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ABSTRACT

Hypothesized from socialization conceptual frameworks and the research question, who learns what, from whom (and how much), under what circumstances, and with what effects, it was found that quite a few of new faculty's socioeconomic backgrounds, experiences, socializers, and faculty development programs were found to be related to their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes. These findings have some ramifications on both academic and practical undertakings of not only Thai higher education institutions but also for their counterparts around the world as well. However, this study needs some replication here in Thailand and abroad if a more confident generalization on socialization of new faculty can be drawn in the years to come.

INTRODUCTION

Early career experience is a critical period for faculty members’ career success and satisfaction in the long run (Boice, 1992; 1993; Whitt, 1991). At the same time, new faculty members typically face various challenges in their early career adjustment, including mastering teaching and research skills, balancing multiple work responsibilities, exploring institutional cultures, unraveling the implicit and often mixed messages about institutional expectations, adjusting to the solitude academic lifestyle, and the lack of collegiality in the academic working environment (Austin, 1992; Boice, 1992; Dunn, Seff & Rouse, 1994; Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992; Rice, Sorcinelli & Austin, 2000, Sorcinelli, 1998; Whitt, 1991). Despite various challenges that new faculty members confront, the academic institutions often expect new faculty members learn their ropes as quickly as possible, as the Elizabeth Whitt’s expression goes, “Hit the Ground Running” (Whitt, 1991). However, in order for new faculty members to thrive with satisfaction in their career, colleges and Universities need to have effective faculty development approaches and institutional support in place. To develop effective
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faculty development programs and institutional support for new faculty members, administrators, faculty developers, and other person involved need essential information on new faculty socialization or be able to answer the key research question of this study, "Who learns what, from whom (and how much), under what circumstances, and with what effects?"

Most of the previous research on new faculty either study experiences of new faculty members in a single discipline from many institutions or experiences of new faculty members from various disciplines in a single institution (Finkelstein & LaCelle-Peterson in Austin, 1992). Rarely is a study that explores the socialization experiences of new faculty members from many disciplines at a number of different institutions. In addition, most studies on this topic are done in the North American context, particularly in the United States which confronted the situation of faculty shortage during the 1990s. However, some other countries in other parts of the world, such as Thailand, are likely to face the similar problem as a large cohort of senior faculty members are going to retire in the near future. Therefore, studies on new faculty socialization are in a great demand. However, due to differences in national and institutional cultures, new faculty development approaches based on data about new faculty socialization in the United States may not be directly applicable in different cultural contexts. Therefore, to enhance faculty development and institutional support for new faculty in Thai universities, studies about new faculty socialization in Thai universities need to be in place. Last but not least, previous studies in North America on new faculty socialization broadly describe numbers of factors that influence new faculty socialization, such as senior faculty members, colleagues, mentors, chairpersons, deans, supporting staffs, and various faculty development interventions (Dunn, Seff, & Rouse, 1994). However, few of those previous studies identified and compared the extent to which each of those factors actually influence the outcomes of new faculty socialization in different major areas of faculty work responsibilities, including teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative work. This study intends to fill many gaps of knowledge on new faculty in the research aforementioned.

The Purposes of the Research

1. To identify variables (including their weights) that influence new faculty socialization into each academic role.

2. To identify the relationships between the weights given to each variable that influences new faculty socialization into each academic role and new faculty's levels of being socialized/learning outcomes in each academic role.

Literature Review

The conceptual frameworks of this study are based on the following five areas of literature related to this study:

1. socialization theories;
2. new faculty experiences;
3. disciplinary differences; 4. faculty work responsibilities; and 5. dimensions and levels of learning/socialization outcomes

1. Socialization theories.

The core question of the socialization process is: "Who learns what, from whom (and how much), under what circumstances, and with what effects?" (Greeneinstein, 1986) The socialization process can be described as a process in which novices learn about their jobs as well as the organizational cultures. It has been conceptualized from two perspectives: traditional and interpretive. From the traditional perspective, socialization is a cultural-acquisition process, a one-way process, in which novices need to assimilate into the dominant culture. Alternatively, from
the interpretive perspective, socialization is defined as “a cultural process that involves the exchange of patterns of thought and action” (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; p. 21) or a bi-directional socialization process (Tierney, 1997; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). That is, while an organization can shape a newcomer’s values, attitudes, and behaviors through a socialization process, newcomers also are encouraged to contribute to changes in the organization.

Socialization process can be delineated into two stages: (1) anticipatory socialization (2) organizational socialization. Anticipatory socialization can be described as a process in which a prospective member gains knowledge, skills, and values pertaining to the roles in the organization to which he or she aspires. Organizational socialization occurs when the novices initially encounter and adjust to their new organization. Van Maanen and Schein analyze the organization socialization process and propose that it composes of 6 dimensions including: collective versus individual socialization; formal versus informal socialization; sequential versus random socialization; fixed versus variable socialization; serial versus disjunctive socialization; and investiture versus divestiture socialization

2. New faculty socialization.

Early academic career is a critical time in which new faculty with full enthusiasm often face various challenges in the process of early career adjustment. Therefore, institution needs to provide a supportive working environment to facilitate new faculty’s transition to their new career and workplace. Studies broadly identify major sources of career support for new faculty career socialization, in which this study use as a frame/basis for further exploration. For example, Parson, Stands, and Duane (1992) identified keys career supporters sequentially as follows: spouse or off-campus personal support, colleagues within the academic unit, and professional support outside the academic units, including administrators as well as on and off-campus colleagues.

According to Olsen & Socinelli’s study, new faculty members rate their career supporters from most to least in the following sequence: colleagues outside their department, untenured faculty members, the chairperson, deans, and tenured/senior faculty members. Studies particularly show that the chairperson can have a crucial influence on the early career adjustment of new faculty members, either negatively or positively (Dunn, Rouse, and Seff, 1994; Parson, Stands, and Duane, 1992; Daly and Townsend, 1992; Wheelers, 1992). In terms of institutional support, numbers of research study effectiveness of various different models of faculty development interventions, such as orientation, teaching workshops, workshops to improve faculty research productivity, mentoring programs, etc. In fact, most research on faculty development in the Thai context concerns faculty development models and evaluate the effectiveness of faculty development programs (Sinararat, 1994).

3. Disciplinary differences.

A number of researchers have developed classifications of disciplines (Lodahl and Gordon, 1972; Biglan; 1973; Becher, 1987; Braxton and Hargens, 1996). According to Braxton and Hargens (1996), what these classifications have in common is that they were developed from the assumption that the level of consensus varies among disciplines. In general, the physical sciences often are categorized as high-consensus fields. In contrast, the social sciences and humanities typically are characterized as low-consensus fields. Such variations are reflected in the differences in appropriate theoretical orientations, research methods, and the relative importance of research questions. It also affects other aspects of academic life such as the rate of publication, work priorities, and levels of collegiality.

The classification of disciplines, which is used in many studies, is that of Becher. According to this model, disciplines can be divided into four major groups:
- Pure-hard/ hard sciences including Physics, Chemistry
- Applied-hard/ applied sciences including Engineering and Medicine
- Pure-soft/ humanities including Philosophy, Literature
- Applied-soft/ social sciences including Education, Criminology

4. **Academic roles.**

Academic roles are faculty work responsibilities which typically include teaching, research, and community service, which are consistent with the three main missions of higher education. Recently, Ernest Boyers (1990) proposed a new way to conceptualize faculty works as the **scholarships**, which include the scholarship of teaching (which can be equated to the teaching role), the scholarship of discovery (which can be equated to the research role), the scholarship of integration (which can be equated to the production of other forms of academic works, such as translated works, multidisciplinary works, knowledge synthesis works), and the scholarship of application/engagement (which can be equated to community service role).

Besides teaching, research, and community service, some academics particularly in some developing countries also add arts and cultural preservation and administrative work as academic roles (Devahastin Na Ayudhya, 2001; Sinlarat, 2000).

5. **Concepts of dimensions and levels of learning outcomes.**

Behaviorists often measure the achievement of the learning outcomes based on whether they match with the identified behavioral objectives. According to Gilley and Eggland (1989), human resource developers, behavioral outcomes that reflect the achievement of the learning objectives can be classified into three domains/dimensions: cognitive domain, affective domain, and psychomotor domain. This classification is consistent with how learning objectives are classified in the Bloom’s taxonomy. Each domain has levels of behaviors for determining progression toward the learning objectives, which can be put into a scale from the simple to the complex levels as follows. Cognitive domain has 6 levels: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Affective domain has 5 levels: receiving, responding, valuing, organization, characterization by a value. Psychomotor domain has 5 levels: perception, set, guided response, mechanism, complex overt response.

In this study, the dependent variables are the learning outcomes which are classified, according to Gilley and Eggland’s classification of the expected behavioral outcomes or behavioral objectives, into three domains including cognitive domain, affective domain, and psychomotor domain.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined in the context in which they are used in this study.

*New faculty* is defined as faculty members who are university employees at the following four Thai public universities: Chulalongkorn University, Thammasat University, Mahidol University, Kasetsart University. These faculty members are employed between 1999-2003 and have never been employed as faculty members before their current academic employment.

*New faculty socialization* is defined from the socializer’s perspective as a process of enabling new faculty to learn the five academic roles (including teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative and clerical work), through experiences, socializers, and faculty development programs. From the socializee’s perspective, socialization is a process in which new faculty members learn the aforementioned five academic roles through experiences, socializers and faculty development activities. This research emphasizes this latter definition of socialization, however.
Context or circumstance is defined as conditions, situations, environment that enable new faculty to learn multiple work responsibilities. Specifically in this study, context or circumstance refers to experiences (including graduate study, teaching/research assistant, trial and error experiences) and faculty development programs (including participation in the internal and external workshops as well as in the orientation).

Socializer is defined as persons who enable new faculty to learn the multiple work responsibilities/each academic role. Specifically in this study, socializers include senior faculty members, peers, mentors, chairpersons, deans/associate deans, and supporting staff.

Socializee is defined as new faculty with an employment status as university employees drawn from the aforesaid four Thai universities, totaling 185.

Socioeconomic backgrounds include institution (universities in which new faculty are employed), gender, age, educational levels, father's occupation, discipline affiliation, alumni/non-alumni status, being an alumnus at which degree level.

Being an alumnus at which degree level means the degree that new faculty obtained from the universities that they identified that they are affiliated with as an alumnus.

Discipline is a particular field of study at the universities.

Pure-hard disciplines are fields of study in the physical sciences (such as biology and chemistry)

Applied-hard disciplines are fields of study in the applied sciences (such as medicine and engineering)

Pure-soft disciplines are fields of study in humanities (such as history and languages)

Applied-soft disciplines are fields of study in professional areas and social sciences that emphasize practicality (such as education, accounting, and commerce)

Multiple work responsibilities are academic roles of faculty members including teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work.

Levels of being socialized or learning outcomes are the achievement in the behavioral learning objectives, which are classified into three domains: cognitive domain, affective domain, and psychomotor domain. Specifically in this study, cognitive domain refers to learning outcomes/achievement at the low level (those with low score or 1); affective domain refers to learning outcomes/achievement at the moderate/intermediate level (those with moderate/intermediate score or 2); and psychomotor domain refers to learning outcomes/achievement at the high level (those with high score or 3).

Hypotheses of the Study

Based on the conceptual frameworks on new faculty socialization or the question, "Who learns what, from whom (and how much), under what circumstances, and with what effects?", it is hypothesized that (see also the aforesaid diagram):

1. Socioeconomic backgrounds of new faculty are related to their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role.

2. Importance or weight new faculty give to each experience influencing their socialization into each academic role is related to their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role.

3. Importance or weight new faculty give to each socializer influencing their socialization into each academic role is related to their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role.

4. Importance or weight new faculty give to each staff development program influencing their socialization into each academic role is related to their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role.
Conceptual Framework

**Independent variables**

**Socioeconomic backgrounds:**
- Institution
- Gender
- Age
- Educational levels
- Father's occupation
- Disciplinary affiliation
- Alumni/non-alumni
- Being an alumni at which degree level(s)

**Variables that influence socialization:**

**Experiences**
- Graduate study
- Teaching/research assistant
- Trial and errors

**Socializers**
- Senior faculty members
- Peers
- Mentors
- Chairpersons
- Deans/Associate deans
- Support staff

**Faculty Development Programs**
- Orientations
- Internal seminars, trainings, and workshops
- External seminars, trainings, and workshops

**Dependent variables**

**Levels of being socialized/learning outcomes in teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work:**

- Cognitive domain (1)
- Affective domain (2)
- Psychomotor domain (3)
METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

Population consists 1,005 new faculty, defined in this study as faculty who are hired between 1999-2003 with the employment status as university employees at the following Thai universities: Chulalongkorn University, Thammasat University, Kasetsart University, and Mahidol University. The population is further classified into four disciplinary areas: pure-hard disciplines, applied-hard disciplines, pure-soft disciplines, applied-soft disciplines. The 303 samples are randomly drawn out from 1,005 new faculty, stratified by their university and disciplinary affiliation, using criteria set up by Arkin and Coltan.

Instrumentation and Statistical Treatment

Data are collected through a questionnaire that the researcher carefully developed to ensure its validity and objectivity by observing the like questionnaires and research methodology. With regard to the reliability of the questionnaire items, the Cronbach test has revealed that the reliability of the dependent variables is about 93%.

Time and space do not allow the researcher to present the questionnaire in detail but the questionnaire itself can be divided into 3 parts: the first part includes 8 questionnaire items that measure informants’ demographic backgrounds, including their university affiliation, gender, age, educational levels, father’s occupation, disciplinary affiliation, alumni/non-alumni, being an alumnus at which degree level(s). The second part measures the extent to which experiences, socializers, and faculty development activities influence new faculty socialization into each academic role (including teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, administrative/clerical work) and the questions posed for each variable are as follows:

1. To what extent do experiences (including graduate study, experiences as teaching/research assistants, trial and error) contribute to your learning about teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work? (scale running from 1-5: 1 is the least; 5, the most)

2. To what extent do socializers (including senior faculty members, peers, mentors, chairpersons, deans/ associate deans, and supporting staff) contribute to your learning about teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work? (scale running from 1-5: 1 is the least; 5, the most)

3. To what extent do faculty development programs (including Orientations; internal seminars, trainings, and workshops; external seminars, trainings, and workshops) contribute to your learning about teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work? (scale running from 1-5: 1 being the least; 5, the most)

The third part measures the levels of new faculty learning outcomes in each academic role, which can be classified into 3 levels: low or level 1, moderate or level 2, and high level or level 3 and the question posed for each variable is as follows:

What is the level of your learning outcomes in teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work? (Scale running from 1-3: 1 being low; 3, high)

In terms of data and statistical treatment, a running of frequency of the variables studied is administered in order to see the distribution of the responses to the questionnaire items on socioeconomic backgrounds, experiences, socializers, faculty development programs, and the level of learning outcomes. With regards to the relationships between variables as shown in the conceptual framework, cross tabulation, Chi-square and Kendall’s tau c have been administered and results analyzed. A relationship with a statistical significance of at least .05 or higher is accepted.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Out of 303 samples, 185 or approximately 61.06% of the samples studied have returned the questionnaires. Research findings can be concluded as follows:

1. From an analysis of the respondents who returned the questionnaires, it was found that 65 (35.10%) are from Chulalongkorn university; 26 (14.10%) from Thammasat university; 52 (28.10%) from Mahidol university; and 42 (22.70%) from Kasetsart university. As of the other socioeconomic backgrounds of the new faculty studied, it was found that the majority of them are female, 31-35 years of age, belonging to civil servant families, graduating with an M.S. degree, applied science orientation, alumni of the institutions where they belonged, and alumni resulting from obtaining two degrees or more.

2. From an analysis of the frequencies of new faculty’s levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role, it was found that the majority of them got high scores on teaching (64.30%) and research (44.90%), while their scores on community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work are at a moderate level (45.40%; 47.60%; and 54.6% respectively). However, when compared the mean of all levels of being socialized or learning outcomes, it was found that new faculty score the highest on teaching ($\bar{X}=2.74$) followed by research ($\bar{X}=2.39$), community service ($\bar{X}=2.33$) and administrative/clerical work ($\bar{X}=2.12$), respectively, while arts and cultural preservation score the lowest ($\bar{X}=2.05$).

The above findings reflect the fact that new faculty need further support with role learning in the areas of community service, administrative/clerical work, as well as arts and cultural preservation. Accordingly, universities need to better focus their attention to facilitate new faculty socialization into these three academic roles, if they seriously consider these academic functions as the important missions of the university and expect new faculty to perform them well with high standard.

3. From an analysis of the frequencies of the importance or weight new faculty give to experiences influencing their socialization into each academic role, it was found that the most influential experience for new faculty socialization into teaching and research roles is being teaching/research assistants (TA/RA) ($\bar{X}=4.29, 4.32$); the most influential experience for new faculty socialization into community service role is graduate study ($\bar{X}=3.29$); and the most influential experience for new faculty socialization into arts and cultural preservation and administrative/clerical work roles is trial and error ($\bar{X}=2.86, 3.28$).

The above findings are consistent with what is said in previous research and literature that faculty socialization occurs prior to academic appointment or what is known as anticipatory socialization (Bess, 1967; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Furthermore, these findings also suggest that the graduate study programs and the provision of teaching/research assistant employment program should place a greater emphasis on socializing graduate students or prospective faculty members into the academic roles which are often neglected, that is, the arts and cultural preservation and the administrative/clerical work.

4. From an analysis of the frequencies of the importance or weight new faculty give to socializers influencing their socialization into each academic role, it was found that the most influential socializers for new faculty socialization into all five academic roles (teaching, research, community service, arts and cultural preservation, and administrative/clerical work) is the mentor ($\bar{X}=4.01, 4.05, 3.55, 3.29, 3.51$ respectively). These findings confirm the results from extensive previous research in the United States which report about the importance of mentoring on new faculty socialization (Boice in Socinelli & Austin, 1992; Luna & Cullen, 1995). Accordingly, institutions need to effectively facilitate both formal and informal mentoring for new faculty. Further studies need to be in place about
effective approaches for new faculty mentoring in the Asian academic context as well.

5. From an analysis of the frequencies of the importance or weight new faculty give to staff development programs influencing their socialization into each academic role, it was found that the most influential staff development programs for new faculty socialization into teaching and arts and cultural preservation roles is internal seminars, training, or workshops ($\bar{X}=3.52,2.58$). The most influential staff development programs for new faculty socialization into research and community service roles are external seminars, training, or workshops ($\bar{X}=3.59,2.89$). The most influential staff development program for new faculty socialization into administrative/ clerical work role is the orientation ($\bar{X}=2.81$).

These findings suggest that orientation programs of these institutions need improvement particularly in terms of facilitating new faculty’s socialization into the main academic roles including teaching, research, and community service as well as arts and cultural preservation. However, most orientation programs are short-term interventions, therefore it might be quite unrealistic to expect only the orientation program to have sustainable impacts on new faculty performance in the major academic roles. Instead, a more viable approach might be a better coordination between the orientation program and other internal as well as external seminars, training, and workshops in offering faculty development services that emphasize the learner-centered philosophy.

6. From comparing the importance/weight new faculty give to experiences, socializers, and staff development programs influencing their socialization into each academic role, it was found that with regard to teaching, teaching and research assistant (TA/RA) experiences score the highest ($\bar{X}=4.29$) whereas deans/associate deans score the lowest ($\bar{X}=2.23$); that with regard to research, TA/RA experiences score the highest ($\bar{X}=4.32$) whereas supporting staff scores the lowest ($\bar{X}=2.37$); that concerning community service as well as arts and cultural preservation, mentors score the highest ($\bar{X}=3.55,3.29$) whereas supporting staff scores the lowest ($\bar{X}=2.45,2.34$); that concerning administrative/ clerical activities, mentors score the highest ($\bar{X}=3.51$) whereas deans/associate deans score the lowest ($\bar{X}=2.43$).

These findings reconfirm findings number 3 above that anticipatory socialization of new faculty actually exists both formally and informally during the graduate study experiences and number 4 about the importance of the mentor on new faculty socialization. It is particularly important to attend to the finding that TA/RA experiences are critical for new faculty’s socialization into the major academic roles, that is, teaching and research. The implications from these findings are that those aspiring to be new faculty members need to aim at mastering the teaching and research skills during their graduate study, particularly, through trying to acquire and make the most out of the TA/RA experiences. Furthermore, those with administrative responsibilities need to proactively facilitate new faculty socialization. Additionally, systematic mentoring interventions need to be in place.

7. From an analysis of the relationships between new faculty’s socioeconomic backgrounds and their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role, it was found that females score higher in teaching role than males ($\chi^2=1.40**, df=2$); that new faculty from Chulalongkorn University got high scores on research role while those from Kasetsart University got low scores ($\chi^2=18.57**, df=6$); the new faculty from Kasetsart University got high scores on arts and cultural preservation role ($\chi^2=18.03**, df=6$) and administrative/ clerical work role ($\chi^2=13.29*, df=6$), while those from Thammasat University got low score on both counts ($\chi^2=18.03**, df=6$; $13.29*,df=6$ respectively). Last but not least important, it was found that new faculty with the highest level of education got high scores on research
role while those with the lowest education level got low scores (tau c = 0.33**).

8. From an analysis of the relationships between the importance/weight new faculty give to each experience and their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role, it was found that: New faculty with high scores on teaching role learn about teaching at the highest level from graduate study (tau c = 0.25**); those with high scores on research role learn about research at the highest level from graduate study (tau c = 0.37**), TA/RA (tau c = 0.33**), and trial and error experiences (tau c = 0.21**); those with high scores on community service role learn about this role at the highest level from the graduate study (tau c = 0.42**), and TA/RA experiences (tau c = 0.36**), and from trial and error (tau c = 0.19**); those with high scores on arts and cultural preservation role learn about this role at the highest level from the graduate study (tau c = 0.40**), TA/RA (tau c = 0.49**), and trial and error experiences (tau c = 0.26**); those with high scores on administrative/clerical work role learn about this role at the highest level from graduate study (tau c = 0.17**) and at a high level from TA/RA (tau c = 0.21**) and trial and error experiences (tau c = 0.29**). These findings reconfirm the findings 3 and 6 about the importance of anticipatory socialization for new faculty.

9. From an analysis of the relationship between the importance/weight new faculty members give to each socializer and their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role, it was found that new faculty members with high scores on teaching role do not learn about this role directly from socializers (due to a nonexistence of any relationship between variables), but learn about both community service and administrative/clerical work roles at a high level instead from mentors (tau c = 0.13*, 0.18**) and learn about administrative/clerical work role at a high level from deans/associate deans (tau c = 0.12*). New faculty members with high scores on research role learn about this role from mentors and deans/associate deans at a high level (tau c = 0.14*, 0.13*). New faculty with high scores on community service role learn about this role from peers, mentors, chairpersons, and deans/associate deans at the highest level (tau c = 0.19**, 0.33**, 0.16*, 0.15*) and from senior faculty and supporting staff at a high level (tau c = 0.20**, 0.17*). New faculty with high scores on arts and cultural preservation role learn about this role from senior faculty members, peers, mentors, chairpersons, and deans/associate deans at the highest level (tau c = 0.30**, 0.30**, 0.29**, 0.26**, 0.28**) and from supporting staff at a high level (tau c = 0.20**). New faculty members with high scores on administrative/clerical work role learn about this role from the chairpersons at the highest level (tau c = 0.18**).

These findings reconfirm the findings number 4 and 6 about the importance of the mentor on new faculty socialization. It is also worth noticing about the nonexistence of any relationship between any socializer variables and new faculty’s high score on teaching. This reflects the view of new faculty with a high teaching performance that they do not receive any support on teaching from any socializer in their institutions and if we compare this finding with finding numbers 8 and number 10, we will see that these new faculty with a high teaching performance also do not benefit much from any faculty development program to enhance their teaching skills, instead they have to rely on their prior skills and knowledge in teaching from their graduate study experiences. This finding will be a useful feedback for the universities to increase institutional support for new faculty’s socialization into the teaching role through both formal and informal interventions. It is also worth noticing that those with a high performance on community service and arts and cultural preservation roles learn about these roles the most from many socializers in the institution.

10. From an analysis of the relationships between the importance/weight new faculty give to each staff
development program and their levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each role, it was found that new faculty with high scores on teaching role, do not learn about this role directly from any staff development programs (due to a nonexistence of any relationship between variables), but they learn about administrative/clerical work role at a high level from an internal seminars, training, or workshops (τ = 0.12*). New faculty with high scores on research role learn about this role at the highest level from external seminars, training, and workshops (τ = 0.14*). New faculty members with high scores on community service role learn about this role at a high level from the orientations, internal and external seminars, training, and workshops (τ = 0.21**, 0.29**, 0.35**). Faculty with high scores on arts and cultural preservation role learn about this role at the highest level from the orientations and at a high level from the internal and external seminars, training, and workshops (τ = 0.31**, 0.42**, 0.35**). New faculty with high scores on administrative/clerical work role learn about this role at the highest level from the external seminars, training, and workshops and at a high level from internal seminars, training, and workshops (τ = 0.20**, 0.23**).

These findings suggest that, for new faculty with high scores on teaching and research roles, internal faculty development programs do not help much in socializing them into these major academic roles. The orientations do not help new faculty learn multiple work responsibilities much. This finding will be a useful feedback for faculty development units to consider improving their interventions.

11. Other than the above research findings, suggestions offered by new faculty members themselves as to how to act and adjust themselves in order to carry out each academic role are very valuable because they come directly from their direct experiences on "who learns what, from whom (and how much), under what circumstances, and with what effects?" These suggestions, if context analyzed, will be very beneficial for the recruitment, development, retention, and utilization of new faculty members in the years to come. Because of time and space limitations, these suggestions by new faculty members can be found in the complete report of this study titled, Analysis of New Faculty Socialization in Thai Public Universities. (In Thai)

Implications for Institutional Practices and Further Research

Based on findings of this study, the author provides recommendations for both institutional practices and further research as follows:

Recommendations for institutional practices

1. Findings about new faculty’s levels of being socialized or learning outcomes in each academic role and their identified sources of socialization provide useful information for faculty developers, administrators, and others with faculty development responsibilities to improve the faculty development interventions to better address new faculty’s needs for development based more on learner/client-centered philosophy.

2. Findings about the relationships between socioeconomic backgrounds and experiences on the one hand and the levels of being socialized/learning outcomes in each academic role on the other reconfirm findings from prior studies and the author’s conviction that anticipatory socialization is important. These findings suggest that to ensure the quality and competency of prospective faculty members, universities need to enhance the quality of existing graduate education programs. In addition, these findings also have important implications for institutional policy on faculty recruitment, selection, and work assignment. This is particularly important for the encroaching situation of faculty shortage in many Thai universities due to the retirement of a large cohort of senior faculty members in the near future.

3. One of the evident findings from this study is
the importance of the mentor on new faculty socialization. As a result, universities should promote both informal and formal mentoring system to be in place. Furthermore, other findings about influences of other socializers on new faculty socialization suggested that other socializers need to take more proactive role to facilitate new faculty socialization.

Recommendations for further research
1. To be able to make the generalization about the critical elements that influence new faculty socialization in Thai universities, future studies can use the conceptual framework of this study to collect the data from new faculty in every universities in Thailand. Additionally, because the different types of higher education institutions have different institutional cultures, new faculty socialization in different types is likely to be different. This assumption need to be replicated and proved in the future studies.

2. Future studies using this conceptual framework and research methodology should be based on a longitudinal or time series dimension.

3. Literature shows that disciplines influence differences among faculty experiences (Becher, 1987; Braxton, 1995; Menges, 1999). Future study should explore relationships between disciplines and the extent to which each independent variable of this study influences the outcomes of new faculty socialization into each academic role.
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