



STUDYDADDY

**Get Homework Help
From Expert Tutor**

Get Help

Unequal Socialization: Interrogating the Chicano/Latino(a) Doctoral Education Experience

Elvia Ramirez

California State University, Sacramento

This article examines the experiences of Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students at a research-intensive doctorate-granting institution. Based on in-depth qualitative interviews with 24 Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students across social science, humanities, education, and science disciplines, this qualitative investigation analyzed how disciplinary affiliation mediated the professional socialization experiences of Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students. Guided by intersectionality and social capital theories, the findings reveal systemic inequities in the doctoral socialization process. Unequal access to professional development opportunities and faculty mentorship were among the most salient challenges experienced by Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students. On the other hand, supportive peers and faculty mentors served as key socializing agents for respondents. Overall, findings suggest that institutionalized racism, sexism, and classism in the doctoral training process play a significant role in Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral socialization and professional career preparation experiences.

Keywords: doctoral students, socialization, intersectionality, social capital, Hispanic

Despite representing the largest racial/ethnic minority group in the country, Chicanos/Latinos(as) remain dramatically underrepresented in higher education. Though Chicanos/Latinos(as) have recently experienced increasing rates of college attendance, they remain less likely than White students to enroll in 4-year universities, attend selective postsecondary institutions, enroll in college on a full-time basis, and earn bachelor's degrees (Fry & Taylor, 2013). Given their progressively smaller numbers in the educational pipeline, Chicanos/Latinos(as) remain tenuously represented in graduate education. In 2011, for example, Chicanos/Latinos(as) obtained just 6.3% of all doctorates, whereas Whites earned 74% (National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2012). Chicanos/Latinos(as) are also the most underrepresented major racial/ethnic group among college/university faculty. For example, in 2011, Chicanos/Latinos(as) constituted just 4.3% of

all faculty in U.S. postsecondary institutions, whereas Whites represented 73.8%; Blacks, 6.9%; and Asian American and Pacific Islanders, 6.4% (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2014).

Because doctorate education constitutes the main gateway to research careers and the professoriate, it is imperative that scholars analyze Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students' perceptions of and experiences with scholarly socialization. In particular, research should examine whether Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students are receiving professional development opportunities (e.g., research and teaching assistantships, publication opportunities, and training in grant-writing) and faculty mentorship. Adequate professional preparation of doctoral students is especially critical in light of the increasingly tight academic labor market and increasing expectations for faculty productivity, entrepreneurialism, and overall competence in teaching, research, and service (Austin, 2002; Helm, Campa, & Moretto, 2012; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Weidman, 2010). How Chicano/Latino(a) students feel about the quality of their doctoral training generally, and of their preparation for scholarly/academic roles in particular, has not been the subject of much scholarly investigation. Moreover, the extant literature

This article was published Online First June 2, 2016.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Elvia Ramirez, Department of Ethnic Studies, California State University, Sacramento, 6000 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819. E-mail: eramirez@csus.edu

has generally been inattentive to how disciplinary context mediates doctoral students' socialization experiences; yet, as various doctoral education scholars suggest (e.g., Gardner, 2010; Golde, 2005), the disciplinary context is critical for understanding the nuances of graduate students' experiences. This study thus aims to fill these empirical gaps in the literature.

This article examines Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students' experiences with the doctoral socialization process. Three research questions guide the present study:

1. How do Chicano/Latino(a) students feel about the quality of their doctoral training? In particular, how do Chicanos/Latinos(as) feel about the way their doctoral programs are training them for scholarly roles?
2. How do race, class, and gender inequities shape Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students' experiences with scholarly socialization? How do Chicanos/Latinos(as) navigate and contest these inequities?
3. How does disciplinary context mediate Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students' scholarly socialization experiences?

Literature Review

Doctoral student socialization refers to the process by which "individuals gain the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for successful entry into a professional career requiring an advanced level of specialized knowledge and skills" (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001, p. iii). The primary objective of the doctoral (PhD) socialization process is "the creation of an independent scholar, or a scholar who independently produces original research" (Gardner, 2008, p. 343). Although doctoral programs are generally structured as socialization for the professoriate, the doctoral socialization process varies by discipline (Becher, 1981; Biglan, 1973; Gardner, 2008). For example, whereas the socialization experience in the sciences is based on laboratory work conducted in groups, the socialization experience in the humanities is based largely on independent scholarship (Gardner, 2010). Moreover, doctoral students in engineering, sciences, and mathematics have a shorter time to degree and typically receive greater research assistantship opportunities than

students in education, the humanities, and social science fields (Nettles & Millett, 2006). Additionally, faculty–doctoral student coauthorship is a more established expectation in science fields than other disciplinary areas (Maher, Timmerman, Feldon, & Strickland, 2013).

A number of scholars have analyzed and interrogated the professional socialization and career preparation of doctoral students (e.g., Antony, 2002; Austin, 2002; Ellis, 2001; Gardner, 2007, 2008, 2010; Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Golde & Dore, 2001, 2004; Helm et al., 2012; Nettles & Millett, 2006; Portnoi, Chlopecki, & Peregrina-Kretz, 2012; Weidman & Stein, 2003; Weidman et al., 2001). In their landmark national survey of 4,114 doctoral students in the arts and sciences, Golde and Dore (2001) discovered that "in today's doctoral programs, there is a three-way mismatch between student goals, training and actual careers" (p. 5). That is, despite the shrinking availability of tenure-track faculty positions and the diversity of doctoral students' career aspirations, doctoral programs continue to singularly focus on preparing students for faculty careers at research institutions. Yet, no more than half of doctorate recipients will find employment in full-time tenure track positions, and only a small proportion (27%) of graduates will find employment as faculty at research universities (Golde & Dore, 2001). Golde and Dore thus note that graduate students "are not well prepared to assume the faculty positions that are available, nor do they have a clear concept of their suitability for work outside of research" (p. 5). Significantly, Golde and Dore also found that although doctoral training entails extensive research preparation, doctoral students do not receive training in *all* aspects of research, such as publishing and collaborating in interdisciplinary research. Because both doctoral students and faculty (including at comprehensive institutions) are increasingly expected to demonstrate scholarly productivity (Nettles & Millett, 2006; Weidman, 2010), the lack of systematic training in publishing can undoubtedly hamper graduate students' educational and occupational success.

Echoing these critiques, Austin (2002) noted that doctoral programs are not adequately preparing students for the realities of a changing academic workplace. "The modern academic workplace," Austin (2002) explained, "is characterized by student diversity, new technolo-

gies, changing societal expectations, a shift in emphasis toward the learner, expanding faculty work loads, and a new labor market for faculty” (p. 97). Some of the deficiencies in doctoral training elucidated by Austin included: (a) lack of systematic professional development opportunities, particularly for the development of teaching skills; (b) insufficient feedback and mentoring from faculty; (c) few opportunities for guided reflection; and (d) insufficient guidance concerning faculty careers or other career options. Similarly, in their investigation of doctoral-level students’ perceptions of and experiences with professional socialization, Helm et al. (2012) found that some doctoral students feel unprepared to perform the skills required in academic and nonacademic settings, such as teaching, proposal writing, management and communication skills, publishing, conference presentations, and committee work. In short, the extant literature on doctoral student socialization and career preparation reveals that doctoral programs provide extensive training in research, but this training often fails to include “professional preparation in teaching and advising, the publication process, writing and attaining research grants, or understanding professional expectations in the areas of service, outreach, or research ethics” (Helm et al., 2012, p. 6).

Research also reveals systemic inequities and disparities in the doctoral socialization process. A number of scholars have found entrenched racial/ethnic and gender inequities in doctoral students’ access to faculty mentorship and professional development opportunities (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001; Ellis, 2001; Gay, 2004; Margolis & Romero, 1998; Nettles & Millett, 2006; Noy & Ray, 2012; Turner & Thompson, 1993; Winkle-Wagner, Johnson, Morelon-Quainoo, & Santiago, 2010). “Existing research,” Noy and Ray (2012) incisively observed, “suggests that some faculty members may view certain students more worthy of advisor support than others. . . . Traditionally, White men have been the dominant group represented in academia. As a result, they are viewed as the default and ‘ideal student’” (p. 877). Indeed, research reveals that faculty typically invest less in woman and racial/ethnic minority doctoral students—especially women of color—and evince more interest in training White and male students for academic careers. For example, Turner and Thompson (1993)

found that White female doctoral students systematically received more mentorship and professional development opportunities (e.g., research and teaching assistantships, coauthoring papers with faculty, and conference presentation opportunities) than women of color doctoral students. The professional socialization process in doctorate education is thus clearly highly unequal.

Inequities in access to faculty mentorship and professional development opportunities are highly consequential and problematic, particularly because these support structures are essential ingredients for graduate students’ success. As Turner and Thompson (1993) noted, “a successful socialization process is critical for a successful graduate career” (p. 357). Similarly, faculty mentorship helps graduate students integrate into the department, cultivate professional and social networks, acquire research competencies, and aids in doctoral students’ placement in the workforce upon graduation (Davidson & Foster-Johnson, 2001). The importance of faculty mentors is also underscored by Lovitts (2001), who argues that the faculty advisor “is often the central and most powerful person . . . during the student’s trajectory through graduate school” (p. 131).

Overall, the extant doctoral socialization literature has made great strides in elucidating the professional preparation needs and challenges facing contemporary doctoral students. There remain significant empirical gaps in the literature, however. In particular, whether Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students feel they are being adequately prepared for academic careers and receive mentorship and professional development opportunities has not been the subject of much scholarly investigation. In fact, only a few scholars have examined the experiences of Chicanos/Latinos(as) in doctoral programs (e.g., Achor & Morales, 1990; Bañuelos, 2006; Cúdras, 1993; Espino, 2014; Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011; González, 2006; Ibarra, 2001; Solorzano, 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). Overall, this research suggests that Chicano/Latino(a) graduate students encounter—and actively challenge—institutionalized racism, sexism, and classism in the form of “low faculty expectations, stigmatization, alienation, racial isolation, tokenism, stereotyping, lack of faculty mentorship and support, hostile departmental and institutional climates, and ra-

cially biased epistemologies and Eurocentric curricula” (Ramirez, 2014, p. 170). No studies of the Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral education experience, however, have systematically analyzed or interrogated the professional preparation and career socialization experiences of Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students. Furthermore, most of the extant literature on doctoral students, including research on Chicanos/Latinos(as), tends to view the doctoral socialization process monolithically (Gardner, 2010), paying little attention to how disciplinary context mediates doctoral students’ experiences. In an effort to fill these gaps in the literature, this study examines the scholarly socialization experiences of Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students across broad disciplinary contexts.

Theoretical Frameworks

This study is grounded in intersectionality and social capital frameworks. Intersectionality theory, a conceptual framework pioneered by women of color feminists, problematizes single-axis, additive frameworks and elucidates the theoretical and empirical interrelations of race, gender, and class (Andersen & Collins, 2001; Baca Zinn & Thornton Dill, 1996; Choo & Ferree, 2010; Collins, 2000; Crenshaw, 1991). Emerging as a critique of unitary theories of inequality, intersectionality theory refuses to privilege one aspect of oppression or identity over another, particularly because all three major forms of inequality are interrelated and simultaneously configure the structure of our society (Andersen & Collins, 2001, p. 3). “At any moment,” Andersen and Collins (2001) explained, “race, class, or gender may feel more salient or meaningful in a given person’s life, but they are overlapping and cumulative in their effect on people’s experience” (p. 3). Concomitantly, intersectionality theory postulates that systems of race, class, and gender inequality simultaneously produce structures of oppression and privilege that mediate the life experiences of *all* individuals. Thus, intersectionality is not simply, or exclusively, a theory about women of color; rather, it is a theory that elucidates the interconnectedness of individuals and groups in a multidimensional stratification system (Baca Zinn & Thornton Dill, 1996). I employ an intersectional analysis in order to examine how multidimensional and interlock-

ing systems of inequality embedded in the doctoral socialization process shape Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students’ experiences.

Social capital theory—particularly Stanton-Salazar’s (1997) network-analytic framework—also informs this analysis. Social capital theory suggests that membership and participation in social networks provides individuals with potential access to vital resources, support systems, and opportunities. Influenced by Pierre Bourdieu’s trenchant critiques of the educational system’s implication in social reproduction processes, Stanton-Salazar’s framework begins with the assumption that “opportunities for entering into different social and institutional contexts and for forming relationships with agents who exert various degrees of control over institutional resources” is unevenly distributed within U.S. society (p. 4). The importance of such agents, Stanton-Salazar posits, is exemplified in the dependence of dominant group members on social ties with institutional agents in securing privileged access to resources and opportunities within mainstream institutional settings. Social capital accumulation is contingent on successful interactions with institutional agents, who serve as gatekeepers to various types of institutional support that enable a student’s success in school.

Stanton-Salazar (1997)’s model notes that both ideological and institutional forces complicate, or mitigate, working-class minority students’ accumulation of social capital and its conversion into institutional support; that is, exclusionary processes embedded both within the educational system and the larger society thwart working-class students’ access to, and supportive relationships with, institutional agents who can provide institutional support. Notwithstanding the multiple barriers confronting working-class students of color in their development and activation of social capital, Stanton-Salazar’s model allows for the role of human agency in countering these processes of stratification. He explains,

Although these constraints and barriers function too often to alienate students from vital sources of institutional support, many minority [students] *do* find ways to acquire social capital. Similarly, ideological forces of a counterhegemonic nature and personal dispositions motivate many institutional agents to struggle against the alienating properties of their institutional roles, and to develop actively explicit agendas geared

toward the transmission of institutional support to [students]. (p. 25)

In short, Stanton-Salazar's (1997) social capital framework offers a robust conceptual lens with which to analyze inequalities in students' access to social capital and mobility-related resources. I employ this framework to examine how Chicano/Latino(a) graduate students' relationships with institutional agents mediate their scholarly socialization experiences.

Method

Data for this investigation stem from a larger case study analyzing the experiences of Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students at a research intensive doctorate-granting institution located in the western region of the United States. The larger case study analyzed how public policies and inequalities ingrained in the doctoral schooling process shaped Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students' access to and experiences at this particular institution. The study is based on in-depth, semistructured qualitative interviews conducted with Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students who were in the process of completing, or had already completed, their doctorate (PhD) degree at this institution at the time of the study.

Respondents were recruited mainly through purposive and snowball sampling techniques. Respondents were identified by an official roster of enrolled Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students at the university. Prospective interviewees who were enrolled at the university were contacted via mail through a letter sent to their departmental addresses. Snowball sampling techniques were employed to identify and locate students that had successfully completed their PhD at this institution. All prospective respondents were provided with an introductory letter that informed them of the purpose and nature of the study. Interviewees were provided with a written consent form, which they read and signed to acknowledge the voluntary nature of their participation and associated potential risks.

A total of 24 respondents (12 men, 12 women) were recruited for the study. Three respondents (all men) were affiliated with the natural sciences, 16 interviewees (nine men, seven women) were from the social sciences, three respondents (all women) were in the field of education, and two study participants (both

women) were from the humanities; the sample thus lacks representation of Chicana/Latina doctoral students in the natural sciences, and of Chicano/Latino men in humanities and education fields. Nineteen respondents were enrolled students at the time of the interview, and five had already completed their doctorate programs. Respondents who were enrolled in their first year of graduate study up until the onset of doctoral candidacy status were identified as being in the "coursework stage"; those who had achieved doctoral candidacy status are identified as a "doctoral candidate"; and respondents that had already finished their doctorate programs are labeled as "completed PhD".

Most ($n = 16$) respondents are Chicano(a)/Mexican American in origin; that is, both their parents are racially/ethnically Mexican. Six respondents are biracial Chicanos(as)/Mexican Americans (i.e., one of their parents is Mexican, and the other is Anglo), and two respondents are Latino(a) (i.e., of non-Mexican Latin American descent). All but one respondent (a gay male) self-identified as heterosexual. Fifteen respondents self-identified as working-class, five described themselves as middle-class, and four described their families as lower-middle class. Approximately half of the sample had at least one parent who had completed a high school degree or less. Five respondents had at least one university-educated parent; only one respondent had two parents that were university-educated.

Respondents filled out a written questionnaire, which documented their background characteristics, as well as answered open-ended questions from an interview guide (Patton, 2002). The interview guide concentrated on a wide range of topics, including respondents' personal and familial background and their K-16 and graduate school experiences. Data for this article stem from questions concerning respondents' perceptions of the doctoral socialization and career preparation process, specifically. The interviews lasted approximately 2–4 hours each; some interviews were conducted in one session, and others took two, and sometimes three, sessions to complete. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. Sixteen interviews were conducted face-to-face, either on or off campus, depending on interviewees' preferences and availability; seven interviews were conducted over the phone; one interview, which

lasted two sessions, was conducted on-campus and over the phone. Interviews were conducted mostly in English, though some respondents often code-switched between English and Spanish. I conducted all the interviews. All respondents were assigned a pseudonym to protect their confidentiality.

The interview data were analyzed via analytic induction processes (Patton, 2002). Open and axial coding schemes were utilized to discover patterns, themes, and interrelationships in the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This process then led to the identification of the most salient issues and challenges embedded in the doctoral socialization and career preparation process of Chicano/Latino(a) students. Upon reaching theoretical saturation (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), intersectionality and social capital frameworks were used to further understand how respondents' doctoral socialization experiences were mediated by race, class, and gender inequalities and access to social capital.

Researcher Positionality, Validity, and Study Limitations

As a bilingual (English- and Spanish-speaking) first-generation Chicana college graduate from a working-class background, I share the general cultural background of study participants. I am thus a cultural insider in the research process. Although one does not have to be an insider to conduct research on racial/ethnic minority individuals and communities, being an insider significantly enhances the validity of the research, data collection, and data analysis process (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000). For example, insider researchers are less likely to elicit distrust from interviewees, are more cognizant of internal diversity among the study population, are better able to understand interviewees' culture and language, and are less likely to reproduce stereotypical and essentialist representations than outsider researchers (Baca Zinn, 1979; Barajas & Ramirez, 2007; Zavella, 1993).

Notwithstanding these research strengths, there are some limitations to the study. Given the nonrandom sampling procedure employed in the study, the findings are not generalizable to all Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students at this institution, nor to Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students generally. The goal of the study was to

advance a nuanced and critical understanding of Chicano/Latino(a) students' experiences in graduate school rather than generalize the findings to the larger Chicano/Latino(a) student population.

Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine how Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students perceive and experience the scholarly socialization process. Guided by intersectionality and social capital frameworks, this study examined how Chicanos/Latinos(as) navigate systemic race, class, and gender inequities in the doctoral socialization process. The findings, presented below, are organized and delineated according to respondents' broad disciplinary affiliations: social sciences, humanities, education, and sciences. This facilitates researchers' understanding of how disciplinary context mediates doctoral students' experiences.

Social Sciences

When queried about their perceptions of the doctoral training process, only a few ($n = 4$) interviewees felt quite positive. Richard (course work stage, lower middle-class), for example, said his academic preparation has been "phenomenal." "I'm very happy with it," he stated: "I like the way they push me in certain areas that I feel I'm lacking. They have definitely encouraged me and helped me and given constructive criticism. So, I think it's been phenomenal."

The majority ($n = 8$) of social science interviewees, however, felt their graduate programs were not providing them with adequate scholarly socialization. Victor (completed PhD, working-class), for example, felt his department offered deficient preparation in teaching and qualitative research methodology—limitations, he surmised, that stemmed from the research orientation and positivistic bias of his university and department, respectively. He opined, "Probably [all research universities] are training [graduate students] how to become researchers, and it's assumed that you're going to become an effective teacher in the classroom, I guess, just by osmosis." Victor also felt his department failed to adequately train him in qualitative research methodology. "I don't think we had a

class on qualitative methodology on the books at that time, and if we did, I don't think it was ever offered when I was a student," he recalled. Still other respondents felt their graduate programs failed to teach students grant-writing skills. Maya (PhD candidate, working-class), for example, felt she needed more training "on the actual writing and proposals . . . how to get money, how to write proposals. . . . It's very mystified" she said.

Similarly, Rebecca (completed PhD, working class) described her department's academic training as "weak." She felt that some faculty members in her department did not take their teaching responsibilities "seriously enough." Moreover, Rebecca perceived that graduate students in her department were receiving an inferior education due to faculty's low expectations for students. She believed the reason faculty in her department failed to intellectually challenge and adequately prepare students for scholarly roles was because they harbored prejudicial feelings toward students—particularly working-class students of color. According to Rebecca, some faculty in her department presume that working-class students of color are "not smart" and are generally unsuited for graduate study. These elitist and classist sentiments were explicitly articulated by a faculty member in Rebecca's department. She said,

I think they resented the grad students that were in the department, that they just felt we weren't good students. That we didn't deserve to be graduate students. That working-class people of color aren't meant to be in grad school. And they treated people like that. I think that's why they dumbed down their courses and didn't have us read original research . . . I think it had to do with [some faculty] thinking that the students at [this university] are not smart. I mean, [a White male faculty member] said that more than once. He said that working-class people didn't belong in grad school . . . How could that not influence how you teach a class?

Other respondents echoed Rebecca's critiques. Several interviewees noted that faculty typically displayed favoritism toward certain graduate students—particularly White, middle-class, and/or male students. Victor, for example, sensed that it was the "shiny" people, whom were invariably White, that were systematically afforded professional development opportunities. "White students . . . tended to be more favored than some," he recalled. Victor also alluded to class-based inequities and hierarchies in his department, insofar as middle-class grad-

uate students that had attended prestigious undergraduate institutions and/or had high GRE scores were disproportionately provided with financial support. Victor felt that because he attended a nonprestigious undergraduate institution, he was denied financial support and treated like a "step-child" in his program. He shared,

I thought there was a pecking order . . . I mean, people . . . with high GPAs . . . coming from [research universities] or maybe a private liberal arts college. You know, they were going to get the rewards, and people that didn't have those impressive credentials were going to have to work their butts off . . . I didn't think honestly that was fair. I mean, I particularly thought, coming from a [comprehensive university] that I was perceived kind of a stepchild, if you will . . . I didn't a TAship at the outset, and I didn't have any kind of financial award. I was working [outside of school]. . . . So yea, I think it was really clear that there was this pecking order.

Similarly, Steve (course work stage, middle class) noted that White male graduate students in his department were "coddled" and provided with substantial research, publication, and funding opportunities. Graduate students of color, on the other hand, were typically neglected by faculty. "We've gotten . . . little encouragement, . . . They're not really on top of us about being very career-oriented. . . . We're kind of on our own," he explained. Additionally, Steve felt that his scholarly accomplishments were not celebrated or recognized by faculty in his program. For example, Steve received external funding via a highly competitive and prestigious minority fellowship but felt he did not "get any real recognition for that" in his department. Thus, although external funding is generally perceived as a prestigious and "valuable commodity within academe" (Espino, 2014, p. 569), racist departmental climates mitigated the potential prestige and elevated status some respondents could have garnered and achieved through their external funding awards. Similarly, Esther (course work stage, working class) shared that most faculty showed "no real interest" in mentoring her or other graduate students of color. Moreover, though Esther had received a departmental fellowship, she felt her academic qualifications were often called into question because she is a woman of color; that is, her peers assumed she had received the fellowship solely on the basis of her race and gender and without

consideration of her academic merit. She shared,

I feel good about the fact that I got [a department] fellowship, but at the same time it's been called into question, that I got it because of my race and my gender . . . Even if you do get financial support, if you're a woman of color, it seems like it's going to be the . . . reason it's called into question. So it's uncomfortable.

Like Steve, Esther felt she was not properly recognized for her academic accomplishments. Esther had received a research award from an academic organization, but “it was never mentioned” in her department. Echoing these concerns, Francisco (course work stage, working-class) shared that most faculty in his department “don’t do a very good job of reaching out to students of color” and fail to validate the intellectual capabilities and promise of graduate students of color.

In light of their experiences with inadequate and highly unequal scholarly socialization practices, some respondents resorted to pursuing scholarly projects with fellow graduate students and/or faculty mentors. Supportive peers and faculty thus served as key socializing agents for interviewees. For example, Steve initiated several research projects with fellow graduate students. “We began starting projects with other grad students,” he said. “We began writing papers, and hopefully [will be] publishing together.” Similarly, Raúl (course work stage, working-class) identified fellow graduate students as his primary agents of scholarly socialization. “Most of the stuff [concerning research, publications, and conferences] you find out from friends or other grad students. Other grad students are the biggest source of information,” he said. Respondents also relied on faculty mentors for scholarly socialization. Victor, for example, received extensive academic training, support, and publication opportunities from his faculty mentor and dissertation chair (a White female), with whom he met “on a weekly basis for an hour” throughout his graduate schooling years. Similarly, Rebecca met with her mentor and dissertation chair (a White female) on a frequent basis and felt she received constructive feedback on her writing from her mentor and other faculty advisors.

In short, most respondents in social science disciplines were critical of their doctoral training and of the way their respective programs

allocated professional development opportunities to students. Many felt the distribution of academic and financial awards and opportunities in their doctoral programs reflected and perpetuated race, class, and gender inequalities. Respondents contested these inequities by actively seeking scholarly socialization opportunities and mentorship from supportive peers and faculty.

Humanities

Respondents in humanities disciplines also articulated strong critiques of their doctoral training. Beatriz (completed PhD, working-class), for example, felt she received inadequate scholarly socialization and faculty mentorship during her tenure as a graduate student. Beatriz was especially critical of the quality of instruction and insufficient feedback she received from faculty in her program. “I feel that . . . we didn’t have good instruction or responsible professors who gave us feedback that was helpful, or that helped us to grow as scholars or as writers,” she recalled. Tatiana (course work stage, lower middle-class) also noted some deficiencies in her graduate training. In particular, she wished that her program featured courses on academic/scholarly writing and academic career development as well as a greater number of faculty—particularly Chicano/Latino(a) faculty. Tatiana was concerned that the absence of Chicano/Latino(a) faculty in her program restricted her intellectual growth and development as a student. “It’s limited my ability to do research,” she said. “It’s limited my ability to understand and to engage in more conversations and dialogue, which is important, to grow.” Concomitantly, Tatiana believed her department did not foster a research culture or offer sufficient professional development opportunities to students. “No one really talks about that,” she lamented. “The professors don’t really try to get the students engaged or actually working on a research project. . . . It’s like you’re floating.”

In light of the inadequate scholarly socialization and mentorship she felt she was receiving from her program, Tatiana felt compelled to seek faculty support and mentorship elsewhere. Thus, Tatiana engaged in the “network shuffle” (Zambrana et al., 2015), a strategy often employed by underrepresented minorities in academia who lack access to

primary mentors; it involves seeking multiple faculty mentors, sometimes from outside the institution. At the beginning of her second year in graduate school, Tatiana decided to enroll in a course taught by a renowned Latina faculty member at a nearby research-intensive university. Unlike most faculty in Tatiana's graduate program, this Latina professor supported Tatiana's research endeavors. "After taking that class with [the Latina professor]," Tatiana shared,

I told her what I was working on and she told me, You know what, let me see that paper. Maybe we can get it published for you. So I was like, aha! Very different. I've never had any other professor [say], Let's work on this together.

In actively seeking intellectual mentorship from genuinely supportive institutional agents, Tatiana clearly exerted agency in her own scholarly socialization process.

Like many doctoral students in humanities disciplines (Golde & Dore, 2004), respondents relied on teaching assistantships and/or fellowships for financial support. Both study participants believed these financial resources were unequally distributed in their respective graduate programs. Tatiana, for example, felt the allocation of fellowships and teaching assistantships in her department was highly racialized and nonmeritocratic, reflecting favoritism toward White students. Similarly, Beatriz felt that funding opportunities reflected "a system of rewarding certain favorite students of certain professors on certain committees." That is, Beatriz perceived that senior faculty in her program, who were mostly White males, wielded an inordinate amount of power and influence in her department and were able to determine which students received funding. "They [White male faculty] are full professors, and they serve on committees, on academic senate, or other committees across campus. They also determine funding, they nominate students for fellowships." The students being disproportionately targeted for funding awards and opportunities, Beatriz noted, were White and middle-class. Respondents in humanities disciplines thus critiqued their doctoral training and the way their departments unequally allocated professional development opportunities to students on the basis of race and class.

Education

The three female respondents in education fields were confident their doctoral programs offered rigorous academic training, though they nonetheless felt there were some deficiencies and/or inequities in their scholarly socialization experiences. Sylvia (doctoral candidate, working-class), for example, wished her mentor (a White female) "was more explicit about things." "At times," Sylvia shared, "I feel very lost as to how different processes work." Sylvia felt she had to be "more assertive" in asking her mentor about bureaucratic processes and requirements. Still, Sylvia perceived her mentor to be "helpful" overall. Concomitantly, she felt her graduate program provided students with ample professional development opportunities, and she did not perceive much competition among students for these resources nor any inequities in their distribution. "The graduate school has a lot money," she explained. "It gets money to do research . . . and gets money to implement different programs in the schools. And so my perception is that there isn't much competition to get the money." Similarly, Erica (doctoral candidate, working class) thought her program offered "opportunities . . . for [graduate students] who want to develop their research interests."

Paola (doctoral candidate, working-class) also felt she was benefitting from rigorous academic training. When asked how well she felt she was being training for the scholar role, for example, she replied,

Very well, very well. I know because I've seen when I go to [my discipline's] conferences. . . . I am just able to read what others have written and I can tell that I'm very well prepared. And it's not just the feedback that I've gotten from those that I work with. It's overall.

Furthermore, Paola felt her research assistantship provided her with invaluable socialization experiences, including research, writing, publishing, conference presentation, and networking opportunities. However, she perceived that departmental funding opportunities (e.g., fellowships) were unequally distributed to students on the basis of race and class. That is, she felt that White middle/upper-middle class students were disproportionately targeted for funding opportunities on the basis of their high GRE scores. "They got quite a bit of money," Paola

remarked, “and those were the students who already had money. . . . I felt that was unfair.” In short, respondents in education departments were generally satisfied with their graduate training, though some felt insufficient feedback from faculty and/or race- and class-based inequalities in graduate student funding were problematic aspects of their doctoral socialization experiences.

Sciences

The three male respondents in science fields were generally satisfied with both their doctoral training and access to faculty mentorship. Michael (doctoral candidate, middle-class), for example, described his academic training as “outstanding;” he especially liked that students in his doctoral program were required to take just a few core courses and were given considerable latitude in crafting their own research agendas. In addition, Michael reported having a close relationship with his faculty mentor (a White male), whom he described as “an actual mentor in every sense of the word.” Michael added: “He’s given me a lot of personal guidance. He knows that what I want to do is to become a professor like him, and so he’s really invited me to share in the experience with him.” Michael described his mentor’s science laboratory, where he worked as a research assistant, as his “second home,” and he expected that his work there would yield several coauthored scholarly publications before completing his doctorate. Similarly, Robert (doctoral candidate, working class) was satisfied with his doctoral training and received substantial professional development opportunities from his faculty mentor (a White female), including research, publication, and grant-writing opportunities. Robert had co-authored two publications and worked on various grant applications with his faculty mentor. In contrast, having just completed his first year as a doctoral student, Pedro (working-class) was still uncertain about the quality of his doctoral training and had not yet identified a faculty mentor. Still, Pedro felt he was “learning some new things” in his doctorate program.

Like many other graduate students in science fields, all three respondents were fully funded via fellowships, research assistantships, and/or teaching assistantships. Respondents generally believed these professional development oppor-

tunities were awarded to graduate students on the basis of individual effort and “merit.” “I don’t think there is any favoritism,” Robert stated, “We all have funding based on our research money from our professor. . . . If [graduate students] receive fellowship money, it’s by their own application.” In short, respondents in science disciplines shared mostly positive evaluations of their scholarly socialization experiences and did not perceive any major inequities in the allocation of professional development opportunities.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students’ perceptions of and experiences with the scholarly socialization process. The first research question guiding this study centered on Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students’ perceptions of the quality of their doctoral training. The findings reveal that some Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students feel positive about their doctoral training; that is, some felt they were receiving rigorous academic training, constructive feedback and guidance from faculty mentors, access to professional development opportunities (e.g., research assistantships, publication opportunities, and training in grant-writing), freedom to choose research topics, and/or ample funding opportunities. The vast majority of respondents, however, were critical of their scholarly socialization experiences. Respondents’ negative appraisals of their professional socialization experiences centered on inadequate preparation for teaching, grant-writing, and/or qualitative research; insufficient feedback from faculty; lack of courses focused on academic/scholarly writing; and/or poor instruction. Overall, these findings are consistent with research literature examining doctoral students’ professional socialization and career preparation experiences (Austin, 2002; Gardner & Mendoza, 2010; Golde & Dore, 2001; Helm et al., 2012; Nettles & Millett, 2006; Portnoi et al., 2012; Weidman & Stein, 2003).

The second research question focused on the ways that race, class, and gender inequities mediate Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students’ scholarly socialization experiences. Overall, the findings are consistent with the extant Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral student experience literature, which reveals systemic racism, sexism, and

classism in graduate programs (Achor & Morales, 1990; Bañuelos, 2006; Cúadraz, 1993; Espino, 2014; Gildersleeve et al., 2011; González, 2006; Ibarra, 2001; Ramirez, 2014; Solorzano, 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). For example, respondents encountered low faculty expectations, which were oftentimes informed by racist and classist prejudice toward working-class students of color; unequal access to professional development opportunities; lack of minority [particularly Chicano/Latino(a)] faculty; and/or lack of recognition for and validation of the scholarly accomplishments, qualifications, and academic potential of doctoral students of color. Concomitantly, respondents across most disciplines felt the distribution of professional development opportunities was “unfair” and reflected favoritism toward certain students, especially White, middle-class, male students. Moreover, interviewees felt that the allocation of fellowships and other funding opportunities to students based on their GRE scores—a common practice in doctoral programs (Nettles & Millett, 2006)—perpetuated race and class inequities; that is, respondents felt that funding students based on their GRE scores meant disproportionate funding awards for already socially and economically privileged students (i.e., White, middle-class graduate students). In short, respondents felt the distribution of professional development opportunities and access to faculty mentorship reflected and perpetuated race, class, and gender inequalities. Respondents were thus highly perceptive—and critical—of how social inequality processes in doctoral education operate! Altogether, these findings are consistent with intersectionality theory, which underscores the simultaneity of race, class, and gender oppression and privilege (Andersen & Collins, 2001; Baca Zinn & Thornton Dill, 1996; Choo & Ferree, 2010; Crenshaw, 1991).

The findings also revealed that Chicanos/Latinos(as) navigate and contest systemic inequities in the doctoral socialization process by actively forging connections with supportive peers and faculty mentors. Peers thus served as key institutional agents in respondents’ scholarly socialization experiences, a finding consistent with existing literature (Austin, 2002; Gardner, 2007, 2010; Gildersleeve et al., 2011; Maher et al., 2013; Winkle-Wagner et al., 2010). In light of inadequate faculty mentor-

ship, some respondents relied on peers to help demystify scholarly processes, such as conducting research, publishing, and presenting at conferences. Peer support networks thus represented valuable forms of social capital for respondents, insofar as they provided “forms of support that facilitate[d] the accomplishment of goals” (Stanton-Salazar, 2004, p. 18). Supportive faculty mentors also served as key institutional agents for interviewees. As Stanton-Salazar (1997) noted, “ideological forces of a counter-hegemonic nature and personal dispositions motivate many institutional agents to struggle against the alienating properties of their institutional roles, and to develop actively explicit agendas geared toward the transmission of institutional support” (p. 25) to minority students. Furthermore, some interviewees (e.g., Tatiana) exerted agency by engaging in a “network shuffle” (Zambrana et al., 2015) when supportive faculty mentors could not be found in their respective graduate programs. According to Zambrana et al. (2015), this patchwork approach to mentorship-seeking enacted by minority scholars “is born out of necessity” (p. 55), reflecting the lack of representation of underrepresented minority faculty on most college/university campuses.

The third research question seeks to illuminate how disciplinary context mediates Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students’ experiences. Though the study sample was relatively small, clear differences by discipline emerged. Most notably, respondents in science fields, all of whom were generously funded via fellowships, research assistantships, and/or teaching assistantships, articulated uniformly positive accounts of their doctoral training and access to professional development opportunities (e.g., coauthoring publications with faculty). On the other hand, the narratives of respondents in non-science fields were replete with examples of perceived systemic racial/ethnic and class inequities in funding, faculty mentorship, and access to professional development opportunities. Other scholars of doctoral education (e.g., Gardner, 2007; Nettles & Millett, 2006) have also found differences in students’ experiences across disciplines. Doctoral students’ experiences are thus clearly mediated by disciplinary context.

Overall, findings from this study suggest that some Chicano/Latino(a) graduate students are,

whether wittingly or inadvertently, being inadequately prepared for and diverted away from academic careers. These unequal socialization processes and practices may partly explain why some racial/ethnic minority doctoral students eschew academic careers, particularly at research institutions (Levin, Jaeger, & Haley, 2013; Winkle-Wagner et al., 2010). Findings from this study reveal that institutionalized racism, sexism, and classism in the doctoral training process play a major role in doctoral students' professional career preparation experiences, which may ultimately affect career choices. Additional research on Chicano/Latino(a) students' doctoral educational experiences and subsequent career choices and occupational trajectories is thus clearly needed and warranted.

Finally, from a policy standpoint, findings from this study clearly underscore the need for reform in the professional preparation of doctoral students, particularly of historically underrepresented minorities. In particular, graduate programs need to systematically integrate training in research, teaching, and service into doctoral programs, as well as provide equitable access to faculty mentorship and professional development opportunities for all students. These reforms could help alter the unequal socialization processes and practices entrenched in academia, thus helping expand the pathway to academic careers for Chicano/Latino(a) doctoral students.

References

- Achor, S., & Morales, A. (1990). Chicanas holding doctoral degrees: Social reproduction and cultural ecological approaches. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 21, 269–287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aeq.1990.21.3.04x0609k>
- Andersen, M. L., & Collins, P. H. (Eds.). (2001). Introduction. *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (pp. 1–11). Stamford, CT: Wadsworth.
- Antony, J. S. (2002). Reexamining doctoral student socialization and professional development: Moving beyond the congruence and assimilation orientation. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 17, pp. 349–380). New York, NY: Agathon Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0245-5_8
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 94–122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2002.0001>
- Baca Zinn, M. (1979). Field research in minority communities: Ethical, methodological, and political observations by an insider. *Social Problems*, 27, 209–219. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sp.1979.27.2.03a00080>
- Baca Zinn, M., & Thornton Dill, B. (1996). Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. *Feminist Studies*, 22, 321–331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3178416>
- Bañuelos, L. E. (2006). “Here they go again with the race stuff”: Chicana negotiations of the graduate experience. In D. Delgado Bernal & C. A. Elenes (Eds.), *Chicana/Latina education in everyday life: Feminista perspectives on pedagogy and epistemology* (pp. 95–112). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Barajas, M., & Ramirez, E. (2007). Beyond home/host dichotomies: A comparative examination of gender relations in a transnational Mexican community. *Sociological Perspectives*, 50, 367–392. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sop.2007.50.3.367>
- Becher, T. (1981). Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6, 109–122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075078112331379362>
- Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 195–203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0034701>
- Brayboy, B. M., & Deyhle, D. (2000). Insider-outsider: Researchers in American Indian communities. *Theory into Practice*, 39, 163–169. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_7
- Choo, H. Y., & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory*, 28, 129–149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2010.01370.x>
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- Cúadraz, G. (1993). *Meritocracy (un)challenged: The making of a Chicano and Chicana professoriate and professional class* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley, CA.
- Davidson, M. N., & Foster-Johnson, L. (2001). Mentoring in the preparation of graduate researchers of color. *Review of Educational Research*, 71, 549–574. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543071004549>

- Ellis, E. M. (2001). The impact of race and gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with doctoral study, and commitment to degree completion. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 25, 30–45.
- Espino, M. (2014). Exploring the role of community cultural wealth in graduate school access and persistence for Mexican American PhDs. *American Journal of Education*, 120, 545–574. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/676911>
- Fry, R., & Taylor, P. (2013). *Hispanic high school graduates pass Whites in rate of college enrollment*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/>
- Gardner, S. K. (2007). “I heard it through the grapevine”: Doctoral student socialization in chemistry and history. *Higher Education*, 54, 723–740. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10734-006-9020-x>
- Gardner, S. K. (2008). “What’s too much and what’s too little?”: The process of becoming an independent researcher in doctoral education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79, 326–350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.0.0007>
- Gardner, S. K. (2010). Contrasting the socialization experiences of doctoral students in high- and low-completing departments: A qualitative analysis of disciplinary contexts at one institution. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81, 61–81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.0.0081>
- Gardner, S. K., & Mendoza, P. (Eds.). (2010). *On becoming a scholar: Socialization and development in doctoral education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers.
- Gay, G. (2004). Navigating marginality en route to the professoriate: Graduate students of color learning and living in academia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17, 265–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390310001653907>
- Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N., & Vasquez, P. L. (2011). “Am I going crazy?!”: A critical race analysis of doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44, 93–114. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.539472>
- Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76, 669–700. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2005.0039>
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today’s doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2004). The survey of doctoral education and career preparation: The importance of disciplinary contexts. In D. H. Wulff & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Path to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty* (pp. 19–45). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- González, J. C. (2006). Academic socialization experiences of Latina doctoral students: A qualitative understanding of support systems that aid and challenges that hinder the process. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 5, 347–365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1538192706291141>
- Helm, M., Campa, H., III, & Moretto, K. (2012). Professional socialization for the PhD: An exploration of career and professional development preparedness and readiness for PhD candidates. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 26, 5–23.
- Ibarra, R. A. (2001). *Beyond affirmative action: Reframing the context of higher education*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Levin, J. S., Jaeger, A. J., & Haley, K. J. (2013). Graduate student dissonance: Graduate students of color in a U.S. research university. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 6, 231–244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0034568>
- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Latham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Maher, M. M., Timmerman, B. C., Feldon, D. F., & Strickland, D. (2013). Factors affecting the occurrence of faculty–doctoral student coauthorship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84, 121–143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2013.0004>
- Margolis, E., & Romero, M. (1998). “The department is very male, very White, very old, and very conservative”: The functioning of the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68, 1–33. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.68.1.1q3828348783j851>
- National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2012). *Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: 2011* (Special Report No. NSF 13–301). Arlington, VA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/sed/>
- Nettles, M. T., & Millett, C. M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to PhD*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Noy, S., & Ray, R. (2012). Graduate students’ perceptions of their advisors: Is there systematic disadvantage in mentorship? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83, 876–914. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2012.0036>
- Patton, M. C. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Portnoi, L. M., Chlopecki, A. A. L., & Peregrina-Kretz, D. (2012). Preparing academics? Doctoral students’ vocational choices. *Education et Sociétés*, 30, 43–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7459/es/30.3.04>

- Ramirez, E. (2014). "Que estoy haciendo aqui? (What am I doing here?): Chicanos/Latinos(as) navigating challenges and inequalities during their first year of graduate school. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47, 167–186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2014.900394>
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Solorzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11, 121–136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518399.8236926>
- Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14, 471–495. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390110063365>
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (1997). A social capital framework for understanding the socialization of racial minority children and youths. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67, 1–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.67.1.140676g74018u73k>
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2004). Social capital among working-class minority students. In M. A. Gibson, P. Gándara, & J. P. Koyama (Eds.), *School connections: U.S. Mexican youth, peers, and school achievement* (pp. 18–38). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education. (2014). *Almanac of Higher Education 2014–2015*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Thompson, J. R. (1993). Socializing women doctoral students: Minority and majority experiences. *The Review of Higher Education*, 16, 355–370.
- Weidman, J. C. (2010). Doctoral student socialization for research. In S. K. Gardner & P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar: Socialization and development in doctoral education* (pp. 45–55). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Weidman, J. C., & Stein, E. L. (2003). Socialization of doctoral students to academic norms. *Research in Higher Education*, 44, 641–656. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026123508335>
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Winkle-Wagner, R., Johnson, S. D., Morelon-Quainoo, C., & Santiago, L. (2010). Socialization factors that influence the transitions of students of color into advanced-degree programs. In S. K. Gardner & P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar: Socialization and development in doctoral education* (pp. 179–199). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Zambrana, R. E., Ray, R., Espino, M. M., Castro, C., Cohen, B. D., & Eliason, J. (2015). "Don't leave us behind": The importance of mentoring for under-represented minority faculty. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52, 40–72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0002831214563063>
- Zavella, P. (1993). Feminist insider dilemmas: Constructing ethnic identity with "Chicana" informants. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 13, 53–76.

Received February 16, 2015

Revision received November 2, 2015

Accepted April 25, 2016 ■



STUDYDADDY

**Get Homework Help
From Expert Tutor**

Get Help