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ABSTRACT

This study contributed to the body of knowledge dealing with recruitment, retention and socialization of underrepresented (UREP) minority populations for academic leadership positions in West Virginia higher education. The purpose of the study was to examine both the institutional and personal factors that are most effective in attracting members of UREP minority groups to administrative leadership positions at institutions of higher education, specifically higher education institutions in West Virginia. The study was conducted using a mixed method research approach consisting of a non-experimental research design in the quantitative phase of the study and individual interviews in the qualitative phase.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Chapter One provides an overview of the recruitment, retention and socialization challenges faced by institutions of higher education and potential solutions to address the identified challenges. The chapter defines the problem statement and the significant terms for the study. This chapter also identifies the purpose of the study and the limitations of the study. The chapter identifies the research questions addressed by this study and the significance of the completed study.

Overview of the Issue

One of the challenges facing higher education is the ability to recruit and retain a diversified workforce and student body. Contemporary literature addresses major societal concerns about anticipated dilemmas concerning workforce shortages and the ability to meet the needs with members of underrepresented minority populations. As an increasing number of administrative leadership opportunities become available in higher education, the demand for qualified underrepresented minority applicants continues to increase and often exceeds the number of qualified applicants. As a result, institutions of higher education continue to work on the development and implementation of effective recruitment strategies to address the demands of creating a quality workforce. However, in order to develop effective recruitment strategies to address workforce needs, current higher education leadership must understand the factors and rewards that motivate and attract underrepresented minorities to pursue administrative leadership positions.

The current minority population accounts for 30 percent of the total population in the United States, and it is predicted that the minority population will exceed 50 percent of the total
population in the United States by 2050 (United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). It is expected that by 2050, the United States population will be 23 percent Hispanic, 15 percent Black, and 10 percent Asian or Other, the latter category including Asians/Pacific Islanders and American Indians/Alaskan Natives (Toossi, 2002). Currently, 25 percent of American children under the age of five are Hispanic; by 2050, that percentage is expected to increase to approximately 40 percent. Furthermore, this demographic change is affecting the landscape of higher education in America. In a thirty-five year period from 1976 to 2011, the percentage of Hispanic students attending college increased from 2 percent to 6 percent and the percentage of Black students attending college increased from 10 percent to 15 percent. During this same period, the number of White students attending college decreased from 84 percent to 61 percent (United State Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Additionally, from 1999-2000 to 2009-2010, the number of academic degrees earned by members of underrepresented populations also increased. The number of associate degrees earned by Hispanic students during this timeframe increased by 118 percent, and for Black students the increase was 89 percent. When the percentage increase in the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded was examined, the increase was 87 percent for Hispanic students and 53 percent for Black students. Finally, the number of graduate degrees earned by Hispanic students increased by 125 percent for master’s degrees and 60 percent for doctor’s degrees awarded. The number also increased for Black students by 109 percent for master’s degrees and 47 percent for doctor’s degrees (United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). The changing demographics of the 21st century and the increase in degrees earned will result in a workforce that looks drastically different from the workforce of today. Institutions of higher education will play an important role in preparing individuals to live
and work in a more diverse society. In fact, the American Council on Education’s *Minorities in Higher Education: Seventeenth Annual Status Report* included the following reasons institutions of higher education will lead the charge for diversity:

Many colleges and universities share a common belief, born of experience, that diversity in their student bodies, faculties, and staff is important for them to fulfill their primary mission: providing quality education. The public is entitled to know why these institutions believe so strongly that racial and ethnic diversity should be one factor among the many considered in admissions and hiring.

- It enriches the educational experience. We learn from those whose experiences, beliefs, and perspectives are different from our own, and these lessons can be taught best in a richly diverse intellectual and social environment.

- It promotes personal growth and a healthy society. Diversity challenges stereotyped preconceptions; it encourages critical thinking; and it helps students learn to communicate effectively with people of varied backgrounds.

- It strengthens communities and the workplace. Education within a diverse setting prepares students to become good citizens in an increasingly complex pluralistic society; it fosters mutual respect and teamwork; and it helps build communities whose members are judged by the quality of their character and their contributions.

- It enhances America’s economic competitiveness. Sustaining the nation’s prosperity in the 21st century will require us to make effective use of the talents and abilities of all our citizens, in work settings that bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures. (American Council on Education, 2000, p.39)

Yet even as the United States’ demographics change, colleges and universities continue to struggle to increase diversity on their campuses. While many colleges and universities believe strongly in the importance of racial and ethnic campus diversity, there have been legal disputes that both support and challenge the constitutional legitimacy and role of diversity in education. *Brown v. Board of Education* is the well-known 1954 Supreme Court Case that many view as the start of a mandate in the United States for equal opportunity in education for all of its citizens. The years that followed this landmark decision ushered in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that established protection from employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or
national origin. To further support these actions, executive orders were instituted to promote actions that achieve non-discrimination through affirmative action programs designed to address past inequalities. Executive Order No. 10925 (1961), issued by President John F. Kennedy in 1961, established the President’s Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and required the federal government and all government contractors to take affirmative action in hiring practices to prevent discrimination based on race, creed, color and national origin. President Lyndon B. Johnson issued Executive Order No. 11246 (1965) in 1965, which divided the committee’s functions between the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. These actions set legal precedence in the United States, which allowed for the creation of programs and initiatives to target the recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups into the educational system.

Regents of the University of California v. Bakke (1978) was a landmark decision of the United States Supreme Court that upheld affirmative action and allowed race to be used as one of several factors in the college admission process. The opinion penned by Justice Powell in this case found “diversity in the classroom to be a compelling state interest,” (p. 287) and concluded that affirmation action was constitutional and allowed under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, many of the more recent rulings by the United States Supreme Court and U.S. Court of Appeals have changed the views on affirmative action. These rulings have also changed legal precedent on the creation and implementation of programs to recruit and retain members of underrepresented minority populations in America’s system of higher education. Probably the most notable cases for minorities aspiring to higher education leadership are recent rulings on the University of Michigan cases. The 2003 Supreme Court case Gratz v. Bollinger challenged the University of Michigan undergraduate affirmative action admissions policy. The University of
Michigan’s policy was based on a 150-point scale, which required students to receive a minimum of 100 points to be granted admission. The University used race as a factor in making admissions decision because “it serves a compelling interest in achieving diversity among its student body” (Gratz v. Bollinger, 2003). The Supreme Court ruled in Gratz v. Bollinger that the point system used by the University of Michigan for undergraduate admission was unconstitutional. However, in the case Grutter v. Bollinger, also decided in 2003, the Court ruled in favor of the University of Michigan law school’s use of race in its admission policy. The Justices held that the race-conscious system used by the University of Michigan Law School may favor members of underrepresented minority groups, but it evaluates many factors on an individualized basis and does not constitute a quota system, which would have been unconstitutional under the Bakke ruling. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated in her concurring opinion for Grutter v. Bollinger that, “From today’s vantage point, one may hope, but not firmly forecast, that over the next generation’s span, progress toward nondiscrimination and genuinely equal opportunity will make it safe to sunset affirmative action” (p. 3). Justice Sandra Day O’Connor delivered the opinion of the Court for Grutter v. Bollinger, which included the belief that “twenty-five years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary” (p. 31). In fact, the Grutter opinion recognized the importance of diversity in the training of the nation’s leaders, when Justice O’Conner penned the following statement on leadership, “In order to cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry, it is necessary that the path to leadership be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity” (p. 20).

With this in mind, the issue of cultivating new leaders from every race and ethnicity is a growing concern as the minority population in American society increases. However, the opinion
written by Justice O'Connor concludes that higher education will no longer need institutional initiatives designed to increase diversity. In fact, based on the *Grutter* opinion, it can be inferred that diversity will be instrumental in changing the institutional structure of higher education and creating a society more inclusive of diverse populations.

Until predominantly white institutions (PWIs) began to participate in the desegregation process in the mid-1960s, minority-serving institutions were not only the primary institutions educating minority populations, but they were often the only institutions affording minorities the opportunity to pursue higher education. At the start of desegregation nearly 100 percent of black students attended Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), but by 1973 three-fourths of black college students attended PWIs. Yet even with the increased enrollment of Black students at PWIs, initially HBCUs still graduated a disproportionately higher number of black students in comparison (Allen, 1992). Now, 80 percent of all black college students are enrolled in PWIs and 75 percent of all degrees earned by black students are conferred at these same predominantly white institutions (American Council on Education, 2000).

As the number of underrepresented minorities enrolling in and graduating from higher education institutions grows, many colleges and universities are beginning to focus on creating a more diverse pool of highly qualified students prepared to assume leadership roles in institutions of higher education. However, diversity is often a term that creates confusion instead of clarity, because so many individuals use the term without any conceptual meaning. For some, diversity is a physical difference such as sex, race and ethnicity, while for others diversity signifies personal identity and cultural awareness. This lack of definition often creates situations in which diversity is neither collectively celebrated nor naturally occurring within the workplace (Neault and Mondair, 2011). In fact, Neault and Mondair point out that in order to support workplace
diversity, more organizations are finding it increasingly important to focus on recruitment, retention and socialization of underrepresented (UREP) minorities hired to fill key positions.

In 2005, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future* was released by the National Academy of Sciences with a clarion call to increase our focus on the development of a highly skilled workforce capable of competing in the global market place. As a result, President George W. Bush announced the *American Competitiveness Initiative: Leading the World in Innovation* in 2006 that also focused on maintaining the United States’ competitiveness in a global economy. Even though many of the proposed initiatives are focused on science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), both documents emphasize the need for a more globally competitive and culturally diverse workforce. Consequently, the concept of equal opportunity as outlined in *Brown v. Board of Education* represents the historical foundation for the programs designed to support increased diversity in the workplace.

**Problem Statement**

West Virginia is not known for diversity of population, but even in West Virginia, the non-Hispanic white population is declining as part of the total number of statewide graduates. In addition, the latest census data shows that West Virginia suffered a 13 percent decline in population between July 2012 and July 2013, making the state one of only two to suffer a decrease in population. Furthermore, most higher education institutions seek individuals with postsecondary degrees to assume the roles and responsibilities of administrative leadership positions, but West Virginia ranks 50th and 48th respectively in the nation for bachelors and advanced degree attainment (United States Census Bureau, 2011). In fact, experts from the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce predict that by the year 2018
approximately 49 percent of all jobs in the state of West Virginia will require a postsecondary education. While 38.7 percent of Americans between the ages of 25-65 have a two- or four-year college degree, only 27.8 percent of West Virginians have a two- or four-year degree. For this reason, the Center on Education and the Workforce projections will require West Virginia to generate 20,000 additional graduates by the year 2018 to fill projected workforce demands (Carnevale, Smith, and Strohl, 2010). With these increasing demands and changing national and state demographics, West Virginia must position itself to meet these demands to maintain the strength of the state’s higher educational system. Therefore, the state must position itself to be prepared to recruit and retain an increasing number of highly qualified members of underrepresented minority populations to meet its educational demands. With an increasing national focus on diversity in higher education, the urgency to recruit underrepresented minorities is also increasing, which means the most successful institutions will be those with effective recruitment and retention strategies in place.

Several studies have focused on improving recruitment practices in higher education, but few focus specifically on the personal and professional factors that influence underrepresented minorities to pursue and accept administrative leadership positions in higher education. Consequently, individuals that currently hold administrative leadership positions in higher education and those tasked with serving on hiring committees for these leadership positions must understand their potential colleagues’ personal and professional interests. The recruitment strategies must take into account the decision-making processes used by underrepresented minorities as they plot out their course toward identifying and obtaining potential administrative leadership roles. Therefore, there needs to be more focus specifically on administrative leadership roles.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to assist higher education institutions, specifically those in West Virginia, with identifying what types of recruitment and retention, leadership development, mentoring and socialization strategies are most effective in meeting both the institutional and personal needs of underrepresented (UREP) minority populations when seeking to fill administrative leadership positions at institutions of higher education. The information derived from the study will be used to assist institutions of higher education with developing and maintaining effective recruitment, retention and socialization strategies to diversify administrative leadership roles at their institutions.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were established:

1. Administrative Leadership Position: A leadership position at an institution of higher education that includes, but is not limited to President, Provost, Vice President, Dean, Chair and/or Executive Director.
2. Affirmative Action: Positive steps taken to increase the representation of women and minorities in areas of employment, education, and business from which they have been historically excluded (Fullinwider, 2005).
3. American Indian or Alaska Native: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community attachment (United States Department of Education, 2007).
4. Asian: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent. This area includes, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan,
Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam (United States Department of Education, 2007).

5. Black or African American: A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa (United States Department of Education, 2007).

6. Diversity:
   The concept of diversity encompasses acceptance and respect. It means understanding that each individual is unique, and recognizing our individual differences. These can be along the dimensions of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, age, physical abilities, religious beliefs, political beliefs, or other ideologies. It is the exploration of these differences in a safe, positive, and nurturing environment. It is about understanding each other and moving beyond simple tolerance to embracing and celebrating the rich dimensions of diversity contained within each individual (Associated Students of The University of Oregon, Diversity Initiatives, 1999).

7. Hispanic or Latino: A person who traces his or her origin or descent to Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Central and South America, and other Spanish cultures, regardless of race (United States Department of Education, 2007).

8. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands (United States Department of Education, 2007).


10. Non-native: A person born and raised outside of the state of West Virginia (Merriam-Webster, 2013).

11. Socialization: A continuing process whereby an individual acquires a personal identity and learns the norms, values, behaviors and social skills appropriate to his or her social position (Dictionary.com, 2015).
12. Underrepresented Minority: Refers to any person belonging to one or more of the following racial and/or ethnic groups – Hispanic or Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Black or African American, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.

13. White: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa (United States Department of Education, 2007).

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the recruitment of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education?

- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the retention of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?

- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the socialization of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?

Limitations

The research study is restricted because the small number of underrepresented minority population members belonging to the target population. The sample size is a result of the study’s focus on members of underrepresented minority populations serving at higher education institutions located in the state of West Virginia. The study is also confined to higher education institutions governed by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, the Community and Technical College System of West Virginia, and the West Virginia Independent
Colleges and Universities. In addition, the study is limited because of the sample population all serve in administrative leadership positions, which create time restraints and restrict availability of the members of the sample population to participate in the study.

**Significance of the Study**

The review of the literature reflects a lack of available research studies that focus strictly on what factors motivate and attract underrepresented minorities to administrative leadership positions. This research study seeks to identify the most effective strategies and significant factors concerning the issues of recruitment, retention, and socialization of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education. The information derived as part of this study will assist current and future higher education leadership in accurately determining the influences and factors that positively affect their ability to attract highly qualified UREP minority applicants to administrative leadership positions at their institutions.

**Summary**

This chapter provided a brief overview of the changing demographics in the United States, and how these changes created the need for more diversity in higher education leadership positions. In addition, the chapter provided a review of significant legal proceedings, legislation and executive orders that both supported and challenged an increase in diversity at educational institutions. The chapter provided a problem statement, purpose, definition of terms and significance. A review of the literature related to this study is presented in chapter two.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the literature relevant to research that identifies the factors that contribute to recruiting UREP minorities in administrative leadership positions in higher education. The literature review focuses on the issues important to this research: (a) recruitment, (b) retention, (c) mentoring and (d) socialization. The purpose of this literature review is to document current research that establishes best practices for the recruitment and retention of UREP minorities in higher education, and the significance of socialization in the process.

Recruitment and Retention

The creation of a diverse campus environment is more than diversity training, courses on multiculturalism and special programs. A diverse campus environment begins with the restructuring of institutions and providing all constituencies with opportunities to participate and expand upon current academic offerings at the institution. It also includes making issues such as citizenship, social responsibility and democratic participation central to the campus experience. It must also include a diverse student body and a diverse faculty and staff. According to Turner and Myers (2000), a diverse faculty population enhances the educational quality for all students, not just minority students. Increased diversity at higher education institutions is driven by strong leadership, including a campus-wide commitment to expanding the university community. Additionally, in a 2005 article by Kayes and Singley, Lee C. Bollinger, president of Columbia University, stated that “building a diverse university community” is crucial to the successful recruitment, retention and hiring of faculty and staff of color.
The college president is the major communicator of campus visions, goals and objectives. Therefore, if strong leadership drives the creation of a multicultural campus, then strong presidential leadership is crucial to this outcome. Hood, Miller and Pope (1999) conducted a study of 96 college presidents. One of the outcomes of the study was the identification of the presidents’ perceptions of their major duties in the presidential role. The study found that the presidents viewed maintaining high quality faculty and encouraging the growth and development of administrators, faculty and staff as major job responsibilities. They also saw themselves as responsible for the identification and development of leadership potential from among faculty and staff. In addition, the study concluded that the president is vital to the development of large-scale institutional programs, which include minority administrator and faculty recruitment programs (Hood, Miller and Pope, 1999).

Some institutional programs are focused on and credited with developing UREP minority talent and with increasing the minority leadership pool, but there is still much work to be done. In 1996, Piland and Silva conducted a national survey of 220 community colleges to investigate the following: the incorporation of multicultural curricula and staff development activities, the perceived barriers to diversification, and plans for multicultural programs. Because of their study, Piland and Silva found that colleges offer these opportunities, but members of the campus community do not participate on a large scale. Thus, the findings of this study suggests that many colleges attempt to educate their campus communities on the benefits of a multicultural campus community, but they are often ineffective and unsuccessful.

However, some schools have been more successful than others have in increasing campus diversity and creating multicultural campuses. In a 1996 study completed by Muller, it was concluded that urban community colleges represented a model for matching faculty and
administrator diversity to students. While, the study did concede that the level of professional applicants from UREP minority groups is much greater in the urban setting, the findings of the study are significant to higher education institutions committed to creating diversity in campus leadership. Muller believed that community colleges were critical in educating students from under-served populations, which is crucial to the development of leadership in UREP minorities. Probably the most important insight gained from Muller’s study was the fact that diversity in leadership does not happen by chance. Colleges that are successful in creating sustained minority leadership within their campus community have institutional leadership committed to the process.

In the Hood, Miller and Pope study, it was discovered that college presidents felt that one of the principle job responsibilities of the president was to identify leadership potential in existing faculty and staff. Based on this study, the assumption is that the candidate pool for minority administrators is closely based on the number of UREP minority faculty and staff on the college campus. For this reason, another means of creating more diversity in campus leadership is to examine how colleges and universities recruit UREP minority faculty. There have been several studies conducted on diversity and faculty recruitment, and most researchers agree that higher education institutions need to increase the representation of minority faculty within their ranks (Kayes and Singley, 2005; Quezada and Louque, 2004; Turner and Myers, 2000). The researchers also agreed that those involved in the search and hiring process need professional development and training prior to participating in the process. This claim is further supported by Caroline Turner in her text, Diversifying the Faculty: A Guidebook for Search Committees (2002), which asserts that the recruitment of a diverse faculty is one of the least successful endeavors of colleges and universities in their commitment to diversity.
In further research, Umbach (2006) examined the impact of faculty of color on undergraduate education using data from his national study of 13,499 faculty members at 134 college and universities across the nation. The study was based on four composites designed to represent pedagogy and engagement of students in educational practices linked to increased student learning. Umbach found that faculty of color provide two important contributions to undergraduate education. The first contribution is that faculty of color employ a broader range of pedagogical techniques and interacts more frequently with students than their White counterparts. For this indicator, the study results show that there was only one dependent variable on which minority faculty did not outscore their white counterparts. The second contribution is that campuses with more diverse faculty have an increased use of effective educational practices. For this indicator, Umbach found that the greater the diversity, the higher the levels of faculty involvement in higher order cognitive and diversity related activities.

Furthermore, in Kow’s (2010) study, *The (Un)compelling Interest for Underrepresented Minority Students: Enhancing the Education of White Students Underexposed to Racial Diversity*, he found that the benefits of a diverse campus environment were greater for White students than UREP minority students. Kow found that many studies often overstate the positive benefits for UREP minority students because these students are more aware and very familiar with the accomplishments of successful members of UREP minority populations. However, White students, who had been underexposed to racial diversity, “benefited in both learning and democracy outcomes with an increase in racial diversity experiences, in and out of the classroom” (Kow, 2010). Even Eckes’ (2005) study noted that the presence of a diverse faculty could enhance the learning opportunities for white students, although there are very few research studies to support these claims.
In 2005, Eckes conducted a study to examine U.S. Supreme Court rulings regarding the consideration of race in university hiring practices. Eckes’ study focused specifically on faculty hiring – the criterion used to achieve diversity among faculty, the reasons identified for the use of race-conscious affirmative action programs, and the significance of faculty diversity. In the past, affirmative action plans were established to remedy the effects of past discriminatory practices at higher education institutions, however, Eskes’ study explored the effect of *Grutter* (2003) and *Gratz* (2003) on higher education institutions’ sustained use of affirmative action programs to reap the educational benefits of diversity. Eskes utilized the faculty role model theory, which views faculty as important role models in the lives of their students. A role model can be defined as a person whose behavior, example, or success is or can be emulated by others, especially younger people (Dictionary.com, 2015).

By utilizing the faculty role model theory, Eskes contended that the campus community would include UREP minority faculty members who are in positions of power and status within and outside of the institution. Therefore, when students from UREP populations see faculty from these same populations succeed, it validates the students’ beliefs that they are able to succeed. The UREP faculty are also able to serve as mentors of the minority students and support minority related research activities and other non-traditional scholarship activities. Moreover, Eskes’ (2005) study suggests that the presence of minority faculty tends to make students of color feel that they are welcome at the institution, and White students who do not have regular contact with UREP populations benefit through increased cultural awareness.

Additional studies focused on diversity in education across the United States, including the 1999 study by Hon, Weigold and Chance, and the 2000 study by Smith and Schofield. Hon, Weigold, and Chance examined the administrator’s role in resolving diversity issues such as
race, ethnicity and gender, as well as the faculty’s perceptions on diversity issues. Hon, Weigold and Chance found that most of the faculty involved in their study believed that diversity had little or no impact on their professional life. However, the study showed that faculty used the “threat of political correctness to achieve personal agendas in personnel selection,” and that diversity simply for the sake of diversity often leads to “warring tribes” among the diverse groups (Hon et al., 1999). Hon, Weigold and Chance found that study participants believed that administrators were responsible for eliminating the negatives associated with diversity initiatives by clearly communicating institutional expectations and the positives of a more diverse campus. Smith and Schofield (2000) explored ideas on how to diversify faculty by examining myths that could obstruct the search process. This included confronting and exposing prevailing misconceptions about faculty from UREP minority groups. One of the beliefs was that there was a lack of minority faculty in the existing pipeline. Another belief was that there was an overall lack of minority faculty in general. The study found that these two beliefs resulted in institutions of higher education competing against one another in the hiring process, or believing that the available faculty was in high demand. It also included addressing the prevailing belief that there is a lack of minority faculty in the pipeline to recruit, which the researchers found resulted in institutions competing against one another for faculty of color. However, Quezada and Louque (2004) completed further studies and found that the lack of minority faculty at institutions of higher education was rooted in organizational cultures. This study found that the search and hiring process included recruiting, retaining and evaluation practices that were often less supportive of faculty of color.

Furthermore, Melendez (2004) identified a need for more research to understand the lack of progress in minority representation among faculty. This is critical to making progress toward
increased diversity in administrative leadership positions. Research has shown that existing faculty and staff serve as a critical resource for current administrative leadership when looking to fill open administrative leadership positions. Statistics show that in 1985, 90 percent of full-time faculty were white males and UREP minorities represented only 10 percent of the total faculty population (American Council on Education, 2005). In 1999, faculty of color represented 15 percent of the total faculty population, however, in the six years that followed, the percentage had only increased to 15.6 percent (United States Department of Education, 2005), even though the minority population in the United States represents approximately one-third of the total population. Researchers have found that one reason for the slow increase in minority faculty numbers is that minority faculty encounter issues that are often not experienced by their colleagues. In their 2000 study, Laden and Hagedorn stated that minority faculty encounters barriers such as lack of social or emotional support and feelings of loneliness and isolation. Additionally, a study by Branch (2001) found that even though being a new faculty member is difficult, it is even more difficult for faculty of color.

Provost John Maher (2002) from the University of Pittsburgh made the following statement on the importance of recruiting a diverse faculty in higher education:

A diverse faculty is essential for the University’s full engagement in the community of scholars. Cutting-edge scholarship and the growth of knowledge depend on discussion and debate incorporating multiple perspectives, theories, and approaches. By nurturing a diverse group of scholars, the University can participate fully in current scholarly discussions and activities, sustaining and improving our academic reputation.

Moreover, Dr. Maher acknowledged that a diverse faculty enhances the University’s reputation with potential students, funders, governmental agencies, business and industry by stating that “only by aggressively recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty can the University meet the demands of these important constituencies” (Maher, 2002).
Finally, when reviewing best practices for recruiting UREP minority populations, Moody (2004) stated that discussions related to lifestyle should also be included as part of the process. Lifestyle related issues include housing and mortgages, spouse/partner employment, composition of communities, local schools, cultural and musical venues and social life opportunities. In addition, Melendez’s 2004 study included adequate mentoring, departmental guidance, personal involvement, team building, inclusiveness, general work conditions merit raises, and discussions about assistance with locating housing as part of the recruitment and hiring process.

Researchers also agreed that those involved in the search and hiring process need professional development and training prior to participating in the process. Moody (2004) suggested that administrators in charge of the search process should insure that search committees are (a) diverse, (b) create advertisements that underscore the institutions’ desire for diversity, (c) make salary and benefits packages equitable for new hires, (d) provide financial resources and support staff; (e) assist with spouse/partner employment; (f) provide housing assistance to new hires, and (g) pay attention to lifestyle concerns bring to the hiring committees attention. Additionally, Dumas-Hines, Cochran and Williams’ (2001) study provided additional guidance to cover both retention and recruitment of UREP minority populations, which included the following recruitment and retention strategies:

- Develop a university-wide philosophy statement to encourage cultural diversity,
- Analyze faculty and student composition on campus and establish goals to enhance campus diversity,
- Research best practices, programs and activities to promote the recruitment of a culturally diverse faculty and student body, and
• Develop, implement and evaluate a comprehensive plan for recruitment activities on campus that focus on cultural diversity (Dumas-Hines, Cochran and Williams, 2001)

The review of relevant literature suggests that there are several effective strategies or “best practices” for the recruitment and retention of UREP minority populations. The strategies presented have been gathered from the research, and consist of the most common strategies organizations use to effectively promote diversity.

• Commitment on the part of executive leadership and members of the senior management team
• Organizational accountability
• Integration of diversity efforts into all organizational initiatives
• Employment of a proportionate number of UREP minority populations across all levels, areas and departments within the institution
• Transparency in career advancement and promotion
• Professional development opportunities for employees that promote advancement
• Creation of institutional programs assist with the successful management of work and personal life
• Creation of a culture of mentoring
• Fostering of internal and external networking opportunities
• Mandatory and ongoing diversity and inclusion education
• Creation of a recruiting pipeline
**Mentoring**

For decades, leadership in faculty and administrative ranks has not been representative demographically of the communities and student bodies it serves. As U.S. demographics shift, filling employment voids on college campuses will offer institutions opportunities to examine their own values regarding diversity. This opportunity will allow colleges to provide professional development and training for new hires. Mentoring will be a key ingredient to their long-term success (Roueche, Richardson, Neal and Roueche, 2008).

Often individuals seek out and develop casual, informal mentoring relationships when looking toward career advancement, which supports the idea of the mentor as a wise and trusted friend. However, lasting and sustainable mentoring relationships are more formal in nature. Therefore, many institutions are now focusing on mentoring and mentoring programs as a way to develop leadership potential.

Studies have shown the number of college students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds is continuing to rise; a comparable level of diversity is not being achieved in higher education leadership positions. Because of the small number of faculty of color available to serve in mentorship roles at institutions of higher education and the growing demand to compete in the global marketplace, the creation of more diversity in higher education leadership positions cannot be left to happenstance. Yet, the leadership development of members of the UREP minority populations is often a missing part in higher education leadership development initiatives. For this reason, many colleges and universities are becoming more creative with how they develop and implement mentoring programs. This includes innovative ideas such as e-mentoring, and the more traditional approach of a leadership development program with built-in mentoring components. Yet, a diversity of institutional cultures creates a demand for leaders who
can fulfill and adapt to a wide variety of roles. This also creates a need for a diverse array of programs and initiatives designed to meet varying individual and institutional needs. Vega, Yglesias and Murray (2010) suggested that effective and sustainable mentoring programs include the following components:

- Specific goals of the mentoring program
- Outcomes of the program – objectives behaviorally articulated with expected outcomes
- Length of time of the program – approximate number of hours expected to be devoted to the mentoring experience on a weekly basis
- Mentor training – empathy, listening, communication skills, time commitment
- Clearly articulated descriptions of clinical or internship experiences associated with the program
- List of formal or informal course or workshop attendance that should be undertaken by mentees during the length of the program
- A well-developed tracking and data collection plan to assess the intended outcomes
- Anecdotal notes on each candidate by mentor, mentee, and program organizers
- Yearly surveys of mentees noting career or job changes as a result of being mentored

One mentoring program containing many of the components identified by Vega et al. (2010) is the Community College Leadership Program (CCLP). CCLP is designed to meet the needs of higher education institutions by increasing the pool of high quality UREP minority leadership available to campus communities across the nation. CCLP is one of the most successful higher education leadership development programs, and is offered at several institutions across the country, including the University of Texas at Austin, Iowa State
University, Mississippi State University and North Carolina State University. The program, which is designed to improve UREP minority access to administrative and faculty positions at community colleges, includes professional development opportunities and the enrollment in selective doctoral programs focused on community college administration. Although, this program is extremely successful, credited with developing UREP minority talent across the nation and increasing the minority leadership pool, there is still much work to be done.

Another example of one of these programs, Leadership for a New Century (LINC), was established at Iowa State University in 1989 as part of the Community College Leadership Program. The program is open to women and people of color with bachelor’s degrees in diverse fields that are currently working in entry- and mid-level positions as faculty members and administrative personnel. LINC provides participants with academic preparation, internships and networking opportunities. Program participants are also given opportunities to visit with nationally recognized leaders, including community college presidents and state leaders throughout the duration of the program. The LINC program has been successful in promoting diversity in community college administrative leadership with 60 percent of LINC participants reporting that they had received promotions after completing the program (Ebbers, Gallisath, Rockel and Coyan, 2000).

Because developing educational leadership is vital to the survival of higher education institutions, institutions cannot depend solely on one specific type of leadership development program. Therefore, many institutions also utilize the practice of “growing your own” to recruit and diversify higher education leadership. Institutions often begin the process of identifying new administrative leadership personnel through traditional human resource practices. This includes the creation of a job description based on the requirements pertinent to the individual desired by
the institution to fulfill the responsibilities of the leadership role. The job description is comprised of the leadership behaviors the institution believes to be essential and indicative of effective job performance.

Traditionally, colleges and universities have identified potential leaders by assessing an individual’s leadership ability based on character traits, such as personality and charisma, demonstrated as part of the interview process. However, as institutions move through the hiring process, the members of the search committee must remain conscious that leaders and true leadership does not conform to stereotypes or the preconceived notions of what it takes to be a good leader. Yet most individuals with leadership potential often have attributes such as creativity, high levels of motivation, emotional tact and a willingness to promote change (Cragg, 2007).

Once identified, potential leaders and those new to leadership positions have to learn how to lead. This process has been identified as part of Kolb’s Learning Cycle, which is a framework of the process by which individuals acquire and fine-tunes leadership skills. A new leader developing a skill goes through a process of conceptualization, experimentation, experience and reflection in order to master a new competency or behavior (Kolb and Kolb, 2009). Yet, effective leadership development programs must not only provide extensive knowledge of various models of leadership, they must also provide participants with extensive knowledge of their core business undertakings.

In 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) developed a set of six core competencies essential to the leadership development of college presidents. While there are no specific skill sets or experiences to prepare an individual for the leadership role of college president, there are specific competencies that can provide a framework for planning leadership
development programs. The six competencies are organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy, and professionalism.

Organizational strategy is defined as the belief that:

an effective community college leader strategically improves the quality of the institution, protects the long-term health of the organization, promotes the success of all students, and sustains the community college mission, based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends (AACC, 2005).

Resource management is defined as the degree to which “an effective community college leader equitably and ethically sustains people, processes, and information as well as physical and financial assets to fulfill the mission, vision, and goals of the community college” (p. 4).

Communication occurs when “an effective community college leader develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships that nurture diversity, promote the success of all students, and sustain the community college mission (p. 5). Community college advocacy means that “an effective community college leader understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college” (p. 6). Professionalism is the manner in which “an effective community college leader works ethically to set high standards for self and others, continuously improve self and surroundings, demonstrate accountability to and for the institution, and ensure the long-term viability of the college and community” (p. 6). These competencies were developed by the AACC to address the leadership gap among community colleges because many individuals currently in leadership roles are retiring. The competencies were also designed to address the need for broader skill sets for those serving in leadership roles because of the changing community college landscape of greater diversity, advances in technology, accountability demands and globalization (AACC, 2005).
Even with competencies in place, the lack of diversity in leadership roles is a challenge in higher education. The challenge exists because many institutions try to implement organizational diversity without addressing the existing organizational structure. In fact, Brayboy (2003) observed that implementing diversity programs at predominantly white institutions is a challenge because PWIs often view diversity as a freestanding policy that can be implemented without changing underlying organizational structures. Another challenge is that higher education institutions often use business organizations as the model (Allison, 1999; Bond and Pyle, 1998), but business organizations are often in the spotlight for failing to respond to diversity issues. As a result, business organizations have had to spend a sizeable amount of organizational resources to address these challenges. This has resulted in higher education institutions moving toward the utilization of a framework based on Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences to prepare individuals for work in diverse workforce and to recognize the organizational benefits of a diverse workforce (Allison, 1999).

In Hrabowski’s article, “Leadership for a New Age: Higher Education’s Role in Producing Minority Leaders,” he uses the idea of “The Talented Tenth” as expressed by W. E. B. DuBois in 1903, as part of his thinking on the concept of leadership development. In “The Talented Tenth, DuBois penned:

The Negro race, like all races, is going to be saved by its exceptional men. The problem of education, then, among Negroes must first of all deal with the Talented Tenth; it is the problem of developing the Best of this race that they may guide the Mass away from the contamination and death of the Worst (as cited by Hrabowski, 2004).

It was DuBois’ belief that continuing education, specifically a classical or liberal education, was the key for the black men destined to become the leaders of their race. DuBois goes on to pen in the text, “The Souls of Black Folks,” that:
Can the masses of the Negro people be in any possible way more quickly raised than by that effort and example of this aristocracy of talent and character?... [I]t is, ever was, and ever will be from the top downward that culture filters. The Talented Tenth rises and pulls all that are worth the saving up... This is the history of human progress... How then shall the leader of a struggling people be trained and the hands of the risen few strengthened? There can be but one answer: the best and most capable of their youth must be schooled in the colleges and universities of the land (as cited by Hrabowski, 2004).

Based on these works by W. E. B. DuBois, Hrabowski concluded that a major part of the leadership development process is to obtain an education and, more specifically, a liberal education. Dr. Hrabowski explains that the definition of the Latin words for liberal and education literally mean the free act of leading out of, and that the liberal education is most often associated with people who have time to cultivate their intellect. It is Hrabowski’s belief that only by “creating and supporting a larger pool of high-achieving minority students can we ultimately increase the number of faculty of color in our colleges and universities and the number of minorities who become leading professionals” (Hrabowski, 2004). Therefore, Dr. Hrabowski identified the following as the most important factors of the leadership development programs developed during his presidency at the University of Maryland Baltimore County:

- taking ownership of the issue and building trust and confidence to address the issue;
- making sure key players are involved and that the importance of the issue is determined by who is involved;
- identifying allies among leading faculty and influential administrators who support the initiatives;
- allocating resources to support diversity; and
- vigilantly recruiting members’ minorities and women (Hrabowski, 2004).

Moreover, as part of the leadership development process an individual must take time to reflect and be self-aware in order to improve their leadership skills. This type of reflective
practice can be accomplished in many different ways including personal reflection in private
time, peer group learning sets, and by receiving personal coaching or mentoring (Boud, Keogh,
and Walker, 1985). Good leaders will not rely solely on one form of reflection, although, many
new leaders will feel more comfortable with specific types of reflection as they start their new
leadership roles. However, institutions of higher education must be committed to cultivating
UREP minorities throughout the leadership process if they truly want to develop tomorrow’s
leaders and future workforce.

Socialization

Socialization is “the continuing process whereby an individual acquires a personal
identity and learns the norms, values, behavior and social skills appropriate to his or her social
position” (Dictionary.com, 2015). Socialization can be defined as a process that occurs when
individuals become part of an organization or start a new profession. In fact, in a 2006 study,
McCoy stated that socialization is the cultural learning that takes place in a social context.
Furthermore, socialization is a continuous process that is most evident when an individual first
joins an organization. In his study, McCoy compared the socialization experiences of minority
county at historically black colleges and universities to the experiences of minority faculty at
predominantly white institutions. McCoy found that a positive socialization experience occurs
when new hires are informed of both the formal and informal norms within their department and
at their institution. This positive socialization process leads to faculty that is more satisfied,
productive, effective and inclined to remain not only at the institution but in academia. Negative
socialization experiences lead to increased stress and conflict and individuals that are more likely
to leave an institution, which also negatively affects the institution through the loss of time and
additional human and financial resources conducting new searches. Therefore, institutions of
higher education with the desire to successfully diversify their campus communities must implement models that fully integrate UREP minorities into the campus community. The most successful models incorporate mentoring, social integration and interaction with colleagues. McCoy also found that both the professional and personal experiences of the new faculty member influenced the socialization process. In fact, McCoy states that “the culture, norms and values of the organization are influenced by new faculty members, which results in a ‘give-and-take’ socialization experience” (McCoy, 2006).

The socialization process is deemed an important factor in the success of underrepresented populations in higher education, and is documented in studies dating back to the 1990s and early 2000s. Boice (1992) found that the socialization process for minority faculty is so important that new faculty from underrepresented populations are more likely to reject higher education as a result of a poor socialization process. The study completed by Branch in 2001 emphasized that being a new faculty member was difficult regardless of race or ethnicity. However, Branch found that it was more difficult for faculty belonging to minority populations. The findings of the study by Thompson and Dey in 1998 align with the findings of the study completed by Boice, Branch and McCoy in 1992. Thompson and Dey (1998) found that socialization process is intensified for African American faculty because the prevailing world views of higher education are challenged by the presence of African American professors. In their 1999 study, Alexander-Snow and Johnson expressed that minority faculty is often marginalized during the socialization process because of “poor institutional fit, cultural and social differences, perceptions of race and ethnic discrimination” (p. 90).

Several studies have found that minority faculty believe that lack of knowledge about academic processes are a barrier to their advancement in higher education. Since most faculty
obtain this knowledge during the orientation and socialization process, inadequate socialization contributes the perception that there is a lack of advancement opportunities among faculty in minority groups. Even though most institutions of higher education make good faith efforts to provide a positive socialization process, many faculty express that the higher education institution that they are a part of has failed in the process (McCoy, 2006). In fact, McCoy found that many minority faculty saw themselves as new faculty members who enjoyed little or no collegial support, felt loneliness, experienced intellectual isolation, heavy workloads and unrealistic time constraints. Therefore, the socialization process must be more than trial and error. Organizational socialization must include two phases – initial entry and role continuation, which consists of education and training with an extended period of acclimation into the new position. Several studies have found that socialization occurs in phases, including studies by Wanous (1990) and Tierney and Rhoads (1994). Based on studies, the phases of socialization can be identified as follows and occur over several years:

- **Anticipatory Socialization Phase** – special training and preparation for the new career, developing personal expectations, and acquiring the new position;

- **Organizational Phase** – the individual confronts the differences between their expectations and their actual role at the organization; and

- **Continuing Socialization and Career Development** – the individual learns the job skills, adjusts to the new job and new colleagues and begins to feel like they belong at the organization (Tierney and Rhoads, 1994)

These studies also found that the socialization process is affected by national culture, professional culture, disciplinary culture and individual culture. National culture is defined as the set of norms, behaviors, beliefs and customs that exist within population of a specific nation.
Therefore, national culture refers to the stereotypical view of what it means to be an administrator or a faculty member in higher education. Boyatzis (1982) defines professional culture as the behaviors that are appropriate and acceptable by each profession. Disciplinary culture consists of assumptions about the nature of knowledge and how the assumptions differ by academic discipline (Kuh and Whitt, 1988). Lastly, socialization is affected by individual culture, which is based on the individual’s gender, race, ethnicity, and personal experiences (Tierney and Rhoads, 1994).

Therefore, it is necessary to create a system and a culture to promote the increase in the number of administrators in higher education that are members of underrepresented minority populations. The system should incorporate recruitment and retention, mentoring and socialization to promote institutions that not only promote diversity, but to develop institutions that are thriving diverse and inclusive environments.

**Summary**

Chapter two provided a review of the relevant literature on the research pertaining to recruitment, retention, mentoring and socialization of UREP minority populations to institutions of higher education. The chapter started with a review of literature on recruitment and retention of UREP minority populations in higher education and the importance of diversity at institutions of higher education. The literature was used to identify several best practices utilized as part of the recruiting and retention processes. Finally, the chapter provided a review of mentoring and socialization and the significance of these strategies in maintaining a positive and inclusive campus environment.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS

Introduction

This research study was designed to investigate higher education leadership, specifically in West Virginia, to develop effective recruitment strategies to attract UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education. The study provides insight into the institutional and personal factors that are most significant to UREP minorities when pursuing administrative leadership positions in higher education. The purpose of Chapter Three is to explain the quantitative and qualitative research methods used to collect and analyze the data gathered as part of the study.

Research Questions

The research questions that will be addressed in this study are as follows:

- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the recruitment of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education?
- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the retention of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?
- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the socialization of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?
Sample

The researcher surveyed members of underrepresented minority populations working in administrative leadership positions at West Virginia higher education institutions, and interviewed five of UREP minorities serving in administrative leadership positions that responded to the survey. The sample included administrative leadership positions at institutions governed by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, the Community and Technical College System of West Virginia, and the West Virginia Independent Colleges and Universities.

Design and Source of Data

Quantitative Research Methods. According to Aliaga and Gunderson (2002), quantitative research is “explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analysed [sic] using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics)” (p. 1). Although beliefs and perceptions may not appear naturally suited for quantitative data collection, the researcher has designed a research instrument specifically to convert the phenomena to a quantitative form for analysis. With this in mind a non-experimental descriptive design will be utilized for the quantitative phase of the study. Demographic data will be gathered. Factors and strategies used by institutions of higher education, as identified in the literature review, will be confirmed by UREP minorities participating in phase one (i.e., online survey) as a significant factor or strategy in the recruiting, retention and socialization process. Further confirmation will occur in phase two, or the oral interview process.

The survey used to complete the quantitative research portion of the study on UREP minorities in administrative leadership positions was scored based on a four-point Likert scale. With one being the lowest point on the scale and four being the highest point on the scale the
respondents assessed the extent that each of the following influenced their decision to accept their administrative leadership – institutional reputations, geographical location of the institution, reputation of the administration, faculty and staff at the institution, quality of students enrolled at the institution, quality of facilities and institutional technology, opportunities for career advancement and professional development, mentoring opportunities, institutional diversity, salary offer, benefits package, type of institution, intercollegiate athletic programs, socialization opportunities on campus, socialization opportunities within the local community, quality of life within the local community, employment opportunities for spouse/partner, quality of P-12 education, availability of childcare, and access to religious affiliation.

Qualitative Research Methods. The researcher conducted a qualitative study to identify and evaluate both institutional and personal factors such as mentoring, academic reputation, demographics, spouse/partner employment opportunities, geographic location and quality of life that positively influence UREP minorities to pursue and accept administrative leadership positions at West Virginia higher education institutions. Qualitative research was utilized to assist the researcher in gaining insight and understanding into human behavior by exploring an individual’s cultural, social, spiritual, and economic experiences influence their behavior in various situations. Qualitative research recognizes the importance of understanding personal experience, and how each individual’s unique experiences affect their decision making process. The researcher gathered data by conducting individual interviews with UREP minority administrators to ascertain the factors and strategies that were most important to them as part of the recruitment process for their current position. The researcher also determined factors that are most important to them as part of the retention and socialization in their current position. The researcher anticipates that institutional and personal factors will vary in importance depending on
the needs of the individual and the institution at which they are employed. The researcher also anticipates that effective recruitment strategies will vary based on the native West Virginian versus non-native status of the UREP minority.

One of the goals of the study is to understand the individual experiences of the UREP minorities and how those experiences shape the decision making process. Interviews will be conducted to record and collect data in the subject’s own words. The goal of the research interview is to become more familiar with the subjects and their perceptions. With this in mind, the researcher utilized the following framework used to guide the interview process:

- The initial phase of the interview process is used for general conversation including recruitment, race and ethnicity as broad topics allowing the researcher and the subject to develop a rapport.
- The orientation phase of the process will involve a more focused look at what the subject perceived as effective recruitment strategies, and the institutional and personal factors that should be included in all recruitment strategies.
- The substantive phase of the interview will focus on a review of the institutional and personal factors identified in the research questions for the study, concentrating specifically on the factors that are most important to their decision to accept an administrative leadership position in West Virginia.
- The orientation and substantive phase of the interview will include the following questions, with possibility that additional questions may arise as the interview proceeds.
  - What factors do you believe helped you be recruited to your position?
What do you believe are the factors that enable other minorities to be recruited to administrative roles in higher education?

What are some of the things that you believe assist your institutions with retaining you in your position?

What are some of the factors that you believe would assist your institution in retaining other minorities to administrative positions?

What are some of the things that you feel hinder or act as a barrier to recruiting and retaining minorities to administrative leadership roles at institutions in WV?

What are some of the values and beliefs that you have learned during your career that you feel have assisted you with adapting to your administrative role?

What are some of the things that you value or believe strongly in and that you feel may hinder you in your administrative role?

The closure phase of the interview process is utilized to gain clarification and to ask if there is any additional information that the respondent would like to share, prior to ending the interview session (Cline, 2013).

**Data Analysis**

**Quantitative.** The UREP minority survey responses concerning significant factors and strategies were measured utilizing a four point Likert scale. The researcher used a “forced choice” scale, which is designed to require a response by eliminating the neutral option of the traditional Likert Scale. Respondents were asked to what degree they agree or disagree with the questions posed as part of the survey items. Each of the items were analyzed and scored to
determine the factors and strategies each of the individual respondents deems significant. The criterion receiving a score of four will represent the highest possible substantiation of a criterion, and a criterion receiving a score of one will represent the invalidation of a criterion. Finally, the researcher used a frequency chart to quantify and report the results.

**Qualitative.** Michael Patton (1990) defines phenomenological research based on the stated purpose of the research method below:

*The assumption that there is an essence or essences to shared experience.* These essences are the core meanings mutually understood through a phenomenon commonly experienced. The experiences of different people are bracketed, analyzed, and compared to the identity of the essences of the phenomenon, for example the essences of loneliness, the essence of being a mother, the essence of being a participant in a particular program.

*The assumption of essence, like the ethnographer’s assumption that culture exists and is important, becomes the defining characteristic of a purely phenomenological study* (p. 70).

Therefore, phenomenological research methods will be used to collect data for the study, and the steps identified by Merriam (2002) will be used to complete the final analysis of the study. Merriam defines the steps as follows:

- Reduction – returning to the essence of the experience to derive meaning;
- Horizontalization – treating all the data as equal, clustering themes and removing repetitious statements; and
- Imaginative variation – examining the data from diverging perspectives and various frames of reference.
Once the data analysis is completed, phenomenological interpretation of the data will lead to the identification of the primary themes. The themes will be further analyzed to assist with the identification of both diverging and converging perspectives among study participants, which will assist with developing a deeper understanding of the phenomenon being investigated.

**Conceptual Framework**

Diversity is a representation of how to measure equal access through quantifiable evidence; however, it does not instinctively produce equal opportunity and equitable treatment. *Brown v. Board of Education* is the well-known 1954 Supreme Court Case that many view as the start of a mandate in the United States for equal opportunity in education for all of its citizens. The years that followed this landmark decision ushered in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and affirmative action programs designed to address past inequalities. These actions set forth legal precedence in the United States, which allowed for the creation of programs and initiatives to target the recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups into the educational system.

Central to the conceptual framework is developing an understanding of what it means to pursue and operate in an administrative leadership position while holding status as a member of an underrepresented minority group. Government agencies and institutions of higher education have a long tradition of attempting to address diversity issues in employment with recruitment and retention initiatives. While many of these programs permit group members to seek employment at institutions of higher education the programs often fail to create diversity because they fail to meet the individual needs of group members. Therefore, this study was developed based on the assumption that understanding of underrepresented minorities’ needs can be obtained by exploring their perceptions of higher education and administrative leadership positions in higher education based on their personal experiences.
Therefore, a conceptual framework based on functionalism and conflict theory was utilized to develop the proposed study. The functionalist framework suggests that the role of the institution is to socialize both faculty and students in a manner that causes them to adapt to the economic, political and social norms of society. This applies to the proposed study in that the recruitment, retention and socialization strategies utilized on UREP minorities by the higher education institutions is used to meet societal needs by facilitating self-sufficiency through the learning of skills that make participants employable members of the institution. In fact, the program fulfills both the manifest and latent functions of this theory. The manifest function is met through curriculum and instruction; the UREP minorities have received postsecondary educations, which provide them with the skills necessary to fulfill the societal needs of the administrative leaders. The latent function of the theory is achieved through preparing UREP minorities through education and training that prepares them to coexist responsibly in a democratic and culturally diverse society. One of the easiest ways to understand and apply the functionalist theory to learning comes from Robert Dreeben in *On What Is Learned in School* (1968). Dreeben divides functionalism into four separate components – independence, achievement, specificity, and universalism. Independence occurs when the student learns that he will be held accountable for his own actions. Achievement is the learning a student acquires when he learns that his performance will be judged against the performance of others. Specificity occurs when the student learns exceptions are made and that these exceptions are permissible in certain circumstances. Universalism is the final component, and this component teaches the student that in general all are treated the same.

Functionalists believe that institutionalized learning is a way of preparing students for life in the broader society and ensuring that advancement is a matter of merit rather than privilege.
Although conflict theorists may often agree with functionalists that this was the intent they do not believe that this is the result. Conflict theorists believe that the force behind societal change is the struggle between different groups for power and status. Under the framework of conflict theory, the recruitment, retention and socialization strategies and programs serve as a means of maintaining the status quo by giving the illusion of objectivity, neutrality and opportunity. While the direct conflict may appear as conflict between groups based on criteria such as race, ethnicity, or gender, the conflict theorists suggest the true conflict is one of social class. I believe that this theory is a conceptual framework for this study because the program participants are part of the conflict between the minority and the majority class. In addition, the UREP minorities serving in administrative leadership positions are examples of how individuals are able to move from one social class to another by acquiring and participating in postsecondary education.

**Validity**

**Triangulation.** According to Maxwell (2013), triangulation is the collection of information from a diverse range of individuals and setting, using a variety of methods. Most research studies that employ qualitative methods depend upon triangulation to enhance validity (Glesne, 2011). The use of triangulation can assist with the identification of variations and discrepancies within the data that is being collected, which can provide opportunities for profound insights into the subjects being studied. For this study, information will be gathered through participant surveys, interviews, theoretical orientation and review of relevant literature to triangulate the research findings.

The surveys and the interviews will provide methodological triangulation, which Denzin (1970) defined as using more than one method to gather data. Members of the sample population will be able to share their perception of the most effective recruitment, retention and
socialization strategies. They will also provide insight into the feelings and beliefs of members the specific population, and shed light on how their perceptions may differ with best practices and information found in the literature review. Theoretical orientation is a part of the triangulation process because it will provide the researcher with the theoretical perspective to interpret the collected data. The literature review is part of the triangulation process because it will provide triangulation of the data in comparison to previous research studies relevant to the topic. The literature review will also provide research data from different times, social settings and a variety of subjects.

Summary

The findings of this study could be used to recruit UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions at institutions of higher education in West Virginia. Specifically, the study findings will identify the institutional and personal factors that are most significant to UREP minorities in their decision to accept an administrative leadership positions at institutions of higher education located in the State of West Virginia.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The study addressed the perception of UREP minority administrative leaders on what are the most significant factors in higher education recruitment, retention, and socialization strategies in attracting them to administrative leadership positions. The survey instrument and interview questions were designed to garner a profuse data collection about the experiences and perceptions in order to address the following research questions:

- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the recruitment of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education?
- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the retention of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?
- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the socialization of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?

The findings for this study include data retrieved through the analysis of thirty-seven (37) survey instrument responses and six interviews with UREP administrative leaders at higher education institutions in West Virginia. Data collection protocols were established that included the approval of the survey instrument and the interview questions, and statements on informed consent and participant confidentiality. The survey instrument was used to collect data over a four-month period (March 31, 2016, through July 31, 2016). The researcher also conducted
interviews over a three-month period (May 28, 2016, through August 25, 2016) with administrative leaders that agreed to participate in the interview by providing their contact information on the survey instrument. The survey instrument was completed via SurveyMonkey, and interviews were conducted in person or by telephone based on the participants’ preference and availability.

Sample

The sample was determined by identifying underrepresented minority populations working in administrative leadership positions at West Virginia higher education institutions. The sample was inclusive of UREP minority administrative leaders with positions governed by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, the Community and Technical College System of West Virginia, and the West Virginia Independent Colleges and Universities. Prior to sending out the survey instrument, the researcher contacted various offices and departments at colleges and universities meeting the sample guidelines with a focus on offices of multiculturalism, diversity, equity and/or inclusion to assist with identifying potential survey participants. The offices often assisted with contact information for organizations or specific individuals that could provide additional assistance with compilation of the list. Additionally, several UREP administrators that received the survey link contacted the researcher about sharing the survey link with other UREP minority administrators on their campuses. This process provided information for sixty-nine potential participants to receive the online survey instrument via SurveyMonkey. Of the sixty-nine survey instruments sent out one bounced back, and the researcher was notified via SurveyMonkey that five of the respondents opted out. This brought the total number of potential participants to sixty-three with thirty-seven or 58.73% of the administrative leaders responding to the survey. The survey was designed to be anonymous with
no IP addresses or personally identifiable information being collected, except for respondents that agreed to participate in the interview phase of the study by providing additional contact information via the online survey instrument. All respondents were asked to participate in the interview process by providing additional contact information upon completion of the survey, but only six agreed to be contacted for the second phase of the study. The survey may be viewed in Appendix B.

After the survey instrument was sent out, the interview process was started as respondents providing additional contact information were contacted to schedule face-to-face or telephone interviews. The interviews were conducted over a three month period with six of the UREP minority administrative leaders agreeing to participate in the interview by providing their contact information. However, the researcher was only able to schedule interviews with five of the six UREP minority administrative leaders. Because of time constraints all five UREP minority administrative leaders requested to complete their interviews via telephone.

Description of Survey Results

A total of sixty-three administrative leaders were sent survey instruments via SurveyMonkey. The initial survey response yielded a 1.58% response rate with only one respondent completing the survey. However, the initial respondent did agree to be interviewed and informed the researcher that he planned on encouraging other potential participants to complete the survey instrument, if received, because his view of the importance of this research study. After the initial survey response, survey instrument reminders were sent out every other week for four months, which yielded a response rate of 58.73% or thirty-seven completed surveys. Each of the respondents completing the survey responded to all of the questions, except the question asking for additional contact information, if willing to participate in the interview
process. Of the thirty-seven respondents completing the survey, six respondents provided additional contact information with five of the six participating in the interview process.

The researcher utilized a “forced choice” scale, which eliminates the neutral option of the traditional Likert Scale. Therefore, the survey consisted of a four point Likert Scale devised to use semantic differential scale design to provide connotative meaning to the administrative leaders’ views of the recruitment, retention and socialization strategies. Selected criteria were identified in the literature review as institutional and personal factors important to potential candidates and current employees in the recruitment, retention and socialization process. Survey data were classified as ordinal, and the analysis was completed using descriptive statistics. Next the frequency of responses was ranked using the four survey categories with four equal to strongly agree, three equal to agree, two equal to disagree and one equal to strongly disagree. Therefore, a four denotes the factors most important to the administrative leaders and the factors ranked the least important received a score of one. The frequency chart of the survey results are located in Appendix D.

The top five factors as ranked by the administrative leaders participating in survey were opportunities for career advancement and professional development, type of institution, reputation of the administration faculty and staff at the institution, institutional reputation and geographical location of the institution (i.e. \( f = 4 \) or strongly agree and \( f = 3 \) agree). The four least important factors were availability of childcare, access to religious affiliation, socialization opportunities on campus, and intercollegiate athletics (i.e. \( f = 1 \) or strongly disagree and \( f = 2 \) or disagree). Table 1 is a frequency table of the most important factors as ranked by the survey respondents, and Table 2 is the least important factors as ranked by the survey respondents.
Table 1

Most Important Recruitment, Retention and Socialization Factors (n=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment, Retention and Socialization Factors</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Career Advancement and Professional Development</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution (Liberal Arts, Public, Private, Community College, HBCU, etc.)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of the administration, faculty and staff at the institution</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reputation</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location of the Institution</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Least Important Recruitment, Retention and Socialization Factors (n=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment, Retention and Socialization Factors</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Childcare</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to religious Affiliation</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletic Programs</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization on Campus</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the respondents were asked to answer several questions about educational attainment and professional development. The criteria for these questions were based on the scholarly literature review, which identified several programs and leadership activities designed to provide professional development and leadership training for members of underrepresented minority populations. These programs were designed to increase diversity among administrators and faculty serving at institutions of higher education. Many of these programs and activities were also designed to prepare and mentor both prior to assuming the role, and to provide support for these individuals once they had assumed the administrative leadership roles. Therefore, the respondents were asked about these criteria to determine what professional development activities respondents participated in prior to assuming their administrative leadership position to
prepare for them. This question also provided respondents the opportunity to identify other activities, and specify the activities. For question one, thirty percent of the respondents replied that they had participated in additional activities. One respondent that specified the activity, stating that he had completed “professional development in my field.” The second question was asked to determine what professional development activities the respondents have participated in during the last year to support their current administrative leadership position. This question also had thirty percent of the respondents identifying other professional development activities. Three of these respondents specified the activities participated in for this question. One respondent stated, “I develop and direct mentoring programs.” Two respondents stated that they “served in mentorship and advising roles.” These data were also classified as ordinal, and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Based on the analysis and the frequency rates of respondents to participate in the identified professional development opportunities, it appears that respondents are least likely to participate in mentoring programs. This includes activities participated in to prepare for the administrative leadership role, and activities participated in after the roles were assumed. In addition, respondents were more likely to participate in leadership training opportunities and advanced degree or certification programs while preparing to assume an administrative leadership role. Respondents that have already assumed their administrative leadership roles are more likely to continue pursuing leadership training opportunities, while also participating in professional development that is specific to their role and/or title. Table 3 and Table 4 show the responses for both questions, as a percentage of respondents that did and/or did not participate in professional development.
Table 3

Prior Participation in Professional Development (n=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrollment in Advanced Degree or Certification Program</th>
<th>Leadership Training</th>
<th>Professional Development specific to your role/title</th>
<th>Mentoring Programs</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Current Participation in Professional Development (n=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrollment in Advanced Degree or Certification Program</th>
<th>Leadership Training</th>
<th>Professional Development specific to your role/title</th>
<th>Mentoring Programs</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Information

The respondent pool for the research study consisted of members of underrepresented minority populations serving in administrative leadership positions at West Virginia higher education institutions. The sample was inclusive of UREP minority administrative leaders with positions governed by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission, the Community and Technical College System of West Virginia, and the West Virginia Independent Colleges and Universities. Specific demographic information was collected from respondents as part of the survey instrument, and is reported in Table 5, Table 6, Table 7, Table 8 and Table 9.
Table 5

**Sex of Respondents (Survey Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

**Respondents Marital Status (Survey Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Union</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Partnership</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

**Race/Ethnicity of Respondents (Survey Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

*Education Level of Respondents (Survey Phase)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate or Two-Year Degree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor or Four-Year Degree</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree – Ph.D./Ed.D.</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree – medical, dental, law, etc.</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of degree or training (specify)*</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Doctoral Candidate – 1 respondent and Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) – 2 respondents

Table 9

*Administrative Leadership Role of Respondents (Survey Phase)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Leadership Role</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President/Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost/Chief Academic Officer (CAO)</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer (CFO)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Operations Officer (COO)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Technology Officer (CTO)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President (including Assistant or Associate VP)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean (including Assistant or Associate Dean)</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director (including Assistant or Associate Director)</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director (including Assistant or Associate Director)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study was conducted as a mixed methods study, with the second phase, or the interview phase, designed to provide additional information that would add to the understanding of the data.
acquired during phase one utilizing the survey instrument. The second phase was an opportunity to expound on the survey data by providing the UREP minority leaders the opportunity to further express their perceptions and understanding of the research topic.

**Interview Design**

Interviews were conducted during phase two of the study. However, the design of the study allowed the researcher to conduct interviews prior to the completion of phase one. The interview questions were formed as broad comprehensive questions to allow interview participants to reflect on factors and strategies that may or may not have been identified in the survey. The goal was to develop questions that would not limit the interviewee’s responses, but provide insight into their perceptions of the topic. Therefore, the researcher used the following interview questions as part of phase two:

- What factors do you believe helped you be recruited to your position?
- What do you believe are the factors that enable other minorities to be recruited to administrative roles in higher education?
- What are some of the things that you believe assist your institution with retaining you in your position?
- What are some of the factors that you believe would assist your institution in retaining other minorities to administrative positions?
- What are some of the things that you feel hinder or act as a barrier to recruiting and retaining minorities to administrative leadership roles at institutions in WV?
- What are some of the values and beliefs that you have learned during your career that you feel have assisted you with adapting to your administrative role?
What are some of the things that you value or believe strongly in that you feel may hinder you in your administrative role?

In addition, the researcher asked each administrative leader that participated in the interview process. If they had additional information that they would like to share that was not covered during the course of the interview. This allowed interviewees the opportunity to further express their opinions and perceptions of the research topic. The interview questions can be found in Appendix C.

**Interview Results**

This study was based on the science of phenomena or phenomenology. Phenomenology was used because it is focused on understanding the phenomena from the perspective of those who experiencing it (Merriam, 2002). Furthermore, Merriam (2009) describes a simple qualitative research study as deriving philosophically from constructionism, phenomenology and symbolic interaction. Merriam states that the overall purpose of phenomenological studies are to understand how people make sense of their lives and their experiences, and are best suited for researchers not interested in studying processes but understanding (1) how people interpret their experiences, (2) how they construct their worlds, and (3) what meaning they attribute to their experiences. Therefore, to insure that the basis for the data analysis was appropriate for the data collected, the researcher utilized the process of phenomenological reduction, which includes bracketing, organizing invariant qualities and themes, and constructing textural description (Merriam, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). This method requires the researcher to begin analyzing data as soon as it is collected and data sets become available. Initial data was obtained from the researcher’s own experience. Horizontalization was then used to assign equal value to each statement that symbolizes a segment of meaning (Merriam, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). The
segments were then clustered into themes, with the segments and themes combined into a
textural description. The textural descriptions were then reviewed using imaginative variation or
different perspectives to create structural descriptions. The textural-structural descriptions that
emerge represent the essence and meaning of the experience (Creswell, 1998; Moustakas, 1994).
The textural-structural description is then created for each of the participants, and used to create
the universal description of the group experience (Moustakas, 1994).

**Description Phase**

Five (13.5%) of the thirty-seven administrative leaders responding to the survey
instrument participated in the interview phase of the research study. These participants consisted
of two male administrators and three female administrators. Four of the participants hold a
doctoral degree and one participant is currently completing a doctoral program. All of the
participants were senior-level administrators including a Community College President, a
Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, an Executive Director of Human Resources and
Chief Human Resources Officer, a School of Pharmacy Dean, and a Medical School Assistant
Dean of Diversity. The participants averaged twenty years of experience in higher education, and
time served in their current positions varied from two months to thirteen years.

All five administrative leaders provided their contact information as their consent to be
interviewed on the survey instrument. The researcher made the initial contact to schedule an
interview date and establish the participant’s preference for a face-to-face or telephone interview.
Because of time constraints, all five participants requested that their interview be conducted via
telephone. Even though all of the interviews were telephone interviews, some of the interviews
were more formal than others. This resulted from the fact that two participants scheduled their
interview during their regular work hours, and the interviews were conducted in their offices on
campus. However, three of the administrators requested the researcher to call them after normal business hours, with one interview taking place on campus and the other two interviews taking place in their home offices.

The greatest challenge for the researcher was to establish her role during the interview process. Four of the administrators that were interviewed were currently or previously employed at higher education institutions where the researcher had worked, and three were employed at those institutions during the same time as the researcher. The first interview was one of the more informal interviews, and it took place on the participant’s campus after business hours. The interview was more conversational and flowed more like an exchange of ideas between the respondent and researcher. The respondent for the first interview had previously worked directly with the researcher, and as a result the researcher questioned the process and reflected on whether or not she had been too informal or talked too freely as part of the process. During the second interview, the researcher made a concerted effort to keep the interview conversational and make the respondent feel comfortable, but to talk less and focus her part of the conversation more on keeping the flow of the interview. As a result, during the next three interviews the researcher was able to create a balance that allowed the researcher to gather a depth of information and a free exchange of ideas without dominating the interview. However, the final interview, with the community college president, was the most difficult interview. The respondent was very cordial and open to the interview process, but the researcher found that she was very conscientious of his time. This resulted in a very formal interview that did not flow as the previous four. However, the respondent took his time to expound on his answers, and the researcher was able to get additional information beyond the specific interview questions. Yet, the researcher felt that overall the proper balance was found through the process, which lead the
researcher to only interject in the conversation to prompt the flow of the interview or garner additional information about topics discussed as part of the process. In addition, the researcher used the planned questions simply to guide the interviews, but encouraged respondents to expound upon new ideas and additional topics that arose as a result of the interview process. The researcher also asked additional questions based on the conversations that developed as part of the interviews.

The researcher found that all the respondents, with one exception, were eager to engage in small talk at the beginning of the interview. Much of the small talk engaged the researcher in questions about how the respondents wanted to utilize the research study once it was completed. The respondents whose positions had a particular focus on recruiting, retention and diversification of their specific campus community were also interested in discussing how the study could be used to improve their efforts. However, the researcher concluded that the respondent that did not engage in small talk as much as the other respondents was busy and did not want to waste the block of time that had been carved out to participate in the interview process. Nevertheless, the researcher felt that even the most formal interview would be considered informal by most standards because the respondents all seemed to have a vested interest in what they portrayed as the successful completion of the study. This allowed the researcher to relax as she developed her comfort level and defined her role in the interview process, and it allowed the respondents to relax and share freely about their thoughts and experiences as they related to the research study topic. This is also reflected in the conversational tone of interview descriptions. One of the prevalent themes of the interviews was that the most effective strategies and processes were those that were developed based on a desire to understand the populations that institution was recruiting. Yet, the institutions failed to retain members of
the UREP populations because the programs and strategies did not extend beyond the recruitment process. The respondents all expressed a strong desire to assist with institutional efforts to strengthen the process, and that the process must be different for each institution in order to reflect institutional strengths that are most attractive to UREP minority populations.

Once the interviews were completed, the researcher utilized the process of reduction to organize and meaningfully reduce or reconfigure the data for analysis. The process of data reduction requires the researcher to select, focus, simplify, abstract and transform the data from the written field notes and transcriptions (Miles and Huberman, 1994). This process allows the data to be transformed into manageable and intelligible concepts about the issues being addressed through the research process. This means that the data can be emphasized, minimized or completely set aside depending on the purpose of the research. Although, the researcher should shape the preliminary categories based on established research questions, the researcher must be open to formulating new meaning from the available data. Therefore, the researcher utilized the process of open coding to accomplish this task. Categories were developed based on the detailed responses of the respondents during the interview phase. The researcher then developed a coding system to break down the categories and reveal common phenomena or trends in the data. The researcher completed this process and identified the overriding themes in the data based on the frequency of repetition among the respondents throughout the interviews. The matrices used to sort and code the qualitative data obtained in the interview phase can be found in Appendix F. The subsequent section of this chapter addresses the perceptions of the UREP minority administrative leaders, as identified in response to the basic interview questions. The section is broken down using the research questions and the overriding themes that were identified and discussed during the interview phase of the research.
Research Question 1: What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the recruitment of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education?

This research question was specifically addressed in interview questions one, two and five in addition to the survey. The specific interview questions were: #1 – What factors do you believe helped you be recruited to your position; #2 – What do you believe are the factors that enable other minorities to be recruited to administrative roles in higher education; and #5 – What are some of the things that you feel hinder or act as a barrier to recruiting and retaining minorities to administrative leadership roles at institutions in WV? An analysis of the responses to these interview questions resulted in identification of important factors and barriers to recruitment.

Important Recruitment Factors

Based on the responses to the survey respondents identified the most important factors in the recruitment process as career advancement and professional development, geographical location, type of institutions, institutional reputation, and reputation of the administrators, faculty and staff at the institution. The respondents in the interview process identified career advancement and geographical location as the important factors when considering positions at higher education institutions in West Virginia. All of the administrators seemed to feel that the opportunity for career advancement and professional development were most important. Many of the administrators expressed that when looking to advance their careers and establish themselves as a higher education professionals, they had to be willing to relocate to where the opportunities present themselves. One administrators stated, “The move to West Virginia was a once in a lifetime career opportunity.” This administrator elaborated that she was responsible for
establishing a brand new program at her institution, which was exciting and would also open up new career opportunities if the program was successful. A second administrator also assumed her position as a new role on campus. This administrator felt that this opportunity was also the chance of a lifetime for similar reasons. “It was the opportunity to develop a program and implement initiatives that were new campus-wide, and the success of the programs has led to opportunities that were not previously available.” Other administrators commented that career advancement was the deciding factor when committing to an institution located in West Virginia because the institution “presented them with the opportunity for growth and autonomy.” All of the respondents also felt that successful implementation of job responsibilities and programs would not only open them up personally to career advancement and professional development opportunities, but would create opportunities for other members of UREP minority populations to pursue administrative leadership opportunities in West Virginia higher education institutions.

The other factor that respondents identified as important was geographical location. Three of the respondents were natives of West Virginia and the other two respondents were non-natives. Two of the administrators who were natives expressed that serving in an administrative role at an institution of higher education was an important opportunity to give back to their home state. They also expressed that it allowed them to serve as a role model on campus and in the community, and to mentor other members of minority populations regardless of whether they aspired to a career in higher education. The non-natives expressed that West Virginia was a good place to raise a family and the communities that they resided in were family friendly. The respondents also stated that geographical location was important because they desired to be in close proximity to family and have the ability to maintain existing friendships. In fact, one respondent identified geographical location as most important to her because of the ability to
maintain what she identified as “work-life balance.” This administrator conveyed that the physical location of the last three institutions that she had worked for were located in close proximity to family and friends because she did not want to feel isolated or feel like everything going on in her life was work-related. In addition, the two administrators that were responsible for and/or participated in the recruitment process at their institution stated that they had suggested changes or implemented changes to the recruitment process based on their own experiences.

**Barriers to Recruitment**

Institutional diversity was identified on the survey as one of the most important factors in the recruitment process. However, several of the respondents identified diversity as a barrier to the recruitment process when not addressed honestly and openly as part of the process. In fact, one of the administrators, whose recruitment process included a national search firm, stated that the institution cannot address diversity as all “lollipops and unicorns.” The administrator stated that institutions need to look to existing employees who are already members of administration, faculty and staff at the institution to participate in the process. This allows prospective administrative leaders to ask questions and get feedback from members of their racial, ethnic and cultural groups at the institution who live in the local communities. Several of the respondents stated that the entire community, not just the campus community, should be included in the process, especially at campuses in more rural or isolated areas. The respondents stated that the institutions with more inclusive recruitment processes are more likely to be attractive because the potential administrative leader is welcomed to “the community,” and not simply interacting with senior-level administration and search committee members. Two of the administrative leaders saw lack of diversity as a barrier, not because of the lack of numbers, but as a failure to step
outside of the box. For example, one of the administrators stated that many of the administrators that were her peers at a previous institution were white males, and that several internal career advancement and professional development opportunities became available, but UREP minorities were never given the “internal” opportunities, which she described as interim positions, campus committee appointments and university liaison positions. The administrator explained that she saw that many of the appointments originated from specific informal groups on campus that had little, if any, UREP minority representation. She asked about joining the groups and found that the group members’ intent was not to exclude, but they did not think the UREP minorities would be interested. However, after her inquiry she found that many of the groups became more inclusive, which led to more diversity among the members of the campus community serving in the “internal opportunities.” Therefore, the overall barrier to recruitment seemed to hinge on the lack of communication and inclusion.

**Summary of Recruitment Themes**

The recruitment themes identified as part of this study are the factors that the UREP minority administrative leaders perceived as most important in the recruitment process for higher education institutions in West Virginia. Based on the data obtained from the respondents the perception of the UREP minority administrative leaders is that opportunities for career advancement and professional development and geographical location, as it applies to family values and proximity to family and friends, are two of the most important factors. These factors were identified as part of the interview process and in the survey. This suggests that institutions should promote career opportunities that may not be available at other institutions and work with the campus and local community to promote positives of the geographical location of the institution. However, it is also important to be honest about the negatives that the UREP
minorities might experience, especially non-natives that are used to more diverse and/or urban environments.

**Research Question 2: What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the retention of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?**

This research question was specifically addressed in interview questions three, four and five. The specific interview questions were: #3 – What are some of the things that you believe assist your institutions with retaining you in your position; #4 – What are some of the factors that you believe would assist your institution in retaining other minorities to administrative positions; and #5 – What are some of the things that you feel hinder or act as a barrier to recruiting and retaining minorities to administrative leadership roles at institutions in WV? Based on the researcher’s analysis of the responses to these interview questions the factors and barriers to retention were identified.

**Factors and Barriers for Retention**

The UREP minority administrative leaders consistently responded to these questions that none of their institutions had retention programs in place, which presented opportunities for implementation but also created barriers at their higher education institutions. They all felt that the institutions that had employed them as administrative leaders had a singular focus on the recruitment process, but no programs in place that focused on retention. Although all of them also stated that they had developed mentor/mentee relationships with other administrators on campus or through professional relationships in an effort to maintain their status at their institutions. But each of them stated that these were relationships that they had taken upon themselves to cultivate, and that there were no formal or informal programs in place on their
campuses. One administrator who described retention as a campus-wide initiative stated that her institution often referred to their salary and benefits packages as part of their retention efforts. She expressed that the institution believed if it was competitive with other institutions and educational organizations they would be able to retain their administrators, faculty and staff. The only other program mentioned was mandatory annual cultural diversity training that many institutions offer, but the training described was more about information than employee retention. Two of the administrators stated that, as part of their job responsibilities, they were working on developing formal retention programs at their institutions, and a third administrator stated that she had implemented an informal program specific to her department. However, all of the administrators stated that the retention process should include opportunities for both formal and informal mentoring. The reasoning behind the formal mentoring was that often individuals in administrative positions will not seek out opportunities to mentor others, or they may not see themselves as a mentor or role model. However, the respondents stated that the formal process was important because it allowed them to have time with other individuals who have been successful in administrative roles. They also stated that in the formal process individuals that may not feel that they have time for the mentoring process can develop a plan and carve out time for their mentee. The administrators also felt the formal process provided mentees with a freedom to seek counsel when needed outside of the formal process. Therefore, for the most part, the administrative leaders participating in the interviews felt that retention was an institutional barrier because most institutions focus on retaining students, but none of the retention efforts focus on administrators, faculty or staff. In fact, most of them reported that in their administrative roles it was disheartening not to have an institutional focus on the retention of administrators, faculty and staff. They felt that their institutions expend a sizeable amount of
budgeted funds on recruitment, and derive no direct benefit from the funds spent when the institution fails to retain those employees.

**Summary of Retention Themes**

The overriding theme for retention is that the UREP minority administrative leaders participating in this study perceive that there are no substantive retention strategies in place for administrators at their higher education institutions. Most of the respondents felt that formal and informal mentoring programs would be effective as part of the retention process, but they believed that most institutions devote resources or the proper amount of focus to retention outside of the resources and focus devoted to student retention. They were also keenly aware of the financial liabilities that their institutions absorb by spending on recruitment, but not having programs in place to retain the institutions valuable human resources.

**Research Question 3: What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the socialization of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?**

This research question was specifically addressed in interview questions six and seven. The specific interview questions were: #6 – What are some of the values and beliefs that you have learned during your career that you feel have assisted you with adapting to your administrative role; and #7 – What are some of the things that you value or believe strongly in that you feel may hinder you in your administrative role? An analysis of the responses to these interview questions resulted in identification of the factors important to the socialization of UREP minority administrative leaders.
Factors for Socialization

Socialization is “a continuing process whereby an individual acquires a personal identity and learns the norms, values, behaviors and social skills appropriate to his or her social position” (Dictionary.com). The questions on socialization focused on the administrators’ values and beliefs, and their values and beliefs assisted them with adapting to their administrative roles. All of the administrators articulated that mentoring was also a part of the socialization process. The respondents also expressed that there are overarching values, principles and beliefs that are held by most institutions of higher education. The respondents felt that the core values of higher education are learned across institutions, however, individuals need a mentor or people that are willing to include them in their groups or take their under their wing to assist with institution specific socialization. One administrator stated that he held what he called his “guiding principles” to help him stay on track. He also stated that his principles required him to be an ethical leader and always “do right by his principles.” However, one administrator also felt that “doing what you feel is the right thing will also get you in trouble” because minorities and women often hold cultural beliefs that require decisions to fall in the category of doing the greater good. She felt this was a social belief that does not seem to line up with the culture of advancement on her campus, which feels like “every man for himself [sic]” when it comes to career advancement. This administrator also stated that sometimes these cultural beliefs might even be counterintuitive to the socialization process because “taking someone under your wing and ‘teaching’ them the ropes flies in the face of a competitive environment where every man must look out for himself or herself [sic].”

Another administrator identified the importance of inclusiveness and understanding diversity as part of creating an environment conducive to the socialization process. She went on
to state that understanding the importance and benefits of diversity need to be promoted campus-wide, and there must be buy-in from the top down for the understanding to be the norm and not the exception. This administrator also mentioned conscious and unconscious bias as hindrances to socialization, and stated a need for environmental assessments and teaching competencies to assist with awareness of unconscious bias.

In addition, several of the administrators mentioned that they had implemented monthly “meet and greets” to assist with socialization. They also stated that when they were aware that new administrators, faculty and staff were joining the campus community they took them to lunch on their first day and prepared a welcome package with information about the community that might be of interest to members of the UREP minority populations. The packets included general information about the local community, such as hair stylists specializing in ethnic hair care and specific religious affiliations.

Summary of Socialization Themes

Based on the respondents’ comments and analysis of the data, the overarching theme for socialization is that most institutions lack a formal process. However, many of the UREP minority administrative leaders recognize the importance of the socialization process, and many are implementing informal processes and programs at their institutions in order to improve the overall combined process of recruitment, retention and socialization at their institutions.

Summary

The findings from survey instrument and interview phase of the study were reported. The most important recruitment, retention and socialization strategies were identified using the survey instrument. Then the interview phase provided additional data to support the survey findings, with the researcher identifying themes around the most important factors and barriers to
effective recruitment, retention and socialization at higher education institutions in West Virginia as perceived by UREP minority administrative leaders. This chapter presented the findings and chapter five contains a summary of findings, implications and recommendations.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In chapter two, the literature review provided an overview of the recruitment, retention and socialization of UREP minority populations to administrative leadership positions in higher education. Chapter Three outlined the quantitative and qualitative research methods used to conduct this mixed methods study, which consisted of an online survey instrument and interviews of UREP minority administrative leaders at higher education institutions in West Virginia. An analysis of the data resulted in the development of themes around the issue of the most important factors in recruitment, retention and socialization as perceived by the UREP minority administrative leaders. The researcher presented the study findings of the survey instrument and interviews in Chapter Four. Chapter Five contains further discussion and summary of the research findings, and it provides implications and conclusions based on the study findings.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assist higher education institutions, specifically those in West Virginia, with identifying what types of recruitment and retention, leadership development, mentoring and socialization strategies are most effective in meeting both the institutional and personal needs of underrepresented minority populations when seeking administrative leadership positions at West Virginia institutions of higher education. Based on the findings of the study, West Virginia higher education institutions can develop and maintain effective strategies to diversify leadership roles at their institutions. The researcher explored this research topic because of her interest in higher education in the State of West Virginia. Additionally, the researcher’s
interests prompted her to study how higher education institutions in West Virginia would adapt to declining populations within the state and changing national demographics when recruiting individuals to fill administrative leadership roles. The following research questions were addressed in this study:

- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the recruitment of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education?
- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the retention of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?
- What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the socialization of UREP minorities in higher education administrative leadership positions?

**Methods**

The methods utilized to collect data for this research study included an online survey instrument sent via email to UREP minorities serving in administrative leadership positions at West Virginia higher education institutions. The survey contained factors identified by a scholarly review of the literature. Interview questions were created to assess the UREP minorities’ perceptions in phase two of the study or the oral interview process.

**Results**

**Recruitment.** As a result of completing the study, the data collected revealed the most important factors in the recruitment process as perceived by the UREP minority administrative leaders. The factors identified by the respondents completing the survey instrument were career
advancement and professional development, geographical location, type of institution and institutional diversity. These findings are supported by the scholarly literature on recruitment and retention (Turner & Myers, 2000; Kayes & Singley, 2005; Hood, Miller & Pope, 1999). Additionally, the UREP minority administrative leaders participating in the interview process also identified career advancement, professional development and geographical location as the important factors in recruitment process.

Two factors were considered important in both the survey and interview phases. However, the factor that was most consistent throughout the responses was career advancement and professional development, which speaks to the fact that all of the administrative leaders were interested in building careers in higher education. They also were consistent in expressing the desire to work at institutions that would allow them to grow as administrators, which included participating in various professional development opportunities to grow and further develop skill sets essential to their success.

Geographical location was important in both phases of the study, and it was just as important to natives as it was to non-natives. Natives seemed to view geographical location in terms of proximity to family members and the ability to give back to their communities. Non-natives viewed geographical location more in terms of access, such as their ability to travel and geographical location in relation to larger, more urban areas. Additionally, both natives and non-natives regarded geographic location in a similar light when it was in reference to family-oriented communities.

Retention and Socialization. The results of the study suggested that the UREP minority administrative leaders felt that their institutions did not focus on retention or socialization, and there were often no plans or programs in place to address these issues. Despite the fact that most
of the respondents felt that there was a lack of focus on retention and socialization, they all felt strongly about the importance of retention and socialization in the success of all new employees to include administrators, faculty and staff. The administrative leaders also expressed that they felt that one of the most effective tools used as part of the retention and socialization processes was mentoring, which is consistent with the literature (Allison, 1999; Bond & Pyle, 1998; Roueche et al., 2008). With this in mind, several of the administrators developed mentoring programs specific to their departments and/or areas of responsibility to address retention and socialization issues. The administrative leaders also developed informal networks to assist new hires that are members of UREP to adapt to the campus culture and to assist new hires from feeling lonely and isolated (McCoy, 2006).

Implications

Understanding the institutional and personal factors that are most effective in attracting members of UREP minority populations to higher education institutions in West Virginia was an important first step in identifying ways to enhance institutional recruitment, retention and the socialization processes. Many insights were obtained through the scholarly review of the literature and the thoughtful reflections provided by the administrative leaders informing this study, which has the potential to inform and sustain substantive proactive strategies for recruitment, retention and socialization. Many of the institutions had effective recruitment strategies, but failed to implement effective retention and socialization strategies on campus. This can often be attributed to the cultural norm of individualism in academia, which tends to inhibit the act of collegiality or reaching out to assist colleagues. Consequently, this results in UREP members feeling more isolated than their majority counterparts (McCoy, 2006).
One way to address these issues is to design accountability measures to ensure the effective implementation of inclusion goals focused on retention and socialization. Many institutions struggle with processes that require cultural changes, especially when the efforts are decentralized. The process can be successful when it is a balanced approach implemented by the president, provost, vice presidents, and deans moving downward through the system. However, this requires commitment and understanding among the ranks of senior-level administrators before any policies or systems are put in place. Once this is accomplished, department chairs and managerial staff must buy into the goals, which allows for partnerships to be formed and progress to be monitored. Without a team of “believers,” accountability measures and monitoring, institutions will fail to make progress in effectively implementing recruitment, retention and socialization strategies, and will fail with retention and socialization.

In addition, effective strategies require shared responsibility. When only one or two administrative leaders buy in or only one or two departments implement strategies, there is the risk of burnout from those bearing the burden of the programs within the individual departments. There is also a risk that the UREP administrators will leave because they feel unappreciated and devalued by the lack of buy in. Institutions also risk lack of buy in from majority administrators, as a result of perceived lack of concern on an institutional level. For example, if an institution starts a formal mentoring program for UREP minority administrators or even a program for all junior administrators, the program must be discussed and shared with all members of the campus community for institutional buy-in to occur.

There must also be institutional assessment of the recruitment, retention and socialization strategies. Often programs fail to continue because there is no formal evaluation process. It is also important that the assessments are shared across campus, so that the campus community is
informed about what members of UREP minority populations feel about being on the campus. The process of soliciting the opinions and participation of underrepresented groups to enhance inclusion is strongly supported by the literature.

Therefore, the implementation of effective recruitment, retention and socialization strategies can be broken down into the following steps:

- Institutional leadership buy-in and adequate administrative support,
- Campus-wide opportunities to contribute and participate,
- Development of a formal evaluation process and monitoring progress, and
- Creation of institutional structure that facilitates accountability and evaluation goals.

Conclusions

The study findings from the survey instrument and oral interview of the UREP minority administrative leaders demonstrates that the administrators’ perceptions are consistent with the review of the scholarly literature on recruitment. The institutional and personal factors identified in the literature as essential to the development of effective recruitment strategies, were also identified during the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study. However, the study findings suggest that institutions need additional information and knowledge on the development of effective retention and socialization strategies.

Recommendations for Future Study

This study focused on UREP minority administrative leaders’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the recruitment, retention and socialization strategies utilized by higher education institutions, specifically those in West Virginia. Because the findings of the study suggest that institutions are more effective in their recruitment efforts, but not in retention and socialization, additional research and study is needed on effective retention and socialization
strategies for UREP minority administrators. This study focused on UREP minority administrative leaders and their experiences with higher education institutions in West Virginia. The study is not easily generalized outside of the State of West Virginia, except for other states in Appalachia that may have similar demographics as West Virginia.

Additional study and research on the plight of underrepresented minority populations in West Virginia higher education would also add depth to this study. Developing the understanding of the UREP minority experience in the academy, especially as it applies to the state of West Virginia, will increase institutional ability to develop effective recruitment, retention and socialization strategies. In addition, the small population of UREP minority administrative leaders in West Virginia suggests the study could be expanded regionally to increase the number of UREP minority administrative leaders included in the research. Finally, this study did not differentiate between types of organizations, which means the study could also be expanded to determine which types of institutions (i.e. HBCUs, Private Colleges, Universities, Community Colleges, etc.) have the most effective recruitment, retention and socialization strategies for UREP minority administrative leaders.

Summary

This chapter provided a summary and discussion of the research study, a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The review of the findings was based on the perceptions of the UREP minority administrative leaders participating in this study. The implications were based on the findings and the research questions, with recommendations offered on further study of effective recruitment, retention and socialization strategies for UREP minority administrative leaders.
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APPENDIX B
Dear Higher Education Administrative Leader:

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled *Recruitment, Retention and Socialization of Underrepresented Minority Populations to West Virginia Higher Education Administrative Leadership Positions* designed to analyze participants’ perceptions of the institutional and personal factors most effective in attracting members of underrepresented minority groups to administrative leadership positions at institutions of higher education, specifically higher education institutions in West Virginia. The study is being conducted by Dr. Louis Watts and Ms. Dedriell D. Taylor from Marshall University. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation research requirements for Ms. Taylor.

This survey is comprised of twenty-seven questions, including demographic questions, and should take less than thirty minutes to complete. The survey may be found at the link attached in the email you are receiving and is to be completed using Survey Monkey at the link shown. At the end of the survey you will be asked if you are interested in participating in an additional interview by phone, in person, or email. If you choose to provide contact information such as your phone number or email address, your survey responses may no longer be anonymous to the researcher. However, no names or identifying information would be included in any publications or presentations based on these data, and your responses to this survey will remain confidential.

If you choose not to participate you may simply delete the email and the survey link. You may choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Accessing the survey through the provided link indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Dr. Louis Watts at (304) 746-1933 or wattsl@marshall.edu or Dedriell D. Taylor at (304) 256-2642 or taylor89@marshall.edu.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at (304) 696-4303.

By completing this survey and returning it you are also confirming that you are 18 years of age or older.

Please keep this page for your records.

Sincerely,

Dedriell D. Taylor, Ed.S.
Marshall University
Doctoral Student
Section I: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the following influenced your decision to accept your administrative leadership role in higher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutional reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Geographical location of the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reputation of the administration, faculty and staff at the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of students enrolled at the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of facilities and institutional technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Opportunities for career advancement and professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mentoring opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Institutional diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Salary offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Benefits package (health, retirement, relocation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Type of institution (Liberal Arts, Public, Private, Community College, HBCU, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intercollegiate athletic programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Socialization opportunities on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Socialization opportunities within the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Quality of life within the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Employment opportunities for spouse/partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Quality of P-12 education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Availability of childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Access to religious affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II: Did you participate in any of the following prior to assuming your current administrative leadership role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enrollment in advanced degree or certification program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Development specific to your role/title at your institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section III: Have you engaged in each of the following activities during past twelve (12) months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enrollment in advanced degree or certification program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Development specific to your role/title at your institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IV: What is your sex?
1. Male  
2. Female

Section V: What is your marital status?
1. Single  
2. Married  
3. Civil Union  
4. Domestic Partnership  
5. Divorced/Separated  
6. Other (specify) ____________________________

Section V: How would you describe yourself?
1. American Indian/Alaskan Native  
2. Asian  
3. Black/African American  
4. Hispanic/Latino  
5. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander  
6. White  
7. Other (specify) ____________________________

Section VI: What is the highest educational level you have completed?
1. Associate or Two-year Degree  
2. Bachelor or Four-Year Degree  
3. Master’s Degree  
4. Doctoral Degree – Ph.D./Ed.D.  
5. Professional Degree – medical, dental, law, etc.  
6. Other type of degree or training (specify) ____________________________  
7. Don’t Know
Section IX: Which of the following describes your current leadership role?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>President/Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Provost/Chief Academic Officer (CFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer (CFO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Chief Operations Officer (COO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chief Technology Officer (CTO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Senior Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Vice President (including Assistant VP or Associate VP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Dean (including Assistant Dean or Associate Dean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Athletic Director (including Assistant Director or Associate Director)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Administrative Leadership Interview Questions

Administrator Interview Questions

1. What factors do you believe helped you to be recruited to your position?

2. What do you believe are the factors that enable other minorities to be recruited to administrative roles in higher education?

3. What are some of the things that you believe assist your institutions with retaining you in your position?

4. What are some of the factors that you believe would assist your institution in retaining other minorities to administrative positions?

5. What are some of the things that you feel hinder or act as a barrier to recruiting and retaining minorities to administrative leadership roles at institutions in WV?

6. What are some of the values and beliefs that you have learned during your career that you feel have assisted you with adapting to your administrative role?

7. What are some of the things that you value or believe strongly in that you feel may hinder you in your administrative role?
# FREQUENCY TABLES

**Quantitative Survey Results – Frequency of Responses (Percentage)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment, Retention and Socialization Factors</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reputation</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location of the Institution</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of the administration, faculty and staff at the institution</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of students enrolled at the institution</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of facilities and institutional technology</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for career advancement and professional development</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring opportunities</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional diversity</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary offer</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits package (health, retirement, relocation, etc.)</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of institution (Liberal Arts, Public, Private, Community College, HBCU, etc.)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletic programs</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization opportunities on campus</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization opportunities within the local community</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life within the local community</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities for spouse/partner</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of P-12 education</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of childcare</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to religious affiliation</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Quantitative Survey Results – Frequency of Responses (Total Responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment, Retention and Socialization Factors</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reputation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location of the Institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of the administration, faculty and staff at the institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of students enrolled at the institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of facilities and institutional technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for career advancement and professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional diversity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary offer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits package (health, retirement, relocation, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of institution (Liberal Arts, Public, Private, Community College, HBCU, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletic programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization opportunities on campus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization opportunities within the local community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life within the local community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities for spouse/partner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of P-12 education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of childcare</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to religious affiliation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10

**Sex of Respondents (Interview Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11

**Respondents Marital Status (Interview Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Union</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Partnership</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12

**Race/Ethnicity of Respondents (Interview Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

**Education Level of Respondents (Interview Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate or Two-Year Degree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor or Four-Year Degree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>20.0%*</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree – Ph.D./Ed.D.</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree – medical, dental, law, etc.</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of degree or training (specify)*</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Doctoral Candidate

Table 14

**Type of Institution Respondents Employed (Interview Phase)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Institution</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institution</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically Black College and University (HBCU)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School (medical, dental, law, etc.)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Administrative Leadership Role of Respondents (Interview Phase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President/Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost/Chief Academic Officer (CAO)</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer (CFO)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Operations Officer (COO)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Technology Officer (CTO)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President (including Assistant or Associate VP)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean (including Assistant or Associate Dean)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director (including Assistant or Associate Director)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director (including Assistant or Associate Director)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITATIVE DATA MATRICES

Table 16

Research Question and Interview Question Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Corresponding Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the recruitment of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education? | Question 1  
Question 2  
Question 5 |
| What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the retention of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education? | Question 3  
Question 4  
Question 5 |
| What are the main factors and strategies members of UREP minority populations perceive as the most effective in the socialization of UREP minorities to administrative leadership positions in higher education? | Question 6  
Question 7 |

Table 17

Qualitative Data Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Most Effective</th>
<th>WHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

*Qualitative Data Sorting Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to Questions</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices (recruitment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best practices (retention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices (socialization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Code/Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code and Sort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Color</th>
<th>1=Blue</th>
<th>2=Red</th>
<th>3=Green</th>
<th>4=Orange</th>
<th>5=Yellow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
WEST VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUIONS IN THE STUDY

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission

- Bluefield State College
- Concord University
- Fairmont State College
- Glenville State College
- Marshall University
- Potomac State College of West Virginia University
- Shepherd University
- West Liberty University
- West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine
- West Virginia State University
- West Virginia University
- West Virginia University of Technology
- Higher Education Collaborative – Erma Byrd Higher Education Center

Community and Technical College System of West Virginia

- Blue Ridge Community and Technical College
- Bridge Valley Community and Technical College
- Eastern West Virginia Community and Technical College
- Mountwest Community and Technical College
- New River Community and Technical College
• Pierpont Community and Technical College
• Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College
• West Virginia Northern Community College
• West Virginia University Parkersburg

**West Virginia Independent Colleges and Universities**

• Alderson Broadus University
• Appalachian Bible College
• Bethany College
• Davis and Elkins College
• Ohio Valley University
• Wheeling Jesuit University
• West Virginia Wesleyan College
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CURRICULUM VITAE

Dedriell D. Taylor

Academic Degrees
Marshall University (December 2016)
Doctor of Education – Educational Leadership

Marshall University (May 2002)
Education Specialist – Leadership Studies

Marshall University (May 1999)
Master of Science – Management

West Virginia University (August 1992)
Bachelor of Arts – Sociology and Anthropology

Professional Experience
Clinical Applications Specialist (2015 – present)
WVDHHR Bureau for Behavioral Health and Health Facilities – Jackie Withrow Hospital

Assistant Professor/Outreach Coordinator (2014 – 2015)
University of Charleston – Beckley Campus

Director of Girl Leadership Experience (2014)
Girl Scouts of Black Diamond Council

Enrollment Coordinator/Education Department Recruitment Liaison (2013)
University of Charleston – Beckley Campus

West Virginia State University

Assistant Director – Center for the Advancement of STEM (2007 – 2010)
West Virginia State University

Grants and Contracts
NASA SEMAA Afterschool Partnership (2012-2013)
Beckley Area Foundation ($3500)

NASA Science, Engineering, Mathematics and Aerospace Academy (2009-2012)
National Aeronautics and Space Administration ($2,000,000)

National Summer Transportation Institute (2007-2011)
Federal Highway Administration and West Virginia Department of Highways ($250,000)

Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (2007-2010)
National Science Foundation ($150,000)

Pre-College Summer Math and Science Institute (2007-2009)
WV EPSCoR ($75,000)

WV Higher Education Policy Commission ($7500)

United States DHHS, Administration for Children and Families ($750,000)

**Professional Presentations (select)**

Taylor, D. (2013). A Qualitative Study of KY-WV LSAMP Participants’ Perception Regarding the Effectiveness of the Program in their Persistence Toward Graduation. Presentation at the 25th Annual Ethnographic and Qualitative Research Conference. June 7-8, Cedarville, OH.


**Professional Development**
Microsoft Access 2013 Level I, II, and III (2016)
West Virginia Office of Technology, Technology Learning Center

Program Planning and Evaluation (2013)
Marshall University College of Education and Professional Development

Sponsored Program Administration Level II (2009)
Fundamentals of Sponsored Program Administration (2008)
National Council of University Research Administrators

Certificate in Fundraising Management (2004)
The Indiana University Lilly School of Philanthropy
The Fund Raising School at Indiana University—Purdue University Indianapolis

Leadership Mercer-Tazewell, Class of 2003/2004
The Greater Bluefield Chamber of Commerce

The Grantsmanship Training Program (2003)
The Grantsmanship Center