that top-ranked universities remain below the average representation of Black faculty members. A survey conducted by the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education (JBHE) shows that a majority of surveyed top-ranked PWIs in 2007 fall below a national average of 5% of total faculty

identifying as Black. Twenty-one out of a total of twenty-six surveyed institutions had a Black faculty percentage of beneath 5% (JBHE, 2007).

JBHE surveyed the nation's top ranking research universities, liberal arts colleges, and state universities to account for their overall percentages of Black faculty. Eight of these universities indicated that Black faculty represented less than 3% of their total faculty (JBHE, 2007). Since 2007, the percentages of Black faculty have slightly grown. Throughout a decade (2003-2013), the overall percentage of Black faculty increased by approximately 0.20%. Unfortunately, the structure of the NCES database did not permit for the identification of growth or reduction within agricultural education. The low representation of Black faculty members expands across all higher education. The lack of Black faculty has been attributed to the challenges faced by Black faculty members through multiple qualitative studies (Burden, Harrison, & Hodge, 2005; Pittman, 2012; Scheurich & Young, 2002).

Race-Related Disparities within Higher Education

Research has identified disparities between Black and White faculty members within higher education. These disparities involve differences between the treatment of Black faculty and White faculty seemingly based on racial identification (Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, and Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Baum, Gerlad, Milem, and Perna, 2007; Branch, 2001; Burden et al., 2005). Black faculty members have been shown to be penalized by systems that favored White faculty.

Black faculty dealt with issues involving opportunity structure, resources, academic and non-academic work demands (Allen et al. (2000). These issues were seen when the Black faculty were compared to their White counterparts. Often Black faculty

found themselves in positions where they were expected to do work and research that focused on minority issues (Allen et al., 2000). This work often involved advising minority clubs, minority students, or conduction research involving minority populations. However, as time as progressed, Black faculty expressed concerns that their work on diversity-related issues had less value as more emphasis was placed on professors who are published within their respective disciplines (Allen et al., 2000). The White professors were able to conduct research that fell in line with the specific purpose of their discipline. The concerns of Black faculty members also expanded to other areas.

Black faculty members were shown to be "systematically and significantly disadvantaged" when compared to their White counterparts (Allen et al., 2000). Black faculty members less often earned tenure, had lower salaries, and/or had lower academic rank at statistically significant lower rates than White faculty (Allen et. al, 2000; Branch, 2001; Burden et al., 2005). Similarly, Baum et al. (2007) also researched the equity for Black faculty in higher education. Baum et al. (2007) researched the equity for Black faculty in higher education within the southern region of the United States. The researchers found that the South remained highly inequitable for Black faculty in all but one state (Baum et al., 2007). The inequity was in reference to the lower levels of tenure and academic rank found with relation to Black faculty when compared to White faculty (Baum et al., 2007).

Black faculty members were below equity for full-time faculty at public institutions in almost every state within the study (Baum et al., 2007). With regards to rank, members of the faculty who were Black were below equity in all 19 southern states when it came to being a full professor. However, this inequity was not limited to full

professors. It affected all ranks including; tenured, tenure-track, and assistant professor (Baum et al., 2007). There was variation throughout the equity levels, but overall equity was shown to have decreased over the decade period examined from 1993-2001. Baum et al's (2007) research contributed to the knowledge regarding Black faculty members in southern states by showing that higher education still remains highly inequitable, and race continues to define educational employment, among other areas. The experiences of Black faculty members in the south were also present in other areas on the continent. Across all of higher education, research has shown that Black faculty members face opportunity issues that have been related to their ethnic identities.

The Experiences of Black Faculty Members

Historically, racial-minority faculty members have been met with racism within higher education, which has led to feelings of isolation and exclusion (Anderson, 2002; Burden, J., Harrison, & Hodge, 2005). Furthermore, the experiences of Black faculty are limited by this racism (Burden, Harrison, & Hodge, 2005; Scheurich & Young, 2002). These limitations have been shown to express themselves in numerous ways the limitations can prevent Black faculty members from have positive experiences and forward momentum with their lives. They can have a drastic impact on the well-being in a variety of areas that are crucial to their experience.

The limitations faced by Black faculty members at PWIs include, physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, societal, and legal distresses (Alexander and Moore, 2008). Key problems addressed by the Alexander and Moore (2008) were that Black faculty members were typically the only one within their respective departments, or one of the few found on their campuses. In some cases, it was identified that this low presence may

have caused their work judged less positively than their White colleagues (Alexander and Moore, 2008).

This experience of being one of the few Black faculty members on a campus has been linked to the term, tokenism, which is defined as a "situation that handicaps members of racial/ethnic minority groups who find themselves working alone or nearly alone among members of another social category" (Niemann, 2003, p.100). Tokenism is stated to cause mental and emotional discomfort. Alexander and Moore (2008) attributed this feeling of being treated as the single symbolical representation of a race (tokenism) as being distressing. The sources of these problems were stated to arise from students, administrators, and environment. Research has demonstrated that problems related to race and ethnicity may be magnified at PWIs (Burden et al., 2005; Pittman, 2012).

Burden, Harrison and Hodge (2005) conducted research that focused on Black faculty members within a kinesiology program at a PWI. The article examined the perceptions of Black faculty on their organizational socialization at predominately white institutions of higher education. Burden, Harrison, and Hodge (2005) utilized the theoretical framework of critical race theory, and the qualitative method approach of interviews that led to thematic narratives.

The thematic narratives explored by Burden, Harrison, and Hodge (2005) led to four chief themes being identified in the lives of these Black faculty members. The first theme, "resources, opportunities, and power structures," primarily focused on the idea these faculty members perceived their white counterparts as the ones who held the power (Burden, J., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S., 2005). The second theme, "programmatic neglects and faculty mentoring needs," focused on the idea that there was neglect in the

recruitment and retention of faculty of color, and that they white faculty were neglectful in this process (Burden, J., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S., 2005). The third theme, "social isolation, disengagement, and intellectual inferiority issues," was developed through the idea that the climate of the workspace was unwelcoming to the idea of engagement between Black faculty and white faculty (Burden, J., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S., 2005). The final theme, "double standards, marginalization, and scholarship biases," dealt with the idea that Black faculty's worth was not meaningfully valued in the academic context due to cultural biases (Burden, J., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S., 2005).

Based on these themes, Burden, Harrison, and Hodge study (2005) go on to suggest that non-Black faculty at PWIs need to develop situational awareness and sensitivity towards these organizational issues regarding the faculty of color. The responsibility for improving the current experiences of Black faculty members should be placed on the faculty members of other races themselves, and not just the university.

The systematic inequalities that Black faculty members at PWIs face extend past university or department controlled issues such as lower pay or academic rank. Their experiences also include the way they are treated in their everyday interactions by those of the majority race at PWIs. These experiences are the ones that can only be seen when Black faculty members are asked to share their stories. The experiences include the lack of equal treatment that Black faculty members face at these institutions.

 Pittman (2012) describes cases where Black faculty members are faced with oppression at PWIs, which includes both institutional and individual actions that prevent them from having access to resources. In this study, the oppression was identified to be perpetrated by the actions of White faculty members and White students. Pittman (2012)

found that a majority (71%) of Black faculty within their study felt race played a large role in their negative experiences on campus. Black faculty members experienced oppression in the form of racial micro-aggressions that came from White faculty and students (Pittman, 2012).

Pittman (2012) uses a definition of micro-aggressions that states they are purposeful, understated snubs intended with slight those of a specific ethnic identity. Furthermore, these micro-aggressions may come in three forms; 1) micro-assaults, 2) micro-insults, and 3) micro-invalidations (Pittman, 2012; Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, Nadal, & Esquilin, 2007). These vary in severity, but can all drastically impact Black faculty. Micro-assaults refer to blatant use of racial slurs (Sue et al., 2007). Micro-insults can be seen as subtle statements meant to attribute certain things as being due to someone's race (Sue et al., 2007). Pittman (2012) describes a possible scenario in which a Black person is told they only received their position due to their race as an example of micro-insults. Lastly, micro-invalidations are described by Pittman (2012) as occurring when certain aspects of the Black experience, such as racial oppression, are stated to not exist. Micro-aggressed were shown to be common in the daily lives of Black faculty members (Pittman, 2012). Based on the information gained and actions by the Black faculty, Pittman (2012) suggested that work was needed to improve campus life for Black faculty. The idea that improvements were needed in the lives of Black faculty members has also been expressed by other researchers.

Alexander and Moore (2008) believed there are multiple ways for Black faculty to enhance their experiences at PWIs. They suggest that Black faculty members should evaluate themselves from an asset and strength perspective, network more often, seek

mentors, develop other interest and employable skills, practice self-care, attend conferences with fellow Black professionals, and know their respective work place discrimination laws (Alexander and Moore, 2008). Alexander and Moore (2008) suggest that Black faculty members leave their departments to find these feelings in outside communities.

Sense of Community

The experience of being a part of a community is one that has been greatly explored (Klein and D'Aunno, 1986; McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Brodsky and Marx, 2001; Clark, 2002; Jason, Stevens, and Ram, 2015; Permut, 2016). This experience is often referred to as Sense of Community (SOC). SOC is defined by McMillan and Chavis (1986) as being a "feeling that members have belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together" (McMillian and Chavis, 1986, p.9). Within SOC there are four primary elements; 1) membership, 2) influence, 3) integration and fulfillment of needs, and 4) a shared emotional connection (McMillan and Chavis, 1986). These four areas SOC have been the foundation for studies focused on SOC for over twenty years (Mannarini and Fedi, 2009).

Each of these four components has a different complex meaning. Permut (2016) has simplified the four components to identify the core meanings. Membership entails "a feeling of belonging to the group or community" (Permut, 2016, p.181). Influence involves an individual feeling that they can both impact and be impacted by the groups to which they belong (Permut, 2016). Integration and need fulfillment relate to members feeling as if they gain some benefit through their association with a particular community

(Permut, 2016). Lastly, shared emotional connections refer to bonds that have been developed over time through positive interactions (Permut, 2016). Despite the further developments in SOC by many researchers and its long history, various aspects have been challenged.

Most critique towards SOC focus on its level of complexity. Researchers have consistently suggested that SOC cannot fully depict the complex nature of communities. Brodsky and Marx (2001) and Jason, Stevens, and Ram (2015) inform us the communities are like "ecological" systems with multiple levels. Brodsky and Marx (2001) stated that communities can be broken down to multiple sub-communities that are structured by the diversity of the participants within the community. This diversity comes from experiences, identity, group roles, individual roles, and variety of other factors. Jason, Stevens and Ram (2015) inform us the concept of SOC covers three distinct "ecological" levels that they define as "the self (the individual), the interactions with others (microsystem), and the organization (macrosystem)" (p.983). These three levels of experience are pushed as being fundamental within sense of community (Jason, Stevens and Ram, 2015). It also suggested that the four components of SOC can overlap (Mannarini and Fedi, 2009). Meaning, that it may be possible for certain aspects of the experience to fall within or affect multiple components of the theory. SOC has also been further developed to apply to a variety of circumstances.

The initial focus of SOC was on community neighborhoods (McMillian and Chavis, 1986; Klein and D'Aunno, 1986). Klein and D'Aunno (1986) go on to suggest that SOC can be applied to the workplace. Klein and D'Aunno (1986) adjust SOC to be Sense of Community at Work (SOC at Work), which refers to a "workers' sense of

membership, participation, and identification with some work or work-related group"
(p.366). SOC at Work expands upon the initial four components of SOC by creating five
areas that apply directly to Sense of Community at Work. These five areas include; 1) a
friendship network, 2) a functional subgroup of organization; 3) the organization as a
whole; 4) the profession; 5) and the work site (Klein and D'Aunno, 1986).

The friendship network refers to groups of friends within a workplace, who
socialize with one another outside of work. The functional subgroup is collaboration by
workers on some set task. The organization as whole is the feelings of "membership,
commitment, identification, and belonging" towards the organization (Klein and
D'Aunno, 1986, p.368). The profession expands outside of the community at a set
location. It refers to those relationships with other within the same discipline, but who
may not necessarily work together. The worksite is seen as a "focal point where [SOC]
may revolve around common experiences and expectations of the local company" (Klein
and D'Aunno, 1986, p.368). These areas together further develop upon McMillian and
Chavis's initial SOC. Klein and D'Aunno's (1986) further developed McMillian and
Chavis's (1986) SOC to suggest that further studies be done that focus on Sense of
Community within work places. Several research studies have used sense of community
to examine populations.

Permut (2016) used Sense of Community to examine how protesters in the
Occupy Movement experience sense of community amongst one another. Through this
research, Permut was able to identify that SOC can occur on multiple levels of an
individual's experience (2016). Occupy protesters experienced sense of community in
relation to the actual protest and to the United State as a whole. Through their research, it

was shown that SOC can vary from individual to individual and can also occur with an individual on multiple levels (Permit, 2016). People are not limited to just one community, they are multi-faceted. As mentioned, SOC can occur in multiple locations; even in online video games

Qualitative research has shown that communities can be formed in a variety spaces with different people. In 2015, research was presented that showed how members of an online video game were able to create gaming communities and develop a sense of community within those (O'Connor, Longman, White, & Obst, 2015). O'Connor et al. (2015) described how a qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews was able to examine sense of community within specific groups. The group in question for this research was an Australian online video game team. They determined that the video game player were able to be analyzed using constructs from sense of community (Connor et al., 2015). The members of the community were found to have a variety of the aspects found within SOC, and supported the idea that these deep relationships form. Sense of community has been shown to have developed past McMillan and Chavis's (1986) focus on neighborhoods.

Research has developed a framework for examining sense of community in the work place through Klein and D'Aunno (1986). Researchers such as Permut (2016) and O'Connor et al. (2015) have shown that groups not associated with a neighborhood can also develop a sense of community. The identification of SOC being present in multiple non-neighborhood community structures shows the possibility for sense of community to be present within agricultural education departments.

CHAPTER   3. METHODOLOGY

Approach

This study was based in qualitative research, so that the experiences of Black

faculty members could be explored to provide a voice for every research participant and

to also identify shared themes and aspects of the experiences. There are a small number

of Black faculty members within agricultural education at Predominantly White

Institutions (PWIs). This study focused on how those Black faculty members perceived

their experiences within their current departments at the time that they shared their stores.

Qualitative Research

John Creswell (2014) defined qualitative research as an approach that pursues

deeper understanding of the significance that individuals or groups attribute to social or

human problems. Qualitative research was chosen so that a deeper understanding of the

importance of the experience of Black faculty members could be achieved. Maxwell

(2013) states that when qualitative research is applied to a specific group it is an attempt

to understand the meaning of events, and the context in which they occur. Many

qualitative researchers believe that people's views, morals, and so on are their own, and

are not part of the extended reality of the world (Schwandt, 2001, p.134). However,

Maxwell (2013) says that this focus on the participant's meaning behind their situations

is a fundamental aspect of qualitative research and is what makes it distinct from

quantitative research. The understanding of the research participant's views is a key

aspect of this study because this research focused on the narratives shared by Black

faculty members in agricultural education departments at PWIs, and the sense of

community held by the research participants. Given that this research study is singularly

based on the stories shared by participants, this research was fully based in qualitative methods.

This type of conclusion signifies this research as qualitative, but it does not label the actual process used to acquire the conclusion. Qualitative research occurs in a variety of forms, all focusing more on intangible data than on tangible data such as numbers. The qualitative research style that most closely fits this study is narrative inquiry.

Narrative Inquiry as a Research Design

This study employed narrative inquiry as the research practice of choice. Narrative inquires can be described as a research practice that involves the recording and analysis of the life experiences of others (Creswell, 2013; Schwandt, 2001). It can also be said that narrative inquiries focus on the storytelling of research participants and the retelling of these stories by the researcher (Riessman, 2008). This narrative study was structured with the use of interviews and was primarily concerned with the content of what the research participants had to say or show (Riessman, 2008). Riessman (2008) also conveys that one of the three types of approaches used to analyze narrative stories includes thematic analysis through which the researcher identifies the themes told by a participant. These themes can be seen as overarching ideals or highlights from the story.

The goal of interviewing was to obtain comprehensive accounts of the experiences of the participants with relation to their professional experiences (Riessman, 2008). These comprehensive accounts allowed for the extraction of further information from the interviews. The information beyond the story entails look at themes. The identification of themes allows for the story to be told with a focus on the larger meanings (Creswell, 2013). Narrative inquiry at its base can be seen as the retelling of

personal stories with emphasis on deeper or overarching meanings (Creswell, 2013; Creswell, 2014; Riessman, 2008). This study used narrative inquiry to achieve a thematic analysis of the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education.

Positionality Statement

I am a Black male pursing an education in the discipline of agricultural education; a field in which I am a minority. My mother is a White woman, who raised a Black child in the 1990's during a time where acceptance of an interracial child was still growing. She was unyielding in ensuring that I understood and accepted that I was Black. She knew I would never be accepted as a member of the White community due to the color of my skin. For her, that meant making sure I understood the world in which I live. There was an established expectation for me not only to serve as a leader within my community, but to also serve as a bridge between White and Black communities.

I was often told that I was too Black to be White and too White to be Black, the separation I felt from others was profound. This drove me to become competitive and determined in all that I undertook, so that I could find some form of acceptance. This drive was never about being the epitome of a great student; I was simply fighting to gain recognition within two opposing worlds. My fight for recognition led me to be a leader in athletics and academia. Each of these roles was necessary for me to be able to bond with classmates that were either Black or White. There were no social barriers that I could not transcend as I moved into adulthood, except for agriculture. I was encouraged to be the best athlete that I could be while in school. Academic counselors, coaches, and teachers did not inform me of the variety of educational opportunities at a land grant institution.

Prior to attending Southern University and A&M College, I was never introduced to the field of agriculture. The idea of majoring in an agricultural related field was a foreign idea. However, attending Southern provided me with the option and tools to learn about agriculture. An amazing friend served as my introduction into the animal science sector of agriculture, and served as my first visual representation of Black people being involved in agriculture. At that time, I had not seen or heard of any other Black men or women with careers in agriculture as a whole. This valuable connection, eventually led me to finding major in the College of Agriculture that I enjoyed.

While progressing through my education, I realized that I wanted to be agricultural educator at the university level. Achieving this goal meant having to spend further years in school, but I was undeterred. My athletic career was over, but my academic one was just getting started. Southern University was a great school, but presented limited opportunities due to funding. Increasing my knowledge in agriculture meant having to attend a university with more educational possibilities.

After obtaining my undergrad degree from a historically Black university, I began my journey for a M.S. in agricultural education at an internationally ranked PWI, Iowa State University. It is also the university that has ultimately led me to my current insider and outsider status in regards to my research interest in the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education at PWIs.

Researching Black faculty members became an interest of mine almost immediately upon reaching Iowa State University. Studying and working at a PWI brought my attention to lack of people of color within agriculture outside of historically Black universities. I wanted to work towards understanding why this difference existed,

and how it could possibly impact me in the future. I want to use the information collected through my research to give voice to the experiences of Black faculty members at PWIs, who I had not yet heard from. This research resonates with me because I fall into the category of being a Black male and a student of the discipline of agricultural education. The shared identities and the differences that I hold in relation to my research subjects build my insider and outsider statuses.

Insider and outsider standing refer to my positionality in regards to the research participants of this study. Insider status represents that which I have in common with my research participants, and suggest that I may have special insight into the inner workings (Kikumura, 1988). Outsider status denotes to what I do not have in common, and may be able to provide an objective view with regards to the research participants (Kikumura, 1988). As an insider, my research participants and I belong to a multitude of similar groups. We are Black Americans inside the field of agricultural education at PWIs. These insider statuses built a common bond between my research participants and me. From the outsider status there are notable differences. I am still a student, I am relatively new to agricultural education, and I have no professional experience within the field of agriculture. These outsider statuses allowed me to have a somewhat unbiased view of the stories that the research participants shared.

The positions that I serve as a researcher in relation to my subjects may have led to biases within my research which I endeavored to prevent. Throughout the interview process, I examined how my positionality and biases affected conversations with the Black faculty members from each institution. Understanding the impact of my biases and positionality helped me to analyze the interviews critically and prevent my biases from

altering the stories the research participants wanted to tell. The goal of the research was to understand how Black faculty members perceive their departmental experience within their respective institutions.

Data Collection Procedures

Setting

The study was conducted through phone interviews with three Black faculty members from Predominately White Institutions in agricultural education departments. PWIs were chosen to give voice to the experiences of Black faculty working within predominantly White spaces. The college search directory of the National Association of Agricultural Educator's was used to identify universities that meet the "four year institution with agricultural education departments" qualification (NAAE, n.d.).

Participants

For this study, a small sample was chosen due to the limited pool of participants within the specific demographic. Demographical data that explicitly states the number of Black faculty members in departments within agricultural education could not be found. Information from N. Knobloch (personal communication, June 21, 2017), T. Cooper (personal communication, June 23, 2017), and M. Retallick (personal communication, July 6, 2017), all professionals familiar with the field, suggest that the total population of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at PWIs may be near a total of ten. The convenient sampling strategy of snowballing was used to assist with identifying faculty that met the specified requirements, for inclusion in the research (Patton, 1990). It is important to note that this number is only an estimate and cannot be

officially confirmed. Through these sources, we were able to identify potential research subjects.

Participants for this study were two males and one female. Each participant met two primary criteria; 1) all participants self-identified as Black Americans, and 2) all participants currently work within an agricultural education department at a PWI. The participants were sent research invitation letters (Appendix E) that described the research project and asked for their participation. When participants expressed interest in the study, a follow up IRB Consent Form (Appendix B) was sent. This consent form explicitly described the purpose and future use of the research.

Data Collection Strategy

Designing the interview prompt

A semi-structured, open-ended interview approach was used for the interview (Appendix A) (Patton, 1990). The interview prompt included a greeting, reiteration of the informed consent documents (Appendix B), broad research questions, follow-up questions, clarifying questions, a final reiteration of the following steps, and a request for final comments and concerns about the research. The research participants were asked broad questions with regards to their experiences within their departments (Creswell, 2013). Follow up and clarification questions were asked as needed. The interview questions were designed to encourage the sharing of information that aimed to encourage participants to share deep thoughts.

Conducting a pilot study

Two pilot interviews were conducted to allow for the interview protocol to be refined and to increase my competency with handling phone interviews. After conducting

the pilot interviews, I learned that more probing questions should be added and that there were additional content areas that could be explored. As a result, additional follow up questions were used during the interview process to encourage participants to further discuss their experiences. At the completion of the pilot interviews, I felt more comfortable speaking with the research participants and using the tools needed for recording.

Data collecting procedures

Data were collected through a single recorded phone interview for each research participant (Van Manen, 1990). This interview method allowed the research participants flexibility in the scheduling of the interview. The interview served as the sole tool for data collection and each lasted no more than an hour. The interviews were recorded using voice recording software present on an iPhone X. The audio files were then transcribed using the professional transcription service Rev.com (Rev). Rev fully supports the protection of the privacy of the individuals within the recordings that are being transcribed. They provide encrypted transmission of all materials, deletion of recordings from their system when requested, and limit access of documents to the owner of accounts within their system (Rev, n.d.). A review was conducted to ensure the transcriptions were accurate. Any personal identifiers were then removed from the transcriptions. Further verification of the transcriptions was obtained through the use of a final consent form (Appendix C). The final consent form asked for the participants to review the transcription of their interview, mark any wanted changes, and then to provide us with signed consent to move forward with data analysis and reporting.

Data collections challenges

The data collection process within this study had two key challenges; 1) openness of the participants and 2) interpretation of participant's emotions. The first prominent challenge dealt with the willingness of each participant to share their stories. The population of Black faculty members in agricultural education departments at PWIs is at an approximate total of ten individuals. The research participants expressed concerns regarding their anonymity throughout the data collection process. They were worried that by sharing specific stories they could be easily identified. Due to this concern, some participants held stories back or wouldn't offer more in-depth answers to questions. As a preemptive measure to counter this concern, we provided the participants with the opportunity to strike certain aspects of their stories from the final transcripts. The solution to this challenge has been highlighted within ethical consideration presented within Mack, MacQueen, and Woodsong's (2005) guide for ethical considerations.

Confidentiality of participants was a known concern of this study, so steps were created that put the control of their narrative within their hands. Participants were not required to answer any questions they felt uncomfortable with and they had the opportunity to remove anything they felt could identify them from transcripts. Most importantly, they were required to approve of all information within the transcript prior to data analysis. We could not and did not proceed with any analysis prior to them consenting of the information. These multiple steps helped to encourage the participants to share more personal information. The second challenge dealt with understanding the emotions behind the words spoken by participants.

Due to the data collection method consisting of phone-interviews, there was no face-to-face contact with the participants of the study. This led to difficulty with interpreting any physical or verbal cues of the participants when sharing their stories. These issues are highlighted in Novick's 2008 article that focuses on phone interviews and some of their critiques and biases. The identification of any physical-movement related to emotion was impossible. It could not be seen if a frown, smile, or otherwise developed upon the face of the participants when sharing their stories. This led to difficulty with identifying if a participant was uncomfortable with a subject area or if they were intrigued. Identifying these situations during the interview relied on their tone-of-voice or use of verbal cues to know when to press on or move-away from certain interview topics. These cues may have been misheard or misunderstood due the electronic means of communication (Novick, 2008). Breaks in the phone signal, muffling of the voice, and other issues related to phone services all served as challenges with interpreting the research participant's narratives and emotions (Novick, 2008). However, it is also important to note that having physically access to the participants may not have guaranteed more in depth interviews.

Novick (2008) also discussed that there are also concerns with in-person interviewing. The same verbal and non-verbal cues that are missing in phone-interviews can be misinterpreted in person. The understanding of these cues is subjective and can be misread by the researcher (Novick, 2008). The limitations of phone interviews can also be repeated with in-person interviews when cues are misunderstood or not seen. In essence, both interview methods can suffer from these issues. However, follow-up

questions were used consistently through-out the interview process to try to combat the lack of physical cues or misunderstanding of verbal cues as much as possible.

Data Analysis Procedure

Creswell (2013) states that "data collected in a narrative study need[s] to be analyzed for the story they [research participants] have to tell…and turning points or epiphanies" (pp.189). The experience of each research participant was taken and retold, and the key themes of their experience were highlighted.

After the collected data were transcribed, the text was then read through multiple times for note taking and initial code formation (Creswell, 2013). The initial codes served as the larger points, or ideas, that have been expressed by the research participants. The stories of each research participant were then broken apart (Creswell, 2013); only crucial parts of the respective stories were kept. With the data in order, the initial coding developed and key events identified, each story was placed in thematic categories derived from Sense of Community at Work (SOC at Work) (Klein and D'Aunno, 1986). .

The work place referents of friendship network, functional subgroup, organization as a whole, profession, and work site (university), which build the sense of community held by individuals in the work place, were used to form the primary thematic categories (Klein and D'Aunno, 1986). Additional themes found within the data were also included in the final analysis. It should be noted that the stories themselves were not analyzed to solely find codes related to SOC or SOC at Work. The codes within the story were placed into thematic categories derived from SOC at Work. Any codes that did not fall within those categories formed additional themes.

Once the data were fully analyzed, it was verified to ensure trustworthiness, validity, and reliability (Creswell, 2014). Qualitative research slightly makes this more difficult due to the opinionated nature of the personal narrative. However, through the use of the verification methods of member-checking and peer-debriefing, the data analysis was shown to be trustworthy.

Verification

Verification is critical for the evaluation of the quality of qualitative research (Creswell 2014). For the purpose of validating the collected data and its analysis, the following strategies were employed; peer debriefing and member-checking (Creswell, 2014).

Peer debriefing is the process of having work analyzed by a disinterested peer in an analytical way to uncover biases, perspectives, and assumptions on the researcher's part (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For peer-debriefing to occur, a willing peer reviewed my analysis of interviews as the study proceeded. In this study, a faculty supervisor served in the role as my peer for debriefing about my thoughts regarding the data analysis. Specifically, the peer examined the coding that I deduced from the interview transcripts and questioned the decisions I made regarding the thematic categories that the codes were placed in. This helped to ensure that I was not overlooking or misplacing any meanings in the participant's stories. This peer debriefing process also helped to ensure that I kept my biases in check as the participant's stories had profound effect on me because of my previously mentioned insider-status. The participant's and I shared ethnicity and discipline, so it was important to ensure that I did not let my pre-conceived notions affect their narratives.

Member-checking is the process of validating data interpretation through the research participant associated with the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This process provided opportunities for the research participant to correct and/or remove any portions of the data transcription that they felt was misunderstood or did not want shared to the public. For member-checking to occur, the completed transcript was returned to the research participant. This allowed the research participant to verify and correct the information collected. Upon completing of the transcription process, the transcripts were immediately sent to the participants for review. Participants were allowed to remove certain identifiable aspects of their stories and to correct their wording. No participant asked to add additional details to their previous thoughts. The participants also had to sign the previously mentioned Final Consent Form (Appendix C) to grant us permission to proceed with using their story. This process helped ensure the anonymity and accurate portrayal of the research participants. Member-checking in conjunction with peer-debriefing helped to establish the validity of the data analysis.

These validating procedures were not the only steps taken to ensure the trustworthiness of the research. Due to the possibility of ethical issues occurring, it was important to have set procedures for acknowledging any these problems prior to their arrival.

Ethical Issues

Creswell (2014) states that, "researchers need to anticipate the ethical issues that may arise during their studies" (p.92). Ethical considerations were made based on Guest, Mack, MacQueen, and Woodsong's (2005) guide for ethical research considerations: 1) the objectives of the study were provided verbally and written to all participants, 2)

consent and confidentiality agreement were provided that ensured any identifying information would not be used in the report and that agreed for their participation in the research (Appendix B), 3) written/oral consent was asked for before the phone-taped interviews began, 4) member-checking was utilized to verify transcriptions of data before data analysis proceeded (Appendix C) . By employing these ethical considerations, the research remained true to its purpose and in alignment with the agreement of the research participants.

Reporting the Data

Narrative studies focus on the retelling of the personal experiences of research participants (Creswell, 2014). Furthermore, Reissman (2008) states that the overarching structure in narrative inquiry focuses on the presentation of several themes. Taking both of these into account, the stories of the participants are shared with a focus on the major themes within the findings.

The findings within this study will focus on the individual experiences shared by each participant. This is done to ensure that the full experience of every participant is shared, so that their voice can be fully heard. While some aspects of the stories may be similar, their experiences are all important and crucial to understanding the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at PWIs. The narratives of each participant will be laid out in similar structure.

First, the participants will be given a short introduction. The brief introduction serves as a tool to provide the context for which the participant's narrative is coming from. Next, the highlights of each story are shown through the discussion of themes (Reissman, 2008). The primary themes explored were developed from SOC at Work.

This serves to help understand the sense of community held by each participant. Lastly, any other themes present within the individual stories are explored. This final piece aids to identify any further items that had major impact on each individual's experience. Ensuring that the voices of the research participants remain active is vital, so whenever possible direct quotes from interviews will be interjected to discuss any themes, experiences, or ideas presented. After reporting the individual narratives within the findings section, the major themes and collective stories are tied together in the discussion chapter.

The discussion chapter focuses on the narratives as a whole, so that the presence or lack of any shared themes and experiences across participants can be shown (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The discussion of the findings also focuses on connecting the research to other literature that has explored the experiences of Black faculty members in higher education. The discussion is structured so that each major theme is reintroduced prior to further discussing the collective experiences of the research participants and any ties to other literature. This was done to ensure that the framework of the multiple sections within the discussion chapter remain clear.

Limitations and Delimitations

There were three primary limitations to this study; (1) spatial relevance, (2) temporal relevance, and (3) the willingness of the participants to share their truthful experiences. Temporal and spatial relevance were the two primary limitations that this study faced. Narrative inquiries are about the stories that people tell when reflecting on events from their lives (Creswell, 2013).

Temporal relevance is a limitation of this study because it focused on the past engagement of Black faculty members within their professional communities. The faculty members chosen for the study were currently living through that experience, but also reflecting on their past experiences in it. The participants of the study were reflected on events that I have already occurred within their lives. There is no guarantee that the story would be the same a year, or even a week, later. The way people view their past experiences changes over time. Due to these natural occurring changes, the results of this study may not be reproducible in the future if the same participants were interviewed once again. Furthermore, the interpretation of the participant's stories is only relevant to their collective experiences, which impacts this study's spatial relevance.

Spatial relevance also influences the ability to reproduce the study. The narratives shared by the participants are unique to their experiences at their institutions. If another group of participants were chosen to be examined, there could be differences in experience. These variances may occur due to the institutions having different structures, policies, demographics, or any number of other factors. Lastly, the willingness of participants to openly and honestly share their experiences was a limitation of the study.

The quality of the data relied on the openness and truthfulness of each interview participant. The small size population influenced the willingness of the participants to share their stories. Some participants expressed concerns regarding being identified, and proceeded to within hold certain experiences that were perceived to be identifiable. The withholding of information may have prevented crucial aspects of their story from being shared. The trustworthiness of each participant was assumed throughout the study, with hopes that they would share their authentic experience as much as they were willing too.

The interviews were based on good faith that each participant was as open and honest as possible during the interview.

The study was conducted with the following delimitations, or boundaries; (1) methodology choice, (2) participant selection criteria, and (3) setting choice. Qualitative interviews, the methodology of this study, created the boundaries of the study. The study focuses on the shared experiences of a specific group of people. Identifying shared experiences required participants to be from similar circumstances. Participants were all self-identifying Black faculty members, working within an agricultural education department at a PWI, at the time of data collection. These delimitations helped maintain a set standard for the selection of faculty participants from similar environments and circumstances. Having Black faculty members who work under similar circumstances increased the possibility of finding commonalities between their personal narratives.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

The narratives of three Black faculty members in agricultural education departments from Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) offer insight in their experiences within the discipline. Each of the participants provided a narrative that allows a deeper understanding of how their current institutions and agricultural education departments are impacting their lives. The findings within this chapter will focus on the individual experiences shared by each participant. The narratives of each participant will be laid out in similar structure. First, each participant will be given a short introduction. Next, the narratives will be explored with a focus on the themes developed from SOC at Work. Lastly, any other major themes unrelated to SOC at Work will be explored. The themes present within the findings have emphasis on multiple areas.

The themes derived from Klein and D'Aunno's theory of Sense of Community at Work (SOC at Work) (1986) include five total. These themes are; 1) views of friendship network at work, 2) functioning within the department, 3) departmental experience as a whole, 4) experiences across agricultural education and 5) impact of the university.

The first theme of "friendship network at work" was adapted from Klein and D'Aunno's SOC at Work referent, friendship network. This theme refers to the participant's socialization with other department members outside of work (1986). The second theme "functioning with the department" was adapted from Klein and D'Aunno's SOC at Work referent, functional subgroup. "Functioning with the department" focuses on the participant's experience of collaboration with other departmental members (1986). Theme three, "departmental experience as a whole" is from Klein and D'Aunno's SOC at Work referent, organization as a whole. The theme "departmental experience as a whole"

focuses on the participant's feelings towards their agricultural education department

(Klein and D'Aunno, 1986, p.368). The fourth theme of "experiences across agricultural

education" was adapted from Klein and D'Aunno's SOC at Work referent, profession.

This theme refers to the participants views on the discipline of agricultural education

beyond their home university (1986). The final theme of "impact of the university" was

adapted from Klein and D'Aunno's SOC at Work referent, work site. "Impact of the

university" refers to their views beyond the department that can be attributed to the

university (1986). Additional themes were explored in conjunction with the above four.

These themes were "source of mentorship," "source of self-value," and "self-preservation

is key."

    "Source of mentorship" is a theme that focuses on the participant's experiences

with finding mentors for personal and professional development. This theme was found

through the experiences shared by each research participant. "Source of self-value" was a

theme found within only one of the participant's narratives. It focuses on how that

participant perceives their value within their professional experience. "Self-preservation

is key" was also only present within one participant. This theme focuses on how the

research participant manages self-care and protects their mental and emotional health

within their experience.

Dr. Green's Experience

Dr. Green is a Black male with over a decade of experience. Within agriculture,

he has received accolades and other recognitions throughout his career. The narrative that

Dr. Green shared narrative reflects on his experience throughout education and his

thoughts on improving the field for Black faculty members.

Dr. Green's Views of Friendship Network at Work

Dr. Green did not have a focus on forming friendships with other faculty members throughout his career. Dr. Green was more concerned with professional collaboration than with building personal relationships. Dr. Green shared that there "has been a couple times where they asked, 'say hey let's go out and have a drink,'…but when it comes to research…that's where it's lacking." Dr. Green in this case was sharing that while there are opportunities for socialization outside of work, he would prefer to be considered "useful" within the department rather than just for "recreation." He did not want to only be asked to go out for fun activities. For Dr. Green, he was not searching for friends within the department. He was searching to be valued as a research collaborator. Dr. Green summarized this by sharing that "it's just professional environment…I'm there to work. I'm not here to have friends, or make friends." When Dr. Green stepped onto campus he was there to complete his require job task. He was not there to bond over non-work related task.

Dr. Green's Views on Functioning within the Department

Throughout Dr. Green's story there were multiple instances where he faced negative experiences. He had difficulty with finding collaborative efforts with fellow faculty members in the department. He often dealt with the minimization of his abilities and experiences. He felt that he was treated such that he had "to do twice as much," but "still be considered half as qualified or equal." Dr. Green thought that he would have to work harder than his colleagues to gain recognition for his efforts, yet he was still being treated a being lesser than them.

Dr. Green also shared that he thought he was not part of the department. Dr. Green acknowledged that he felt the "brotherhood" of agricultural education did not include him because he was not "actually included in the profession on the professional level." The minimization of his abilities and the exclusion that Dr. Green felt impacted him most in his interactions with other faculty members within the department. Dr. Green's key concern was with his lack of interaction with others. He explained;

> The biggest thing is having interaction with individuals…if I didn't push, or drive the interaction, nobody would come to me about things. And a lot of times people, they know your qualifications, yet they don't come to you with things... For example, if you have a colleague whose doing work with underrepresented students, and they see that you have been doing research with that already… yet you're not incorporated within those discussions.

For Dr. Green this continual negative communal experience represented a lack of interaction and a sign of his expertise not being valued. The expertise that Dr. Green held was not being fully recognized and put to work in his eyes. He felt that he had more he could contribute to discussions and efforts within the department. Dr. Green used his negative experiences to provide insight on what could be done to improve it.

Through purposeful collaboration and teamwork, Dr. Green felt that the departmental experience could be improved for Black faculty within any area. He stated that through collaboration the ideal department could be reached where "everyone would be on the same page." Through collaboration the department could demonstrate efforts of working together and utilizing everyone's expertise in ways that encourage collaboration. Teamwork was explained by Dr. Green as being "where people can see you working

together." The collaboration that Dr. Green wanted, would not be something seen only behind the scenes. It would be something where other faculty and students could see two professors of different ethnicities working together in some form. Dr. Green thought that through these two areas the department could be improved. He also felt that by improving the department, you could impact the students by showing them that the department is a "collaborative environment." However, this suggested improvement does not change Dr. Green's current experiences.

Dr. Green expressed that he was lacking the collaboration he wanted within his department, so he found it elsewhere. He shared that he has "more resources of people who are not at the same institution," who he can call to help him be "successful." The collaboration that Dr. Green was experiencing with these other institutions is what he wants to have within his current department. He wants his department to be where he discovers success, but we will go elsewhere until that success is realized.

Dr. Green's Views on the Department as a Whole

The culture of the overall department is what affected Dr. Green the most. In his eyes, agricultural education department was a "family unit," but the lack of fellow minorities created a lack of interaction with others. For him, it made it "extremely difficult to develop that type of relationship." Dr. Green did not feel included within the family of agricultural education.

Dr. Green placed value in knowing things about others, but did not feel as if they attempted to know things about him. He explained how he would have to "learn thirty people," but those same thirty people would not "know a thing about me as one person, expect for I'm a Black man, and a Black Professor." Dr. Green saw that as being the

"world we living in," when it comes to being a Black professor within agricultural education. Dr. Green wants others to assume part of the responsibility for building the community within the department. He wants to see his colleagues take more effort to get to know and understand him. This lack of a sense of belonging and understanding is one that led Dr. Green to find community elsewhere.

Dr. Green shared that the only time he felt a sense of belonging was when he engaged with one of the minority-focused groups related to agriculture. Groups like these allowed him to be surrounded with the "like-minded individuals…and people striving for the same thing." He contrasted this to his current PWI by sharing that in dealing with PWIs there "is a sense of exclusion" that he faced. Those shared connections and sense of belonging did not exist for him within his department. Dr. Green also shared that feelings of exclusion were throughout his experience. He felt that he was different than others and said that "it's just that people have commonalties amongst themselves that sometimes does not match with your commonalties." This lack of commonalities caused him to believe that "as "minorities in agriculture, no matter what you in…you're gonna be exhibiting these specific trains of exclusion".

Although this exclusion was influential in Dr. Green's experience, he does not fully blame his colleagues within the department. He shared that "it may not always be something that they try to do, but it happens…These levels of exclusion happen to you." Dr. Green also stated that, "I don't think, sometimes I don't even know if people even know if they're doing it or not…It's just that they go about their business..." For Dr. Green his sense of not belonging and exclusion were caused by the actions of his colleagues, but he does not feel that they are always intentionally excluding him. He

believes that their similarities created silos that he cannot fit within when looking at the department. He also does not lump them all together as one unit. He shared that "every once in a while, yeah, you'll feel some value, because there are people who really do look at you based on your professionalism." He found that even in the negative experiences that he faced, he was still able to identify that there were also positives. He did not blanket the entire department or discipline as negative. He gave credit to those who were showing him respect and comradery.

Dr. Green's Views on Experiences across Agricultural Education

Dr. Green experienced loneliness, invalidations, and general negative treatment outside of his department. His experiences were reflected in the discipline at large. Dr. Green acknowledged his loneliness by sharing how "it can be pretty lonely when you are one in thousands, in anything you're involved in". Dr. Green was referring to the expanse of the agricultural education discipline. Despite their being a great number of professors and universities within the discipline, Dr. Green still faced the feeling of being alone.

With regards to the discipline Dr. Green also expressed feelings of invalidation or minimization of his experience and accolades.

> "I've seen times in the profession where people have said, 'You don't fit the mold that we're looking for...' Um, whatever that means is always kept in a zipped up envelope somewhere, but there is a definition to not really meeting the qualifications, you know, even based on my experiences and accolades, it always make you feel like you just don't really truly fit in, into this profession.

In the mind of Dr. Green, his qualifications had no impact on the treatment he was given. They were ignored and put to the side. Dr. Green summed this feeling up by sharing that he felt "no matter how high, or how far you reach, or how many accolades you achieve, you still are marginalized, in the profession." Dr. Green was troubled by this marginalization.

Dr. Green's Views on the Impact of the University

Dr. Green also shared his thoughts on his experiences that were aligned with his university-wide dealings as his institution. Dr. Green has given some thought on how to improve the issues that he faces as Black professor at a PWI. He feels that for change to occur it "has to be impactful to everybody. From the national levels all the way down." It has to include the leaders of the university being interested in "cultural diversity, and cultural related response and practices," and then it "can make a faculty member feel more at home." Dr. Green believed that improving the university experience required effort from individuals on all levels of the university. He thought the improvement of the community could not be solely placed on the backs of Black faculty members.

White students at his institution also created issues for Dr. Green. They often did not show him respect or trust towards his position as a faculty member or the teacher of their classes. Dr. Green shared that there was a difference between his experiences with Black and White students. Often White students would go to "white professors, and ask questions, and they're in your class." Dr. Green would question this and wonder "why the heck didn't they come to me and ask?" He felt that they always "overlook you" as a Black professor. Contrastingly, Dr. Green shared that "Black students come to you with questions and concerns, and sincere issues." He mentioned that there were a few White

students "who are more open minded," and who "treat you like everybody else, but you know, that's far and few between. Far and few between." These differences between Black and White students were one of the other negative aspects of Dr. Green's experience that expanded beyond his agricultural education community. Similar to his wants for the department, Dr. Green wanted to see his White students see him as a source of support and knowledge. He wanted to see them willingly and openly come to him directly with their concerns. Dr. Green felt that it was his responsibility to handle his students.

Dr. Greens Views on Sources of Mentorship

Mentorship was a small, but importance piece for Dr. Green. The collaboration and support that he did not find within the department he sought elsewhere. The mentors that he discussed seeking out were those "people who have showed an interest in working with the underserved communities." Those individuals were the ones that Dr. Green felt were important to speak of in relation to identifying sources of support and mentorship.

Dr. Green's Views on Sources of Self-Value

Dr. Green spoke briefly about how he measures his success. For him, it is not defined by what happens within the departmental unit. Nor is it defined by research accolades, promotion, or salary. For Dr. Green, the "ultimate goal of what I achieve has to do with [student] success. So, you know, if they're not succeeding, if they're not getting jobs when they get out, then, to me, I'm more of a failure, compared to myself getting national awards here and there. That doesn't mean a thing to me." Dr. Green expressed concerns with finding collaboration and value within his department. However, he felt that his primary purpose was to support, grow, and push students towards success. He

was able to accept and deal with the negatives of not having a collaborative work environment, if his students were still having forward momentum in their lives.

Dr. Red's Experience

Dr. Red is a Black male professor with nearly a decade of experience. However, he has only recently joined his current community having worked for the university less than a year at the time of data collection. It is also a department that was undergoing changes in structure. The reflection of Dr. Red's experience focuses on his current situation, and is therefore somewhat limited in depth.

Dr. Red's Views of Friendship Network at Work

The friendship network that Dr. Red developed in his current work place was limited, but thoughtful and impactful. Dr. Red considered his coworkers to be "multidimensional," viewing them as both professional and personal resources. Dr. Red considered the "personal dimension" to be where "you interact with each other" beyond the work place. He stated that he was working to build his understanding of his colleagues' personal dimensions within his new community. He felt those personal relationships did not exist at the moment. He felt building those personal relationships was within the realm of possibility in further. It was "just taking time" due to his relative recent start at the university. Dr. Red had hope for the future growth of friendships within his new work network.

Dr. Red's Views on Functioning within the Department

Dr. Red shared that his experience within the department was constrained due the limited time he has worked for his current institution. This limitation did not prevent him from having confidence and trust within the current departmental system. He felt that he

had the support he would need to be successful. Dr. Red thought that his past experiences gave him an advantage to starting at his new university. He felt that he already knew what to do to be successful, and that he could immediately begin to "ask the right questions" and show that he had "something to offer others." Dr. Red felt his abundance of experience led to "more of a collaboration" between himself and his colleagues within the department. He felt there have been more people that have ignited collaboration with him because he is "considered to have some expertise that people need." He went on to share that;

> There's already that understanding and that support, from others, to do it that way and so I find that even though I've only been here a short amount of time, that it feels that I haven't halted within my scholarship or within my teaching, I'm actually progressing as if I have been here for a while because I'm not spending as much time trying to defend the choices that I make, or trying to find collaborations within my department because they naturally happen.

For Dr. Red, the collaboration and work with others was progressing with forward momentum. He was not seeking to find collaboration and support, because it was already occurring.

Dr. Red's Views on the Department as a Whole

Dr. Red held positive views towards his entire department. He felt that there was support from the top to the bottom. Immediately, upon joining his department, he found support from the department head and colleagues.

> So, when I first came in, my department head, who's the interim, had a lot of expectations for me and was very happy to have me here. He set a clear path to

get the program started. And then as we begin to roll that out to the other faculty, most of the faculty were like, 'Yes, go with it', but that's because they saw me as a peer.

However, for Dr. Red this was an experience that he felt would change. He thought that things were temporary because of the future administrative changes coming. As it stood at that moment, Dr. Red thought everyone was doing what was necessary to be successful in the current environment. In this situation he and others were working based on what was currently occurring and did not look very "far into the future." He and his fellow faculty members were only focused on the things that they felt would impact their immediate future. They were focused on "what we need to do in order to get things done currently." Dr. Red also held positive thoughts in other regards.

Dr. Red felt forward momentum in his current university. He did not feel that he was being held back by misunderstandings or confusion. He noted,

I feel that I can actually progress because I'm not trying to explain…my area is within social justice issues, and so I'm not having to explain how that fits within the field. I'm not having to always explain why I'm connected to what I do.

Dr. Red attributed this forward momentum to breadth of experience that members of the department held. He felt that because "for most of us, this is not our first job. I think that we, just by being in the field, so long see the need, we look at the national priorities and have found a way to be relevant within our particular area." Dr. Red thought there was "an expectation that the level of excellence, the level of productivity, will continue and so even though they may not clearly understand what I'm doing, they trust that I know what I'm doing and that it'll help students, it'll help the field." He returned these sentiments to

those within the department. There was trust within the system and value placed on the collective experiences and expertise within the department.

Dr. Red's Views on Experiences across Agricultural Education

Dr. Red identified as an African-American male from an urban area and shares that there are "very few within the field" and that little "were in faculty positions that fit" his background. He did not see others in the field that looked like him or were from the area he was from. He felt that his background made him an outsider with the field. He was one of the few that shared his experience. He was not able to avoid the feeling of being different within the demographics of agricultural education. The other concern that Dr. Red expressed was regarding his research.

Dr. Red is involved in a sector that is one of the "components of agricultural education that is different nationally." He stated that his area "is a small component of my field, and a fairly new component of the field." He feels that his research focus also separates him from others within the discipline. Dr. Red is explicitly a part of the agricultural education discipline, but only a relatively new part. It something that he still gaining a foothold and Dr. Red feels as if he is still working to ensure its gaining recognition.

Dr. Red's Views on Sources of Mentorship

Mentors have a variety of roles in Dr. Red's experience. Having been unable to find mentorship with the academic department, Dr. Reed selected mentors at the university level and beyond. At the university level, he stated that "more diversity" and "other experiences" can be found to identify mentors. Dr. Red said that he feels mentors can take on different roles, so he finds "people who are in education…people that are in

administration…some that have the same ethnic background. His focus is "finding people that fit different parts of my identity," and going to those certain people for "help in how to navigate the system based on those parts of my identity."

Dr. Blue's Experience

Dr. Blue describes herself as being a "Black female with hair that is not straight" and who does not attempt to fit the mold of her agricultural education department. She shared that for nearly two decades she has been in a "challenging environment since day number one." Throughout her story she shares about the negative experience she has faced and how she managed self-preservation.

Dr. Blue's Views on Functioning within the Department

Dr. Blue did not share any experiences that highlighted her work with others in the department. Her experiences within the department, which she categorizes as "challenging," have pushed her to identify outside resources. These outside resources included friends and support systems from other institutions. Dr. Blue explained that a large portion of her collaborative efforts come from her being "resourceful" and learning to "work with others outside of the department."

Dr. Blue's Views on the Department as a Whole

The experience shared by Dr. Blue about her work interactions within the department highlight a lack of interaction, exclusionary practices and inequitable access. Dr. Blue described one such instance involving the lack of interactions and exclusionary practices when describing an everyday occurrence of entering her office;

> I can go to my office everyday without having a conversation with colleagues
>
> unless it specifically relates to a specific work related topic or business conducted.

For example, the department head, associate department head or other faculty members can walk in a room and act is if I am invisible. On the other hand, others can enter the room and suddenly these colleagues are collegial and other colleagues are visible. However, there are a few who do not behave in that manner.

The experience of dealing with the exclusion by colleagues has led to Dr. Blue developing a defense mechanism. When Dr. Blue attends work she chooses to place her own boundaries. She states that she has learned to protect herself in a department that she describes as being one "where I do my job, and pretty much, that's it. I have discussions on a needs-only basis." Her defense barriers are meant to serve as a tool that keeps her mental and emotional well-being intact. She did not want to let her negative experience impact the rest of her life.

Dr. Blue spoke of how her research is invalidated and treated as if it has limited value. She believes that it is "valued to meet the needs of my department, college, and university," but that is still "not valued by senior colleagues." She says the opposite is the case when her "colleagues of European descent", White faculty members, do similar research and are treated with value. She has seen instances where her colleagues can do similar research, and receive praise and recognition from the department. In instances where she has done the research, she feels that she barely receives a nod of recognition for it. She further believes that her "research agenda has not helped me to advance as quickly as others." Despite this she states that, "I do feel it is important and I will continue to work in the areas in which I am lead to work on regardless of how others value my research." She says part of her purpose is to "move beyond the concrete

barriers" that she considers "meant to be broken." Dr. Blue feels that her research has power and addresses issues that are not touched on nearly enough in agricultural education. She finds value in the fact that she is the one conducting the research. Dr. Blue sees this as her way to push things forward and challenge the status quo.

Over time Dr. Blue has continued to push with her current research agenda despite feeling that her department supervisors "did not care enough to provide resources" that would have "helped her to be more successful." The resources she feels that she was lacking include mentorship, grant wiring information, career planning help, and other items. She attributes this denial of resources towards what she calls the "good old boys club," who are the "white males and a select group of females in the department with…perceived prestige and power." She shared that this group holds "traditional beliefs as far as what ag should look like" and "don't want anyone else to work their way up," so that they can hold on to their power. She believes that this in-group did not want professors that did not fit a traditional agricultural mold to move forward with their careers and efforts. They wanted to ensure that the current structure of the department remained the same and continued in the years to come.

Dr. Blue attempted to not let this denial of resources impact her though. She shared that even though her "work with diversity" or her identity as a "Black female with hair that is not straight," causes her to feel as if she will never be part of that "good old boys club," she is "completely ok with that." She does not want to be part of their group. She wants to see things improve and continue to grow within the department.

She provided information related to current improvements within the department that may be beneficial to future faculty members. These improvements are the resources

that she wishes she would have been given access too. She spoke of new processes meant to ensure the success of new faculty members.

> There is now an onboarding process. A blueprint has been laid out for these individuals so they have formal mentoring and matched with mentors. They have training to discuss research agendas, grants, etc. Those are some of the changes that I see that have helped others.

> Dr. Blue feels that the changes that her department is currently experiencing can be attributed to the administrative changes in recent years. She stated that "some of those that were in that close-knit in-group [are] still there, but it's not as prevalent as it has been in the past decade." For the period before the administration changed, Dr. Blue explained that a set group of people "received all of the accolades, access to information, university and departmental grants…access to other pocket funds, as opposed to everyone else." Dr. Blue feels that the department is making steps towards improvement, but that "it's still too soon to say."

Dr. Blue's Views on Experiences across Agricultural Education

Within Dr. Blue's narrative there was a limited focus on the discipline at large. Dr. Blue only briefly spoke about her considerations to the leave the university for another, but remarked that "many of the behaviors of the colleagues are similar to the ones I talked about previously. Maybe, I would see slight changes, but overall…it's the same…" She fully believes that her experience within her department would be repeated at other institutions. It is also important to note that Dr. Blue's experience has not only been impacted by fellow educators; students have also played a large role.

Dr. Blue's Views on the Impact of the University

Invalidations by students and the enabling of those students by administrators was a common phenomenon within Dr. Blue's narrative. She commented how she has been "continuously questioned about [her] knowledge" from students about the educational content she teaches. She has faced negative evaluations and criticism that she says is based upon "who you are, and what you look like." Dr. Blue explicitly states that the student's evaluations that she receives are "consistently harsh, very critical any many times do not reflect the content of the classroom." She believes that these evaluations reflect how the students "feel toward me as a person of color and as a professor." She also spoke on how students who are uncomfortable with the diversity topics in her classes choose to "speak directly with the department head or deans about me," rather than having conversations directly with her. The administrators do not offer much to support Dr. Blue. Rather than ensuring the students return to Dr. Blue with their questions and concerns, the administrators address them on the student's behalf. They do not offer support and recognition towards Dr. Blue's position as the teacher of these students.

The enabling that Dr. Blue was referring too made her feel as if the students were beginning to "feel more empowered." This empowerment was in reference to the students choosing to go above her head rather than speaking with her directly and being successful in their effort. She could not confirm if this issue was experienced by other faculty members within the department, but she did say that she felt "other faculty members do not have the same issues" as her because of difference of ethnicity and teaching topics. Dr. Blue believes that the color of her skin and her focus on diversity issues create the

differences in treatment that she faces. She thinks that they challenge her White students and cause them to feel uncomfortable with addressing her.

Dr. Blue's Views on Sources of Mentorship

Dr. Blue regularly faced a lack of support and mentorship from those within her department. She explained unlike her fellow colleagues she never received the formal mentoring relationship from the department.

Some of my colleagues, they were assigned [mentors], and they didn't realize until recently that I was like, "I've never had a mentor." They were assigned. I would say new assistant professors were assigned a mentor, like a full professor to kind of work with them and meet with them regularly throughout the year to make sure they were on task. I didn't even know about that, so those are the things that I'm talking about.

This lack of mentoring led Dr. Blue to feel as if she missed out on numerous benefits of having a mentor. She felt having mentor within the department could have helped. She noted,

I think that more mentoring could have been done just about simple things that I just kind of had to figure out myself. I was just thinking more mentoring. I think more formal mentoring about how to set up a research agenda, professional development, working with students. These are things I had to figure out on my own. Mentoring on the importance of grants and grant writing and building those teams early in my career. I think those things would have been beneficial. I didn't have that.

Dr. Blue said the trainings that she did not receive allowed others the "opportunity to get ahead fast, and the opportunities to work on various projects." However, it should be noted that Dr. Blue highlighted a single informal mentor who served as a source of "emotional support" from within the department.

The emotional support provided by this mentor was described as being useful for "getting you through some tough things," by Dr. Blue. This mentor provided Dr. Blue with the ability to defend her emotional health, which is important to her. She needed this sense of support to develop her ability to continue on within her department and field. However, she still continued to reinforce the missing mentoring in relation to academia.

> I would say yes, that I did have a mentor that provided emotional support, but I also needed a mentor for other types of support, which I didn't realize until later years that that's what I needed.

The support that Dr. Blue wanted to receive revolved around professional and academic advances. She needed mentoring on the "importance of grants and grant writing and building those teams early in my career…and how students react to you in the classroom." She needed mentoring in ways that would assist with her development as a faculty member within the department.

Dr. Blue's Views on Self-Preservation

Dr. Blue learned different ways to preserve her mental and emotional health through her experiences within the discipline. She needed to do what she felt was the right decision. This right decision was what would protect her most in her life as a faculty member. She wanted protection from her negative experiences within her department.

She wanted to be able to leave the negativity at the office. Dr. Blue noted that her experience had a profound affect upon her;

> I checked out three years after I got there as far as actively trying to engage with colleagues. I think I tried for the first three years when I got there. I played by the unwritten rules by going the traditional conferences, attending departmental lunches and Christmas parties. It was too much energy, I didn't want to be there. I think after year three, I just decided I'm not going to do it unless it was something that I wanted to do. It was not the right political decision, but I feel like for my health, sanity and the balance of my life, I think it was the right decision for me. I just refused, to compromise myself, my values, and my time to do things that I didn't want to do or make efforts to talk to people who had no desire or interest in me or the things that I was doing. So after three years, I just said, no, I'm done.

The decision to "check out" was what Dr. Blue felt was best for her situation. She had a strong desire of "not wanting to relocate and uproot my family." She also wanted to do her best to "leave the negativity at the office." Dr. Blue had a solid belief in "balance" and that she would "not allow others to have power and control over my existence." She never placed the blame on the negative aspects of her experience on herself. Dr. Blue fully believed that "9 times out of 10, it not about you, it's about their insecurities and inadequacies." Dr. Blue felt that she could not allow herself to be the blame for her negative experience within agricultural education. She felt it was a reflection of others not having faith in themselves to accept her diverse appearance and thoughts into their traditional view of agriculture.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

This discussion addresses the five major themes derived from Sense of Community at Work (SOC at Work) and other themes that appeared within the participant's narratives. The discussion focuses on exploring the shared and differing aspects of the research participants as a collective.

Theme: Friendship Network at Work

The theme of "friendship network at work" refers to the participant's socialization with other department members outside of work the work setting. It's based on the building of relationships that extend past professionalism and reach a level of comradery. There were limited findings with relation to this theme. It only truly appeared within the narratives of Dr. Green and Red, but its appearance differed between the two.

Klein and D'Aunno (1986) tell us that within the frame work of sense of community, the friendship network is related to the "feeling of belonging to a circle of friends at work," and the partaking in actives that are not necessarily related to work. Neither Dr. Green nor Red expressed that they belong to such a group in their narratives, but they did share their takes on building those relationships.

Dr. Green expressed that his interest with the department was purely professional. When he entered his work place, he was "there to work," and not here to "have friends, or make friends." Multiple researchers speak of the ill effects that forced social isolation can have on Black faculty members (Burden, Harrison Hodge, 2005; Alexander & Moore, 2008). However, research does not seem address the opposite. What impact does the purposeful choice of Black faculty members to not build relationships with colleagues have? Comparatively, Dr. Red felt that the multidimensionality of his colleagues was

important. He saw them as both professional and personal resources. Unfortunately, in his specific situation his limited time within his position has prevented him from establishing those friendship networks. However, Dr. Red believed that there was the possibility that personal relationships would grow and form in the future. At the time of the study Dr. Red was seemingly confident and hopeful for the future.

Theme: Functioning within the Department

The theme of "functioning within the department" focuses on the participant's experience of collaboration with other departmental members. Each participant provided some insight in their experiences with collaborating within the department. Alexander and Moore (2008) have found that Black faculty members may have their work and value judged more harshly than others. In some instances, Black faculty members have even been found to face issues with being considered intellectually inferior or to have restrictions with regards to professional opportunities (Burden, J., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S., 2005). Similar experiences to these in the previously highlighted research were shown to impact Dr. Green and Dr. Blue within their respective universities.

Dr. Green dealt with the minimization and harsh judgement of his abilities and expertise. He shared that he felt was treated in such a way that he had to do more than his White counterparts just to be considered half as equal. Dr. Blue did not share any specific stories that showed a negative experience with collaboration with fellow departmental members. However, she suggested that is because she has been forced to form her collaboration efforts by learning to "work with others outside of the department." Her struggles within the department were so detrimental, that she focused on finding those

professional collaborations elsewhere. These experiences were vastly different from Dr. Red.

Dr. Red immediately experienced collaboration between himself and his colleagues within the department. He attributed this to the wealth of experience that he brought to the table. Ultimately, Dr. Red felt there was already "understanding and that support, from others" for his work. He felt trust in the system that he was a part of. Dr. Red attributed this collaboration within his department to the ability of his colleagues to look at the "national priorities, and find a way to make it make sense" from the standpoint of examining agricultural education.

Theme: Departmental Experience as a Whole

The theme of "departmental experience as a whole" focuses on the participant's feelings towards the agricultural education department with regards to membership, commitment, identification, and belonging. I also noted how the participants viewed the department as a whole. All research participants were able to provide thoughts on their views of their entire department. Dr. Green and Dr. Blue faced experiences related to minimization, exclusion, and limitation of themselves within the department.

Exclusion was a force that kept Drs. Green and Blue removed from the departments that they were a part of. Dr. Green described agricultural education as a "family unit," but attributed his status as a minority as causing difficulties with being a part of the family. Dr. Blue shared that she was aware that her "work with diversity" and her identity as a Black female prevented her from being part of the "in-group." Both Dr. Green and Blue found themselves forced to look elsewhere to find that sense of belonging and identification. This aligns with Alexander and Moore's (2008) suggestion

for improving the lives of Black faculty members, which primarily focused on finding

support networks outside of their work communities. In some cases, Black faculty

members will have to leave their departments to find these feelings in outside

communities (Alexander and Moore, 2008). Dr. Green found his community within a

minority-focused agricultural group. It allowed him to be around "like-minded

individuals." As previously mentioned, Dr. Blue has been collaborating with colleagues

from other departments and universities. Drs. Blue and Green's expertise was invalided

by the lack of collaboration within their department, but both have found people that

value and support them. Both of these professors have found ways to develop the specific

sense of community although is does come from elsewhere. Dr. Blue's experience also

aligns with Allen et al.'s findings regarding the Black faculty experience.

Allen et al. (2000) found that Black faculty members have shown concern about

the devaluation of their work on diversity issues. Dr. Blue faced feelings of the value of

her research being minimalized by the senior colleagues within her department. However,

she has chosen to continue forward with it. Her determination was described as being

because she wants to "move beyond the concrete barriers," because "they are meant to be

broken." The experiences of Dr. Blue and Green sway drastically away from that of Dr.

Red.

Dr. Red held his experience within the department with high esteem. He attributed

his positive feelings towards his department to the vast experience being brought to the

table and the respect for one another. He described how that within his department they

were able to "look at the national priorities" of agricultural education and continually find

ways to be "relevant within our particular area[s]." He said an expectation of continual excellence exists, and that's what everyone strived to be.

Theme: Experiences across Agricultural Education

The theme of "experiences across agricultural education" refers to the participants views on the discipline of agricultural education beyond their home university. It looks at how they view the discipline across the nation and their engagement with it. All participant's within this study expressed concerns within this context. Drs. Red and Dr. Green expressed concerns related to their identities as Black men within a predominantly White field.

These concerns are similar to those expressed by Alexander and Moore (2008) and Niemann (2003) when discussing tokenism and the issues caused by it. As discussed in the literature, tokenism occurs when Black faculty members find themselves working alone among White faculty members. In agricultural education, this is an occurrence that occurs both on the institutional level and national level. Dr. Green explicitly stated this concern when he mentioned that "it can be pretty lonely when you are one in thousands." This loneliness is something that Dr. Green echoed throughout his narrative. Dr. Red also shared these feeling of being alone. He describes himself as being an African-American male from an urban area and recognizes that there are "very few in the field." This created a concern for him with identifying fellow colleagues from similar circumstances.

The concerns that Dr. Blue expressed were related to her belief that the issues she faces will persist regardless of where she goes. Dr. Blue shared that "many of the behaviors of the colleagues are similar…Maybe, I would see slight changes, but overall…it's the same as I've experienced at regional and national conferences." The

negative aspects that Dr. Blue has faced are similar to the ones shared by Black faculty members in kinesiology programs. Black faculty in these programs were found to deal with "double standards, marginalization, and scholarship biases" (Burden, J., Harrison, L., & Hodge, S., 2005). Dr. Blue felt that these issues permeated the entirety of the agricultural education profession. Dr. Green also dealt with some of these negative aspects. When reflecting on his experiences within the profession he shared that he has been to feel he does not truly fit within the profession. He has been told that he "doesn't fit the mold that we're looking for," even though, based on his experience and accolades, he feels that he really meets any qualifications necessary.

Theme: Impact of the University

The theme of "impact of the university" and refers to participant's views beyond the department that can be attributed to the university. These views include factors related to invalidations by students on campuses and a lack of support by administrators. Due to Dr. Red's relatively short experience at his university, he felt unable to truly discuss any factors beyond the department and discipline. However, both Dr. Blue and Green were able to provide insight into the impact of the university on their experiences.

Invalidations by students were common in both Dr. Blue and Green's experience. They both felt that White students caused numerous issues within their lives. Dr. Green and Blue both had White students who would choose to go around them instead of having discussions with them about issues. For example, Dr. Blue shared that "many times, they have usurped my authority by going to talk to someone over my head." Dr. Green shared he would experience this with White students choosing to go to White professors to address issues within his classroom. The White administrators and fellow professors

would "enable the students to feel more empowered" according to Dr. Blue. This empowerment was not for good cause though. It was the empowerment to go around their Black professor to get what they want done or to address their concerns. Dr. Green expressed that this "causes rifts" when "White students don't come to you with their issues." He contrasted these experiences with White students to that of Black students.

When comparing Black and White students, Dr. Green felt that Black students were more likely to "come to you with questions and concerns, and sincere issues." He felt that only a small minority of White students would do the same. Dr. Green and Blue both faced issues with relation to the university setting. These issues had profound impact on their experiences, but that did not stop Dr. Green from thinking of ways to improve the university in the future.

Similar to Pittman (2012), who suggested that work was needed to improve the lives on Black faculty members on campuses, Dr. Green also felt this way. Dr. Green suggested ways to improve the community based on his own experiences. These ways included insuring that Black faculty members felt as if "we were hired based on our credentials, and our qualifications." He wanted to ensure that Black faculty members did not have to feel as if they were solely hired due to being Black. Dr. Green expressed that Black faculty members simply want "to be treated like everyone else." This aligns with Burden, Harrison, and Hodge's (2005) research that showed Black faculty members felt their White counterparts had a negative impact in the recruitment and retention of fellow Black faculty members. Dr. Green shared that for this improvement to occur it had to occur from the "national levels all the way down." He felt that it would take everyone to improve the experiences of Black faculty members.

Theme: Source of Mentorship

The theme, "source of mentorship," was found within all participants narratives. Within this theme we found that participants had to identify external sources for mentorship. Each participant described these external sources of mentorship as being the ones that helped them to succeed. For example, Dr. Red explained that he went outside of the department to find people that fit the "different parts of [his] identity." He explained that within agricultural education there were not enough people with "the same background and experiences." This experience was not unique to Dr. Red. Both Dr. Green and Blue found themselves searching for others outside of their departments that would provide them with mentorship and community. This experience of the research participants having to find mentoring elsewhere aligns with the literature.

Within Burden, Harrison, and Hodge's (2005) study, it was found that Black faculty faced issues with relation to faculty mentoring needs. Black faculty members were not finding the levels of mentorship and support that needed within the department. This is matched by Alexander and Moore's suggestion that Black faculty members would need to network more, seek mentors, and attend conference with fellow Black professionals to identify those communal resources that could improve their experiences (2008). Each of the participants within this study did exactly that to ensure their success. Dr. Blue found other Black female colleagues that shared her identity and was able to call upon them to share stories of her experiences. Dr. Red found mentors from outside the department that fit each area of his identity, so that he could find success. Dr. Green found support from individuals other institutions that could help him be successful.

Individual Themes Presented within the Narratives

The six previously covered themes all appeared within two or more participant's stories. However, there were two distinct themes that were presented in the individual narratives. Dr. Green and Dr. Blue both had additional themes appear during the data analysis process. These themes are unique to their experiences.

Through the data analysis I was able to identify the theme "source of self-value" within Dr. Green's narrative. This theme was profound within his experience. Dr. Green shared that his idea of self-worth was formed by "student success." While Dr. Green was affected by the minimization of his accolades and experience, it did not affect how he viewed true success. He felt that he was only truly a failure if his students did not succeed. In Dr. Green's words, "getting national awards here and there…doesn't mean a thing to me."

The data analysis also uncovered the theme "self-preservation" within Dr. Blue's experience. This theme focuses on the idea that measures need to be taken to remove possible distresses. The literature identifies some of these stresses to include mental, emotional, spiritual, and societal factors (Alexander and Moore, 2008). Each of these was present within Dr. Blue's experience. She had to learn ways to preserve her mental and emotional health. She purposely disengaged from her department to protect herself. She acknowledged that that decision may have had consequences on her professional life, but that it was the right choice for her "health, sanity, and the balances of my life." Dr. Blue found herself in an environment where she felt she had to do her job and "have discussions on a needs-only basis." The stresses she faced were harming her. She ultimately felt that "I have to protect myself through self-preservation."

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this narrative inquiry was to provide a voice for Black faculty members in agricultural education departments at predominantly White institutions. Through this study, we were able to explore the experiences of three of the Black faculty members. The narratives of these individuals showed that some aspects of their experiences are shared throughout the agricultural education and higher education in general. However, it also showed that some individual's experiences are not shared throughout the research participant group. The data collected through this study permitted the research questions to be addressed and suggestions to be made that could impact the experiences of Black faculty members and further research.

Addressing the Research Questions

The data analysis uncovered that the experiences of Black faculty members in agricultural education departments at PWIs reflected shared some similarities, but also many differences. By answering how the individual experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments compared to the tenants of SOC, we were also able to see how these experiences compare to one another. Five primary theme categories were explored that were derived from Klein and D'Aunno's (1986) foundation for Sense of Community at Work (SOC at Work). These five themes included; 1) "friendship network at work," 2) "functioning within the department," 3) "departmental experience as a whole," 4) "experiences across agricultural education," and 5) "impact of the university." It is important to note that these themes were established from the referents, or "anchor points," of SOC at Work. These were the things establish the sense of community that someone feels in the work place.

The findings of show that the experiences of Drs. Green and Blue have prevented them from forming a sense of community within their departments. Sense of community is a "feeling that members have belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together" (McMillian and Chavis, 1986, p.9) Klein and D'Aunno (1986) apply SOC directly to the work place by defining SOC at Work as being a "workers' sense of membership, participation, and identification with some work or work-related group" (p.366). Drs. Green and Blue shared experiences do not align with either of these definitions.

Dr. Blue and Dr. Green both expressed numerous negative connotations with respect to their sense of community. At times they both expressed that they did not truly feel as if they fit within the community. They faced isolation within their departments, exclusion from collaboration, and a lack of identification with the discipline of agricultural education. They both shared ways for their experiences to be improved, but due to the nature of their current experiences it can be determined that they did not have a strong sense of community as the time of data collection.

Contrastingly, Dr. Red's experience was primarily positive. Almost every level of SOC at Work and the original SOC were within Dr. Red's experience. He provided a narrative that shared a positive connection towards his department. The only constraint placed in Dr. Red's narrative was due to his short time at the institution and future expected changes within the department. However, up to the point of Dr. Red's current experience he acknowledged things were positive. Dr. Red was able to experience community, collaboration, and belonging within his department. It should be noted, that

Dr. Red did express some concerns related to his ethnic identity preventing him from finding others from similar backgrounds. However, this single area did not prevent Dr. Red from forming a general positive sense of community within his department.

Implications

The differences in experiences shown by the research participants show that it is not currently possible to say that Black faculty members within agricultural education at PWIs have a positive or negative sense of community. However, the findings do show that it is possible to examine the sense of community held by individual within the research population. Through this narrative inquiry, the voice of three Black faculty members has been explored and made available to others. Their voices allow for the following contributions to be further discussed.

Through this study, the identification of issues facing Black faculty members in agricultural education has been made possible. All three research participants acknowledged the issue of identifying with others within agricultural education from similar ethnic backgrounds. The research participants are the sole representatives of Black faculty members in agricultural education at their respective universities, and across the discipline of agricultural education there are only a limited number of other Black faculty members for these individuals to connect with. Alexander and Moore (2008) suggest that Black faculty members need to network more and attend conferences with other Black professionals to improve their experiences at PWIs. Together these two recommendations can help suggest that it may necessary to develop a network specifically meant to address the needs of Black professionals within the discipline. This network could be similar to other Black professional resource groups, including; the

National Association of Black Accountants (NABA), National Society of Black

Engineers (NSBE), Blacks in Government (BIG), or any number of other groups (Woog,

n.d.). Each of these groups serves as a tool for allowing Black professionals within a

specific discipline to connect with others. The creation of such a network for Black

faculty members within agricultural education may allow them to build an identity

connected with the discipline that doesn't seem to exist for them currently.

The findings of the study also show that the participants have had to find

mentorship from outside of their respect departments. Once again, this aligns with the

suggestions of Alexander and Moore (2008), who shared that Black faculty members

may have to seek mentors elsewhere. Each participant expressed that there was a lack of

mentorship throughout their experience within the department. This finding suggests that

agricultural education departments at PWIs need to ensure that their Black faculty

members are being provided with mentorship opportunities. While each participant was

able to identify sources of mentorship elsewhere, having a departmental mentor may

enhance the integration of a Black faculty member with the department. It would provide

them with the ability to gain knowledge and information on how the department

functions. It also provides them with the opportunity to build connections with someone

who actively participates within the community of the department. The findings of the

study continually also express how race, or ethnicity, has impacted the experience of the

Black faculty members.

The impact of racial identity has been addressed by research through Critical Race

Theory (CRT). This theory focuses on the experiential knowledge held by ethnic

minorities with regards to race and race relations (Aronson R., Brown-Jeffy S., Graham

L., & Stephens C., 2011; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). The Black faculty members within this study have reported how they felt their ethnicity impacted their ability to build community and progress within a discipline that is led by predominately White individuals. In both Drs. Green and Blue's experiences, situations were identified where they attributed their race to having specific impact on their experiences. In some situations, it was the power of White students to supersede their authority by going to White administrators. In other situations, it was blatantly acknowledged that they did not feel they had the power to change things. When questioned about improving the department, Dr. Green shared that "I don't think I have the power to make change. I can advise…I can suggest…I can recommend…," but ultimately felt that his suggestions had no power to change things. This feeling has also been shown in literature, where it has been determined that some Black faculty members feel their White counterparts hold the power. The intent of this research was to provide a voice for a minority group within a historically "White" faculty field. This has led to the possibility that the impact of ethnicity on the experiences of these Black faculty members can be further explored. CRT could provide a lens for the further examination of the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at PWIs. It should also be noted that the identity of the participant's doesn't end with race.

Each of the participants held multiple identities, some known and some unknown. Drs. Green, Red, and Blue are all Black faculty members within agricultural education. Drs. Green and Red are both male, and. Dr. Blue is a female. Dr. Red also identified as being from an urban area, and noted that prevented him from identifying with others. These identities beyond their Blackness may have impacted their experiences within the

department. This idea is known as intersectionality. The African American Policy Forum (AAPF) describes intersectionality as a concept that allows us to acknowledge that people can be vulnerable to various forms of bias due to their membership of multiple groups (AAPF, n.d.). This belonging to multiple identities is suggested to say that the exclusion or disadvantages faced by certain people can be based on "the interaction of multiple factors rather than just one" (AAPF, n.d., pp.3). Essentially, this means that other factors may have played an integral role in the experience of the Black faculty members that participated within this study. This study only had had an emphasis on the ethnicity of the faculty members. It may be important to also explore how their other identities may have impacted their experience.

Recommendations

The nature of narrative inquiry is such that data is not generalizable to the population at large; meaning certain aspects of the experiences of the Black faculty members included in this study may not be reflected in the experiences of others. However, through the voice of the Black faculty members within the study, multiple findings and implications were acknowledged as possible problem areas. Taking these into account, I believe the following recommendations can be made in relation to the experiences of Black faculty members in agricultural education departments at PWIs:

Possible new practices

1. I recommend that a new professional network for Black faculty members in the agricultural education discipline should be developed. Numerous other Black professional organizations have shown that Black professional groups can benefit their members. Membership of these organizations provides members with access

to a community of individuals who are more likely to share certain aspects of their identity with one another. These aspects may include ethnicity, demographical background (urban vs. rural), religious identity, and other areas. I believe that this network would provide a tool that allows Black faculty members to connect and build relationships with one another. This network could be established as part of an already developed agricultural educator group, so that Black faculty members could also work towards identifying with the entire discipline over time.

2. I believe that the establishment of departmental mentoring programs meant to specifically support minority faculty is needed. Each participant within the study expressed that they lacked mentorship from within the department. Ensuring that all Black faculty members, new and old, are connected with a co-faculty member within the department may assist with building their sense of community. Encouraging faculty members to build research or teaching partnerships with one another is one way to encourage Black faculty members to further engage and integrate within the department.

Future research objectives

1. Expanding the research population to include those who have formerly served in agricultural education departments at PWIs should be considered. Including these former faculty members would allow the possibility to increase the research population. At the time of data collection, an approximate total of 10 faculty members were found that currently work in agricultural education departments at PWIs. However, a number of faculty members had to be excluded from this list due to recent retirements or university transfers. I believe that these faculty

members are a valuable resource for further exploring the experiences of Black

faculty in agricultural education departments at PWIs. They may offer crucial

insights into the experience that could allow for deeper insights.

2. Participant criteria should be considered to only include those who have been at

the current institution for at least one academic year or that have prior experience

at a PWI that is greater than at least one academic year. Any less time may impact

participant's ability to speak to the idea of "community." Participants having

been in a position less than twelve months may not have had adequate time to

fully develop a "sense of community" amongst their peers.

3. Expansion of the interview protocol to involve more specific open-ended

questions with the aim of addressing areas that are crucial to sense of community.

These questions may focus on the aspects of SOC including; sense of belonging,

influence, fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connections. By directly

encouraging discussion of these areas, a greater understanding of the sense of

community held by participants may be seen.

4. Multiple interviews should be conducted with each research participant. By

adding additional interviews, we can permit the research participants to further

reflect on the conversations and their experiences.

5. Research should be expanded to further examine how identity plays a role in the

experiences of the Black faculty members. Further examining these through

critical race theory and intersectionality could lead to deeper understanding of the

impact of identity on the experiences of Black faculty members within

agricultural education departments at PWIs.

REFERENCES

African American Policy Forum. (n.d.). A primer on intersectionality. New York, NY: Columbia Law School

Alexander R., & Moore S., (2008). The benefits, challenges, and strategies of african american faculty teaching at predominantly white institutions. *Journal of African American Studies, 12(1),* 4-18. doi: 10.1007/s12111-007-9028-z

Allen W., Epps E., Guillory E., Suh S., Bonous-Hammarth M., (2000). The black academic: Faculty status African American in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Negro Education, 69(1/2),* 112-127. Retrieved from www.jounralnegroed.org

Anderson, J.A. (2002). Race in American higher education: Historical perspectives on current conditions. In W. A. Smith, P.G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (revised ed., pp.3-22). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Aronson R., Brown-Jeffy S., Graham L., & Stephens C., (2011). Critical Race Theory as Theoretical Framework and Analysis Tool for Population Health Research

The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, (2007). Black faculty in higher education: Still only a drop in the bucket. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 55,* 67. Retrieved from http://www.jbhe.com/

Barrick, K., (1998). *The Discipline Called Agricultural Education*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Agricultural Education Department, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Baum E., Gerald D., Milem J., & Perna L., (2007). The status of equity for black faculty and administrators in public higher education in the south. *Research in Higher Education, 48(2)*. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9041-4

Branch, A.J. (2001). Redefining and refining scholarship for the academy. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Retaining African Americans in higher education* (pp.-175-192). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Brodsky, A., Marx, C., (2001). Layers of identity: Multiple psychological senses of community with a community setting. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29(2),* 161-178.

Burden, J., Harrison L., & Hodge S., (2005). Perceptions of African American faculty in kinesiology-based programs at predominantly White American institutions of higher education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 72(2),* 224-237. doi:10.1080/02701367.2005.10599283

Clandinin, D. J. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Darden J., Kamel S., & Jacobs A., (1998). Black faculty in predominantly white institutions of higher education: The influence of black student enrollment. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 31(2),* 6-18. doi: 10.1080/1066568980310202

Delgado, R., and Stefanic J., (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY. New York University Press.

Flaherty, C., (2016). More faculty diversity, not on tenure track. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/09/22/study-finds-gains-faculty-diversity-not-tenure-track

Guest, G., Mack, N., MacQueen, K. M., Namey, E., & Woodsong, C. (2005). Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide. Retrieved from http://www.fhi360.org

Jason, L., Stevens, E., and Ram, D., (2015). Development of a three-factor psychological sense of community scale. *Journal of Community Psychology, 43(8),* 973-985. doi:10.10002/jcop.21726

Klein, J., D'Aunno, T., (1986). Psychological sense of community in the workplace. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14(4),* 365-377. doi: 10.10002/1520-66629

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Mannarini, T., Fedi, A., (2009). Multiple senses of community: The experience and meaning of community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 31(2),* 211-227. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20289

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McMillan, D., Chavis, D., (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14,* 6-23. doi: 10.10002/1520-66629

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Association of Agricultural Educators (n.d.). Find a college: Find a school. Retrieved from www.naae.org/teachag/college.cfm

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Full-time instructional faculty in degree granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2003, fall 2005, and fall 2007.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_250.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *Full-time instructional faculty in degree granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2009, fall 2011, and fall 2013.* Retrieved from, http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_315.20.asp

Niemann*, Y. F. (2003).* The psychology of tokenism: Psychosocial reality of faculty of color. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial and ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 100– 188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Novick, G., (2008). Is there a bias against telephone interviews in qualitative research? *Res Nurs Health, 31(4),* (391-398). doi:10.1002/nur.20259

O'Connor, E., Longman, H., White, K., Obst, P., (2015). Sense of community, social identity, and social support among players of massively multiplayer online games (MMOGS): A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 25,* (459-473). doi:10.1002/casp.2224

One explanation for the low representation of black faculty in higher education. (2003). *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, (42),* 27-29. doi:10.2307/3592424

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.).* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Permut, M., (2016). Psychological sense of community as an example of prefiguration among occupy protesters. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 2016, Vol. 4(1),* 180–195, doi:10.5964/jspp.v4i1.533

Pittman C., (2012). Racial microaggressions: The narratives of african american faculty at a predominantly white university. *The Journal of Negro Education, 81(1),* 82-92. Retrieved from http://www.journalnegroed.org/

Rev. (n.d.). Retrieved February 15, 2018, from https://www.rev.com/transcription/faq

Riessman, C. K. (2008). Narrative methods for the human sciences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scheurich, J. J., & Young, M.D. (2002) White racism among White faculty. In W.A. Smith, P.G. Altbach, & K. Lomotey (eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (revised ed., pp.221-242). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seidman, I. (2013). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education & the social sciences. New York, NY: Teachers College Press

van Manen, M. (1990). Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. London, ON, Canada: Althouse Press.

Woog, D., (n.d). Top 21 African American professional groups. Retrieved from https://www.monster.com/career-advice/article/african-american-networking-groups

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROMPT

- Hello, (insert name), I would like first thank you for agreeing to allow me to interview you today. However before we begin, I would like to read over and confirm your signatures on the Informed Consent forms. (Reads over information)
- If you have no further comments, questions, or concerns I will begin recording now.

Main Question	Additional Questions	Clarifying Questions
• What has your professional experience been as a Black faculty member within your department? • How would you describe your community within the department? • How would you describe your relationships with your co-faculty members?	• Why (Why not) do you believe this? • How do you explain that problem/success? • How does that impact you personally? • How has that impacted you professionally?	• Can you expand a little on this? • Can you tell me anything else? • Do you have an example? • When did this occur?

- Thank you for your time today, I will be in contact you soon to request your review of the transcript. This will provide you with the opportunity to correct anything, before I proceed into the final stages of research analysis. You will also be asked to sign a final consent form for the use of the interview within this research.
- Do you have any final comments, concerns, or questions, before I end this recording? If not, thank you for your time. I look forward to talking to you soon.

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM FOR:

Experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at

predominantly White institutions

This form describes a research project. It has information to help you decide whether or

not you wish to participate. Research studies include only people who choose to take

part—your participation is completely voluntary. Please discuss any questions you have

about the study or about this form with the project staff before deciding to participate.

Who is conducting this study?

This study is being conducted by Zachary C. Brown, principal investigator, under the

supervision of Dr. Theressa Cooper, co-major professor, and Dr. Michael Retallick, co-

major professor.

Why am I invited to participate in this study?

You are being asked to take part in this study because you are a African American/Black

faculty member working within an agricultural education department at a predominantly

White institution. You should not participate if you do not identify as African

American/Black, if you no longer work within an agricultural education department, or if

you do not work within a predominantly White institution.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into how Black faculty members perceive

their community of practice while working within agricultural education departments at

predominantly White institutions.

What will I be asked to do?

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to participate in a two hour maximum phone interview where you will be asked questions regarding your experiences within your department. You will then be asked to review the transcriptions of your interview for accuracy. If you request any changes or wish to expand on anything from the first interview, you may be asked to complete a second two hour maximum interview. If you request no changes, your participation in this research project will end once you have submitted the Final Consent Form permitting the use of your initial interview transcript for this research project. Should the second interview occur, you will also have the opportunity to review the transcript of that interview. You will also be asked to sign a Final Consent Form permitting the use of your second interview transcript for this research project.

Your participation will last for no more than two two-hour interviews, and the time that it takes you to review your interview transcripts and sign the consent forms for the research project. The estimated time for this process to be completed will be over one to three months. The topic of the interview(s) will be focused on your experiences working within your agricultural education department at your university. You will asked to provide an account of your experiences.

What are the possible risks or discomforts and benefits of my participation?

Risks or Discomforts—The foreseeable risks or discomforts related to your participation in this research are psychological reaction to questions, embarrassment from answering sensitive questions during an interview, and discomfort with the topic of the interview. Also, your anonymity will be at risk. While we will protect your confidentiality to the extent possible by following the steps outlined below; however, we cannot guarantee that

others, we cannot guarantee that others will not be able to infer who you are through the stories that you tell. This is largely in part due to the total size of the population of Black faculty members within agricultural education at Predominantly White Institutions. To protect your identity will provide all identifiable information told through your interview transcripts with pseudonyms or report the data using general terms. The type of information that may be given a pseudonyms or reported using general terms includes, but is not limited to: names, universities, department names, position titles, cities, landmarks, class names, third party names, etc.

Benefits—You will not receive any direct benefit from taking part in this study. We hope that this research will benefit society by providing a voice for the experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education, and help to expand research that focuses on the experiences of people of color working within agriculture.

How will the information I provide be used?

The information you provide will serve as the primary and sole tool for data collection and analysis. We will examine your story and compare it with other Black faculty members to identify any shared or different experiences. Furthermore, your information will be used to complete a master's thesis that satisfies the terms of Iowa State's graduate program in agricultural education. The thesis may also be turned into research articles for publication.

What measures will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the data or to protect my privacy?

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by applicable laws and regulations. Records will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University,

and the ISU Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies with human subjects) may inspect and/or copy study records for quality assurance and analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken:

- Upon the completion of transcription of your interviews, any and all identifiers will be given pseudonyms and any other potentially identifying information will be described generally when results are shared. These pseudonyms will be placed onto a separate document that will be a password protected file that is uploaded to a secure storage website hosted by Iowa State. Electronic data (e.g., audio recordings of interviews, transcripts of the interview, etc.) will be stored in Cybox, Iowa State University's secure cloud based storage system. Physical copies of study will be stored in locked file cabinets. These documents and files will be saved for approximately three years, per federal regulations. Access will be only granted to the principal investigator and supervising faculty members.

Will I incur any costs from participating or will I be compensated?

You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

What are my rights as a human research participant?

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study or to stop participating at any time, for any reason, without penalty or negative consequences. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

If you have any questions *about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury*, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115.

Whom can I call if I have questions about the study?

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information, please contact Zachary C. Brown, zcbrown@iastate.edu, (832) 675-1382 or Dr. Theressa Cooper, tncooper@iastate.edu, (515) 294-8574.

Consent and Authorization Provisions

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the written informed consent prior to your participation in the study.

Participant's Name (printed) _____

_____   _____
Participant's Signature   **Date**

APPENDIX C

FINAL CONSENT FORM

Perceptions of Black Faculty Members

Dear Participant:

This form gives us final consent to use material from your interview in "Perceptions of Black Faculty Members". A draft of these materials should have been presented to you for your review, correction, or modification. You may grant us rights for this draft "as is," or with the modifications you specify, if any. See "Conditions" at the bottom of the form.

I, _____, hereby award the right to use information from recordings and or notes taken in interviews of me, to Zachary C. Brown, and as offered to me as a draft copy. I understand that the interview archives will be kept by the interviewer and the researcher, and that the information contained in the interviews may be used in materials that may be made available to the public.

The following conditions limit the release of information, as agreed between the interviewer and the interviewee:

_____ None needed

_____ Material may be released once corrections I specified have been made. (Please attach any corrections to this form).

_____ Date:

_____

Signature of Interviewee

_____ Date:

_____

Signature of Interviewer

APPENDIX D

Research Letter of Invitation

Title of Study: Experiences of Black faculty members within
agricultural education departments at predominantly White institutions
Principal Investigator: Zachary C. Brown, Principal Investigator, Department of
Agricultural Education, Iowa State University
Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Theressa Cooper, Major Professor, Assistant Dean for
Diversity, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Iowa State University

I, Zachary C. Brown, Master's student, from the Department of Agricultural
Education, Iowa State University, invite you to participate in a research project entitled
"Experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at
predominantly White institutions."

The purpose of this research project is to gain insight into the perceptions of
Black faculty members in agricultural education departments at Predominantly White
Institutions. Specifically, the study will examine your professional experiences within
your community of practice. Should you choose to participate, you will be asked to
participate in no more than two, two-hour phone interviews. You will be provided with
the opportunity to review the transcript of the first interview to approve and/or correct
any of the content within the transcript. The second interview will only occur for one of
two reasons; (1) You feel the need to change or expand on anything from the first
interview, or (2) further discussion is needed for topics not covered in the first interview.
Should the second interview occur, you will also have the opportunity to review the
transcript of that interview.

The expected duration of the project is between one-to-three months, through no
more than two recorded phone interviews that will not exceed two hours in length. You
will also be asked to review the transcripts from the interviews during this time.
We believe that this research should provide help begin to fill a general research gap
related to the experiences of Black faculty members in agriculture at the higher education
level. We also hope that this research will encourage larger studies that further examine
issues related to this topic.

If you have any questions about the rights of research participants or a research-
related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, 2420 Lincoln Way, Suite 202, (515)
294-4566, irb@iastate.edu; or Director, Office for Responsible Research, 2420 Lincoln
Way, Suite 202, (515) 294-3115.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me (see below for contact
information).

Thank you

APPENDIX E

IRB Approval

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Date:	10/20/2017		
To:	Zachary Clayton Brown	CC:	Dr. Theressa Cooper
	▬▬▬▬▬		▬▬▬▬▬
			Dr. Michael Retallick
			▬▬▬▬▬
From:	Office for Responsible Research		
Title:	Experiences of Black faculty members within agricultural education departments at predominantly White institutions		
IRB ID:	17-490		

Approval Date:	10/17/2017	Date for Continuing Review:	10/16/2019
Submission Type:	New	Review Type:	Full Committee

The project referenced above has received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University according to the dates shown above. Please refer to the IRB ID number shown above in all correspondence regarding this study.

To ensure compliance with federal regulations (45 CFR 46 & 21 CFR 56), please be sure to:

- **Use only the approved study materials in your research, including the recruitment materials and informed consent documents that have the IRB approval stamp.**

- **Retain signed informed consent documents for 3 years after the close of the study**, when documented consent is required.

- **Obtain IRB approval prior to implementing <u>any</u> changes** to the study by submitting a Modification Form for Non-Exempt Research or Amendment for Personnel Changes form, as necessary.

- **Immediately inform the IRB of** (1) all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences involving risks to subjects or others; and (2) any other unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

- **Stop all research activity if IRB approval lapses**, unless continuation is necessary to prevent harm to research participants. Research activity can resume once IRB approval is reestablished.

- **Complete a new continuing review form at least three to four weeks prior to the date for continuing review** as noted above to provide sufficient time for the IRB to review and approve continuation of the study. We will send a courtesy reminder as this date approaches.

Please be aware that IRB approval means that you have met the requirements of federal regulations and ISU policies governing human subjects research. **Approval from other entities may also be needed.** For example, access to data from private records (e.g. student, medical, or employment records, etc.) that are protected by FERPA, HIPAA, or other confidentiality policies requires permission from the holders of those records. Similarly, for research conducted in institutions other than ISU (e.g., schools, other colleges or universities, medical facilities, companies, etc.), investigators must obtain permission from the institution(s) as required by their policies. **IRB approval in no way implies or guarantees that permission from these other entities will be granted.**

Upon completion of the project, please submit a Project Closure Form to the Office for Responsible Research, 202 Kingland, to officially close the project.