UC Riverside

UC Riverside Previously Published Works

Title

The influence of cultural social identity on graduate student career choice

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/77v0x2ft>

Journal

Journal of College Student Development, 55(2)

ISSN

0897-5264

Authors

Haley, KJ
Jaeger, AJ
Levin, JS

Publication Date

2014

DOI

10.1353/csd.2014.0017

Peer reviewed

The Influence of Cultural Social Identity on Graduate Student Career Choice

Karen J. Haley Audrey J. Jaeger John S. Levin

This study examines and enriches understanding of the career choice process for graduate students of color. Social identity theory (SIT) is used as a framework to expand our understanding of how and why graduate students choose (or do not choose) faculty careers. Graduate students' cultural social identities influenced their career choice beyond work-life balance as they sought an integrated life that included values, beliefs, and perspectives that represent their cultural community.

Racial and ethnic minorities make up approximately 33.0% of the US population and the number is projected to move to 40.0% by the year 2020 (U.S. Census, 2004). This increasing minority population is reflected in college enrollments with minority students representing 34.3% of total student enrollment in 2009; however, only 18.0% of the nation's professors belonged to racial and ethnic minority group (Snyder & Dillow, 2011), an increase of only 13.5% since 1995, in spite of the push by institutions to increase their numbers. On one level, the faculty ethnic and racial profile suggests that there may be inequities in the preparation, recruitment, and hiring of minority populations.

Opportunity for students of color to engage and interact with someone of their own race or ethnicity has potential to positively affect retention rates (Swail, Redd, & Perna, 2003). The lack of a diverse faculty body

limits the opportunity for majority or White students to interact with faculty of color as well. Benefits for all students, such as improved learning outcomes and enhanced preparation as professionals, are associated with a diverse university and college environment (Denson & Chang, 2009; Gunn, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Singh & Cooper, 2006).

Low numbers of faculty of color have been anecdotally attributed to low numbers of students of color enrolling in doctoral programs; however, the most recent figures for postbaccalaureate enrollment in 2009 represent 79% White, 7% Black, 6% Asian / Pacific Islander, 4% Hispanic, and 1% American Indian / Alaskan Native (Snyder & Dillow, 2011). Between 1986 and 2006 the number of domestic US students earning doctorates shows a significant increase: Asians by 194%, Hispanics by 140%, and Blacks by 101%; and

[i]f US doctoral programs only focus on the successful completion of those students they admit each year, they could have a major impact on the leaky pipeline of underrepresented minorities and women who enter with the motivation and talent to become successful faculty and professional researchers but who for one reason or another do not fully realize those initial aspirations. (Denecke, Frasier, & Redd, 2009, p. 41)

Yet, increases in doctoral degree attainment are not sufficient and have not been reflected

Karen J. Haley is Assistant Professor of Postsecondary, Adult, and Continuing Education at Portland State University. Audrey J. Jaeger is Associate Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis: Higher Education at North Carolina State University. John S. Levin is Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of California, Riverside.

in faculty placement, which suggests that these new doctoral recipients are choosing alternate career paths.

Students may enter graduate school with a specific career or profession in mind; yet, not unlike undergraduates, they adjust their plans as a result of their graduate experience. The choice of an academic career for graduate students of color is further complicated by the cultural and social barriers these students may experience. Socialization theory helps us to understand the process by which students become inculcated into their roles as graduate students, researchers, teachers, and future faculty members during their time in a graduate program (Antony & Taylor, 2001; Austin, 2002; Bess, 1978; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). This theoretical orientation, however, does not address the career decision making processes of students prior to graduate school. Nor does it address those who do not pursue faculty careers, except as perhaps a lack of successful socialization. In addition, previous research has used models of professional socialization that may not take into consideration the unique cultural characteristics of underrepresented minority graduate students (Tuitt, Hanna, Martinez, & Salazar, 2009; Winkle-Wagner, Johnson, Morelon-Quainoo, Santiago, 2010).

According to Lindholm (2004) research has yet to determine how personal and situational factors affect a graduate student's decision to pursue a faculty career and the effects of graduate school, socialization, and labor market conditions on the shaping of their career identity development. Social identity theory (SIT) contends that individuals obtain value from their social groups through validation of self and maintaining group connections (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1985). The primary social groups prior to graduate school are based on cultural backgrounds (both in home communities

and undergraduate education) and thus engender a form of social identity (Gardner, 2010) that we define in this study as *cultural social identity*, which is culture expressed as a social identity. Cultural backgrounds and social identity can be based on race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, immigration status, or other community-based categories. Of particular interest for this study are the cultural social identities of students of color; therefore, SIT may add to the conversation by offering insights into how students of color do or do not connect with a professional identity in an academic context (faculty identity) and the effects of this identification, or its absence, on career decision making. This study examines the relationships between graduate students' career choices, faculty identity, and cultural social identities specifically related to racial and ethnic origins. Our research questions are:

1. What is the relationship between cultural social identity and choosing a faculty career (or not) for graduate students of color
2. How do students of color view the intersection of a potential faculty identity and their cultural social identity?

FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE

A theoretical perspective, as defined by Jones, Torres, and Arminio (2006), is the paradigm that gives meaning to our work and provides a philosophical macro foundation. Our overarching perspective for this study is critical race theory (CRT) as outlined by Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995), which helps to explain racial inequities in education. We assume, therefore, that race plays an important role in career choice whether or not students identify race as a factor. The main principles of CRT are that racism is endemic and deeply ingrained in American

culture. Addressing inequalities requires a reinterpretation of ineffective Civil Rights laws and challenging claims of neutrality, objectivity, color-blindness, and meritocracy. The theoretical perspective of CRT influenced how we framed this study by focusing on the experiences of graduate students of color, not in opposition to White students, but to hear their stories. CRT also influenced our interview questions as we assumed that race mattered and therefore we included questions to specifically address perceptions about the role of race in career decision making.

We reviewed the literature of faculty career choice and graduate student education as a foundation for this article. We then explored social identity theory as the theoretical framework and analytical foundation (Merriam, 2009) for understanding graduate student career choice.

Faculty Career Choice

According to Nerad (2009), while there is a common assumption, particularly among faculty themselves, that all doctoral students want to become professors, one quarter of all doctoral students and one half of science and engineering students do not intend to become professors. The percentages of students that choose academia in the humanities and social sciences ranged from 65% (geography) to 84% (history); but percentages in science and engineering range from 19% (electrical engineering) to 46% (computer science). There are multiple uses of the doctoral degree for careers in numerous sectors, and the university as a workplace may not be the most attractive option to graduate students.

An academic career is generally chosen prior to a student's enrolling in a graduate program and may be based on undergraduate research opportunities, faculty mentors, or perceived congruencies with individual competencies (Corcoran & Clark, 1984; Golde

& Dore, 2001). Two independent types of career decisions are relevant for prospective faculty: the choice of a disciplinary field and the choice of an academic career (Finkelstein, 1984). A majority of students choose their discipline during their early undergraduate years (by choosing a major) and up to 66% make the decision to become faculty by graduation (Lindholm, 2004); however, other students drift into graduate school and an academic profession with little prior planning (Bess, 1978; Haley, 2006).

Once students enroll in a graduate school, the educational process influences further refinement of their career goals (Corcoran & Clark, 1984). Finkelstein (1984) describes two components that shape career decision making: early developmental experiences and career-specific sources of influence. Several studies cite the influence of faculty on an individual's career choice to become a faculty member and the need for continuing support and encouragement through graduate school (Antony & Taylor, 2001; Baird, 1992; Girves & Wemmerus, 1988; Haley, 2006; Tinto, 1993). One line of research claims that career-specific sources of influence for a faculty career have little to do with environmental, institutional, and background factors, including race or ethnicity, but are almost fully dependent upon college academic achievement (Cole & Barber, 2003).

From a broad perspective, students are interested in academic careers for multiple reasons. Most generally, they are attracted to the combination of research, ideas, and teaching (Corcoran & Clark, 1984). Specific motivators include interest in teaching, working on campus, research, lifestyle, encouragement from a faculty member, and service (Golde & Dore, 2001; Haley, 2006). Students also intend to join the faculty ranks because of a desire for acquiring knowledge and conducting research, engaging

in teaching and creative work, contributing to a discipline, interacting with interesting people, and participating in meaningful work (Austin, 2002). Other factors—such as desire for autonomy, independence, and personal competence—also influence the fit of student to academic career (Lindholm, 2004). In addition, younger cohorts and those who identify as a minority (gender or race) identify social change as a motivator for a career. For example, African American students have connected career paths to the purpose of their life, including family, community, religion, and spirituality (Antony & Taylor, 2001; Constantine, Miville, Warren, Gainor, & Lewis-Coles, 2006; Jaeger & Haley, 2010).

Of particular relevance to this investigation, career assumptions in the literature often reflect male and Western European worldviews, which include a separation of work and family, emphasis upon individualism and autonomy, central placement of work in one's life, and a career path that is linear and progressive (Cook, Heppner, & O'Brien, 2002). These views are not necessarily consistent with career choices of graduate students of color, whose backgrounds and characteristics do not fit the prevailing White male culture that exists in academe (Kerchoff, 1976; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Tuitt et al., 2009).

These contradictions to dominant worldviews play out in the influence of family members upon career choices of students of color. Whereas earlier literature indicates that families of students who choose academics stress the value of intellectual and academic pursuits, and emphasize achievement and autonomy with little regard for increasing income and status (Finkelstein, 1984), findings from more recent research that address students of color offer a different perspective. For students of color, parental influences on career choice are oriented to the financial needs and aspirations of the family. Students

of color in one study chose a career based upon financial returns in order to provide financial help to the family (Whiston & Keller, 2004). Clearly parents have a role in students' career choices: one third of the full-time faculty in a higher education research institute (HERI) study cited a parental role in their career decision making (Lindholm, 2004). Of import to this investigation, parental support and encouragement were more influential on the career decision-making process for students of color than for white students (Whiston & Keller, 2004). Thus, if students of color follow their parents' advice, and if financial gains are a major goal, then the career pursuits of academically capable students may not be aligned with an academic profession and instead follow into fields such as engineering, medicine, and business (Bowen & Bok, 1998).

Graduate Students

While not all studies of graduate education use socialization as a theoretical framework, this approach is among the most prevalent and is intertwined with the literature of graduate student education (Gardner & Mendoza, 2010). Socialization, as the process of norms and role adoption, builds commitment and loyalty to the organization (Schein, 1968) or, in the case of the academy, to the discipline. Graduate school has been identified as the beginning of the socialization process as students anticipate their future careers and begin to take on the values and behaviors of faculty members (Tierney & Rhoads, 1993). Earlier literature viewed this anticipatory socialization as aiding the student in attaining membership and easing adjustment into the faculty ranks (Bess, 1978; Merton, 1957). Socialization theory may frame our understandings of the process by which students in doctoral programs become inculcated into their roles as graduate students, researchers, teachers, and future faculty members (Antony & Taylor, 2001;

Austin, 2002; Bess, 1978; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001), but does not address the influences on students' career goals prior to entering graduate school.

Most research about students of color focuses on their experience during graduate school. For example, there is a level of discomfort for students of color in graduate school (Johnson-Bailey, Valentine, Cervero, & Bowles, 2009), and they experience graduate school differently from their White counterparts, citing isolation, a serious lack of mentorship, and an avoidance by faculty of meaningful discussions about race and culture (Ellis, 2001). Mentoring is even more significant for students of color as they may have lacked appropriate guidance in their undergraduate years and connected with fewer support systems during their academic career (Gasman et al., 2009). In addition, the demographic characteristics of faculty, especially at research universities with doctoral programs, reflect a small proportion of faculty of color, and their experiences too are not portrayed as satisfactory ones (Johnsrud, 1993). This and other work may give insight into why graduate students of color may not see the world of academe as either their world or as a path worth pursuing. The research on the influence of role models may also have some bearing on the career decisions of graduate students of color, perhaps both from a positive perspective—the presence of a role model—and from a negative one—the absence of a role model. Students look to their faculty to see how they live their lives and how they do their jobs. Faculty in their programs, especially faculty advisors and supervisors, influence students' perceptions of faculty work (Lindholm, 2004). This was especially the case with a recent University of California survey: graduate students saw faculty lives as unbalanced, which gave them a negative role model and deterred them from

entering faculty work (Mason & Goulden, 2006; Mason, Goulden, & Frasch, 2009). While the research has shown that graduate faculty intentionally (through mentoring and role modeling) and unintentionally (through unbalanced lives) influence the career goals of graduate students of color, we do not fully understand the influences of students' cultural identities on their career decisions and their educational processes (Austin, 2009).

Social Identity Theory

The graduate student literature reflects the use of socialization as a major theoretical framework; however, it has been shown that the addition of other frameworks such as cognitive apprenticeship theory (Austin, 2009) and social networking theory (Sweitzer, 2009) expands our understanding of graduate students. As the theoretical framework for this study, social identity theory (SIT) offers additional depth to the literature as it helps with addressing the specific concerns of graduate students of color and understanding their career goals, especially decisions made prior to entry into a graduate program. Through this framework we were able to identify the influences of cultural social identity upon their career goals (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1985).

SIT has four basic premises: (a) individuals seek to achieve a positive self-concept; (b) social identification with social groups is a part of an individual's overall identity; (c) individuals seek groups that will increase their self-concept; and (d) group distinctiveness, an important characteristic of social identity, is maintained through exaggeration of out-group differences and in-group similarities (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1985). While a good deal of the SIT literature focuses on the in-group/out-group aspect of the theory, Ashforth and Mael (1989) focused on social identification as distinct from internalization. Internalization is central to socialization theory

whereas it is not a central focus of social identity theory. Social identification helps an individual define self (Who am I?) but does not necessarily lead to internalization of values in relation to a group. In addition, they theorized that identity conflict is more about the conflicting values and demands of the different identities (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). For example, a student who seeks to become a faculty member does not have to internalize and take on all the values previously associated with that role, such as independence, autonomy, and expertise. A student could choose a faculty role and hold other values such as collaborative and community-based research, while still internalizing other values of the faculty role such as a commitment to students or the importance of teaching. Finally, social identities are the aspects of individuals' self-image that emanates from the social categories to which they perceive themselves belonging (Tajfel & Turner, 1985).

While higher education research has not used Tajfel and Turner's (1985) SIT as a theoretical lens in this context, numerous studies have used the theory to understand corporate organizations and the work identity of individuals within the organization, including the strength of identification through shared values (Kreiner & Ashforth, 2004), the perceived characteristics of groups and the enactment of those values (Postmes, Baray, Haslam, Morton, & Swaab, 2006), and the presence of nested or combined identities (Crisp & Hewstone, 2006; Ashforth et al., 2008). These studies offer a foundation for questioning the influence of the cultural social identities of graduate students as they make decisions to join the academic organization. For example, do students who share values with faculty have a stronger identification with an academic career? How do students perceive the characteristics of the faculty role models?

And what is the relationship between students' multiple social identities?

In addition, The Model of Multiple Development Identities (MMDI; Abes, Jones, & McEwen & 2007; Jones, 2009; Abes & Jones, 2004; Jones & McEwen, 2000) provides insight into the intersection of identities of undergraduate students. While the MMDI addresses the intersection of core personal traits and socially constructed identities (race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation), the primary precepts may have value when adding the intersection of professional identity as either an additional identity or as the context in which identity is defined. Identity development is ongoing and individuals are on a spectrum of the development process (Evans, Forney, Guido, Patton, & Renn, 2010). While many graduate students already have a well-developed sense of social identity based on their cultural heritage, or cultural social identity, others may still be developing their identity (Gardner, 2010). In either case, cultural social identity is salient to graduate students as they enter doctoral programs. Grounded in SIT, this study will explore individuals' self-concept and group identification, as well as the intersections and conflicts of cultural social identity and the choices of a faculty career of graduate students of color.

METHODS

We employed a "basic qualitative study research design," as described by Merriam (2009, p. 23), because we were interested in how students interpreted their experience and what meaning they gave their experience. The purpose of this type of study is to understand "how people make sense of their lives" (Merriam, 2009, p. 23). The results of this qualitative study will provide both increased understanding of this group of students and insights to assist future policy development (Merriam, 1998).

Research Site

We were looking for a diverse student population and therefore chose as our research site the University of California–Riverside (UCR), a public, comprehensive, high research activity university that has a highly diverse undergraduate population of 15,000 (80.0% students of color) and graduate population of 2,000 (23.8% students of color, 34.8% international students). UCR defines students of color to include those who self-identify as African American, Asian American, Native American, or Latino/a. International students are counted separately and were not a part of this study. Graduate degrees are offered in engineering, humanities (arts and social sciences), natural and agricultural sciences, management, and education.

Participant Selection

Selection of the UCR graduate students began with an e-mail communication to graduate students explaining the project and asking them to participate. If they were interested in participating, they followed a link in the e-mail to a short demographic survey and provided an e-mail address for contact. While self-selection by the participants may have influenced the overall results, each participant was committed to the study—giving of their time and conveying their experiences—and as a result provided information-rich narratives (Patton, 2002), which is vital for a qualitative study. Additional participants were solicited through graduate faculty advisors and from interview participants—a form of snowball sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992)—which continued until we reached saturation of data (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

A total of 26 domestic graduate students of color completed an interview, which lasted between 40 and 80 minutes. The sample of students in our investigation self-identified as Hispanic/Chicano (9), multiracial (9), Black /

African American (5), Asian American (2), and Native American (1). The participants were seeking graduate degrees in humanities, arts, and social sciences (10), science (8), engineering (5), and education (3). As part of our IRB agreement with UCR, we could only tie one attribute to each participant; therefore, to maintain the confidentiality of their stories we cannot offer additional identifying factors for our participants; participants are identified in the data only by their academic department.

Data Collection

Interviews were the primary method of data collection for this project, which is an appropriate qualitative method as it allows for the exploration of the experiences of graduate students of color based on their perspectives (Fontana & Frey, 2000). While interviews were semistructured and led to the collection of similar data from all students, the strategy was to seek out narratives of explanation that provided personalized accounts of the graduate school experience. Interview questions addressed broad inquiries such as, “Tell me about your graduate school experience” and “Tell me about what has influenced your career choices,” which allowed each participant to respond from their own experience in their own words. We also asked more specific follow-up questions if needed, such as, “What role has race played in your graduate experience?” and “How has your home culture influenced your career choices?” and “What is appealing (or unappealing) about a faculty career?” Understanding our own researcher social contexts as different from or similar to the participants was important (Seidman, 1998) as we addressed the sociocultural context of graduate school education that influences career decision making; and thus, we were attentive to signals from participants based upon our unobtrusive exploration of issues of racial, ethnic, and cultural identities.

Data Analysis

Verbal responses from the individual interviews were recorded, transcribed, and loaded into NVivo (version 9), a qualitative software program, for coding. Each participant was assigned a pseudonym to maintain confidentiality, which was critical because we identify the study site. Initial coding of the data was completed using provisional codes based on graduate student literature, such as the role of mentoring, peer and faculty socialization, and curriculum, as well as codes based on CRT such as the role of race and discrimination in the graduate student experience (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Open coding was then completed as an additional method for developing emerging themes (Charmaz, 2005; Saldana, 2009). From the new open codes (e.g., culture, community, connections, giving back, role modeling) the theme of the influence of cultural identities was developed for this article, and the literature of social identity was researched to support the findings and further develop the analytical process.

Research Trustworthiness

Our use of a team of researchers both for data collection and data analysis—a team comprised of researchers with no affiliation with the site and researchers who work on the site—permitted us considerable opportunity for developing both breadth and depth in the investigation. Before, during, and after site visits members of the research team met to discuss the project, compare perceptions, check data acquired, refine interview prompts, and propose explanations of behaviors, thus providing a peer debriefing process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A focus group with four of the research participants provided member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) as we asked them to confirm the issues that were identified in the individual interviews. The data were subjected to analysis through a

software program; in addition, research team members read each transcript individually and then met as a team to collectively discuss coding and themes (peer debriefing). Such an approach to data collection and data analysis provided triangulation of the data and ensured credibility or trustworthiness of the research process and its findings (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Research Limitations

The study limitations are connected to the data collection methods. We depended on students responding to our e-mail and were limited to those who chose to respond and therefore circumscribed the race/ethnicity of the sample. In addition, 9 participants chose to identify as multiracial, which makes it difficult to know whether the breakout by race/ethnicity was similar to the institutional percentages. Additional participants may have provided different perspectives; however, we found similar themes throughout the responses of this diverse sample of graduate students. Another limitation is in the timing of our study in the participants' lives. We asked them to assess their career decisions while they were in a graduate program, decisions that may change prior to graduation or as they seek their first position; therefore the study results are based on their current perceptions, not on their future actions. This study methodology is meant to enrich our understanding of graduate students in a diverse environment; additional work will need to be completed in other contexts.

INFLUENCE OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES

The participants made initial career decisions prior to entering their graduate program, although 4 participants were already reconsidering their career. The identified career paths

of the remaining 22 participants fell within the categories of either academia, industry, or both: research university (7), comprehensive university (6), government or industry (5), community college or open to any level (2), and university administration (2). They based their decisions to go into either academia or industry on perceived job flexibility, salary potential, community influences, geographical desirability, and congruency of the career with their skills and interests. All of these factors were influenced by their cultural identities. For example, graduate students indicated that job flexibility and location were critical as they had other family and community responsibilities. Participants described their affinity or aversion to a faculty career through the lens of cultural identities.

Families and Communities

One unique aspect of our findings is the influence of others on a student's decision whether or not to seek a faculty career. The participants based career decisions in part upon family expectations and their intent to become role models for their communities. Immediate and extended families were viewed as important contributors to the decisions of the participants. For these students it was more than just considering the perspectives of their family and community, which many graduate students do; they made their decision to pursue a career based on the needs of their family and community, and sometimes a faculty career was incongruent with those needs.

For some, the family's value of education was an essential part of their decision-making process. "I'm the last of six [children in my family], all of us have our college degrees, we are first generation and education has always been a priority in my family" (Leticia, English). This was even more apparent for Sarah because others in her family did not have the same opportunities.

Education is a really important value in that part of my family, when I was growing up. . . . You have all these opportunities that your relatives who are still in the Caribbean don't have, so take advantage of that. (Sarah, biology)

A faculty career then became the ultimate expression of educational opportunity for Sarah and her family, an opportunity that many like her did not have.

Yet for several students, life goals were based on more than family expectations. They were looking for a satisfying career, a family, and an active role in their cultural or geographic community. These students cited their own parents as role models for how to have an integrated life; how to be a part of your extended family and community; and how to raise your children. Ahmad (neuroscience) noted that his father attended all of his sports events (he "wanted to become like my dad") and was therefore looking for a career that allowed him to be involved in his future children's lives as well as an active member of his cultural community. Others noted that they had established roles within their community and did not want to move too far for a faculty job or give up the time they spent with friends and family. Darius (engineering) had lived in the community most of his life and was not looking to move. In this way, then, the social identity of parent, spouse, or citizen was more salient to some students' future identity than the role of faculty member. It appeared that for Ahmad and Darius the demands of a faculty career were in direct conflict with their family and community priorities. This conflict was most apparent when students talked about the behaviors of their own faculty advisors. The students noted that their faculty moved great distances to take positions ("She moved here from Boston to take a faculty position") and that many were not involved in their cultural communities ("The campus was his focus").

These students did not see the faculty role align with what they needed or wanted in a career.

Most of the participants referred to their connection to their racial, ethnic, or cultural communities: giving back to the community and being a role model in the community were two aspects of cultural community that were embedded in their narratives. Lana (anthropology) was adamant about giving back to her community through her research, which she planned to continue in a faculty position.

What I am interested in is how researchers produce information about how Native Americans as being kind of pathologically ill, and how that affects treatment of native people, healthcare treatment. Hopefully at some point we build an education intervention for doctors to better serve native people. That's the intent of my dissertation. And I think that was all influenced because of family. All of my aunts had diabetes, and I had cousins that died from it. So it's a big deal. There was always a sense that you should help the community.

Lana found a topic that was suitable for both her degree and her future research agenda, and would ultimately help her community. While she found acceptance for her topic and an alignment with a future faculty career, not everyone assumed that they could pursue the topic of their choice and succeed in academia. They noted that studying specific ethnic groups or topics that related to specific ethnicities was not accepted in their academic field, which then precluded them from a faculty career.

To serve as a role model for their community was an important motivator for students. Jose (engineering) noted that too few Latinos had the opportunity to pursue and obtain a PhD; therefore, he wanted to be an example for others by being a university professor to show that it is possible to be a "Latino engineering professor." Leticia (English) also wanted to inspire others, especially girls.

[H]aving grown up in a very poor neighborhood and [having] seen the lack of role models in the classroom at every level for Latinos and Latinas, I just thought that . . . my experience and my story . . . if I can inspire one girl, that's fantastic!

Andria (engineering) found she was a mentor just by doing what she wanted to do—following her passion for research. Calistro (engineering) connected his lack of role models in higher education to his desire to be more for Hispanic students in science.

One of the things that [concerned me] all through my undergraduate education is that I never saw any Hispanic professor. When I came here, I saw a Hispanic professor teaching Spanish, but I never saw one in sciences. I think at times it discouraged me, but once I put forward that effort for graduate school and I was in graduate school, it made me want to be a faculty member to make that change.

While some students may have been discouraged by the lack of role models, Calistro took it upon himself to change the environment and be a role model for the next generation of scientists. The connection between the students and their families and communities was important not only in their career decision making but also in how they prioritized their life in both academia and their communities.

Faculty Identity and Cultural Social Identity

Students saw the conflicts between what they wanted professionally and personally and how the faculty behaved and lived their lives. Those who wanted to be a faculty member said they would do it differently than their own professors and role models. This meant that they would focus more on teaching, choose unpopular research topics that were of cultural interest, connect more closely to the students, or spend more time with family.

Calistro (engineering) valued research as a component of the faculty career as well as the work required to maintain funding; however, he also saw himself as a teacher and a role model for future teachers in a way that he did not necessarily see in his own faculty.

I want to be a good instructor. I want to be an inspiration to some students who maybe don't have anyone else that they can relate to. I don't want them to be like, "I don't want to be that kind of a professor." I want them to say, "Wow, you can be that kind of professor, I can do it too."

Shakina (biology) recognized her internal conflicts and chose to honor her cultural social identity, stating that she "would do it a little different." Similar to Calistro, she sought to project a modification of the normative lifestyle of the faculty for her own benefit; as a faculty member, she wanted to provide more attention to students and to become a positive role model.

For several participants the decision was more than choosing a career that afforded them an opportunity to lead a more balanced life, it was about identifying a career that fit with their cultural social identity. Anthony (chemistry) was going to start his job search at a nonresearch college or university. Although the security of tenure was appealing, he was also open to positions at community colleges. He explained his rationale for not choosing a research university as a function of both personal time and the pressures of time.

You have to have real focus in your time, because you have to get tenured with research, not just teaching. I know my boss described it, maybe not for that specific purpose to teach me that, but he talked about it once. When he was starting up he was in the lab 24/7. In fact, he would, while they [family] were sleeping, come in from around . . . 9 [p.m.] to 2 in

the morning to do research, so he could have that afternoon free. I would say that is a difference and that's part of the reason why I don't want that. I have my time more dedicated to things already—spiritually and friends and interactions. I think you get more free time [when you consider other institutions] at least in the normal sense.

Anthony was making the connection to his life priorities, including his cultural communities, and realized that a research-focused university would not suit him. However, others were not able to integrate their cultural social identity with any faculty role, and they indicated they were less likely to become a faculty member.

[I want to be] respected in the field for what I want to study. Because . . . I'm Nigerian American, I want to study African Americans. I want to study Nigerians. I want to study women, and you know, that's not always respected—to study who you are or whatever. . . . I was like well, let me try this applied route. (Orma, Sociology)

Because she did not feel her research interest in Nigerian women would be accepted as a viable topic in her field (unlike Lana and her healthcare research for Native Americans), Orma believed that she needed to go outside academia to find her career.

For Hector (environmental science) an industrial career was more attractive than a faculty career for a host of reasons, including grant-writing expectations and an overly intense workload, which conflicted with his life choices.

I [would] not really like to become a professor at a research institution because I see day in and day out what my professor, as well as other professors, have to deal with: pressures of bringing in funding, grants, always having to write grants,

apply for them. It is very difficult right now to acquire money. And also you are always taking your work home and you never really go home and leave my work. So I will like a job where I can have my life at home and my life at work. I don't have to be thinking about my work all the time.

While Hector sounds similar to many other graduate students, both White and of color, he ties his lifestyle choices to his community and the desire to spend time with his extended family rather than in the lab. The politics of funding, lack of collaboration, and extensive workload were aspects of the faculty identity that were seen as negative attributes for graduate students. As well, students saw evidence of the lack of faculty collegiality as faculty carved out their niches in the research world and the academy. Martina (psychology) noted the stress of the workload for new faculty as a concern.

So I think they're dealing with the hierarchy issue and [how] they need to establish themselves, and that puts pressure on them. . . . I definitely notice a difference when I speak to an older faculty member who's more relaxed and more helpful. It seems more of hierarchy [issues for untenured faculty when] they're not talking *with* me as much so much as talking *at* me.

Students have to decide whether or not the perceived stresses of a faculty position are worth it as they seek to integrate their career and home life.

Graduate students also related the lack of prestige of faculty careers to those outside of academe and to the perceived lower salaries compared to corporate positions. Even National Labs postdoctorate positions were more attractive as noted by Calistro: "Pay is like double what you make as a regular postdoc, so that is kind of motivating." As noted in the literature, potential compensation

was important to students of color as they may also need to support their extended families (Whiston & Keller, 2004). Students with these views did not perceive or define themselves as future faculty.

Students who expressed interest in faculty roles saw themselves as different from current faculty, whether that was because they were interested in teaching as much as research, working at a nonresearch university, or pursuing a faculty career for reasons above and beyond the interest in teaching and research for purposes such as role modeling. Those students who were disinterested in the faculty role cited conflicts which were influenced by family and community expectations.

The desire to give back to the community, specifically as a role model for younger students of color, was part of these students' cultural social identity. They chose careers in or outside academe because of their cultural social identity. This often trumped other factors that were considered in choosing a career. Thus, in order for a faculty career to be viable it had to allow them to incorporate their cultural social identity. Calistro, Leticia, and Andria might have chosen careers outside academe, however, they believed that the faculty role was the best way to encourage students of color to continue in higher education and advanced degrees. That said, they also saw framing the role of a faculty member on teaching or mentoring (even at a research-focused university).

DISCUSSION

Career aspirations of our participants were influenced by experiences prior to graduate school (e.g., lack of faculty of color in their undergraduate institution) and were shaped as much, if not more, by both the unintended consequences of faculty behaviors (and life choices) and the specific noninstitutional characteristics or variables—represented by

the concept of the students' cultural social identity. In answering our first research question—What is the relationship between cultural social identity and choosing a career (faculty or not) for students of color?—we identified a consistent connection between the participants' cultural social identity and their motivation to pursue a specific career.

Current literature shows that younger faculty cohorts are motivated by the desire for a balanced life within the context of academe or their next career step (Rice, Sorcinelli, Austin, 2000; Trower, 2008); however, many of our participants were looking for more than just a balanced lifestyle: they were trying to create an integrated life. They found, often unintentionally, that their race or ethnicity was a part of the decision-making process: Calistro wanted to be a role model for other young Latinos; Orma wanted to research Nigerian and African American women; and Lana thought it was critical that she add to what was known about diabetes in Native Americans. The topics were tied to the participants' self-concept: they were seeking to integrate their identities and give back to their communities (group identification) through their research. Our participants wanted to tie their cultural identity to their professional work, either through content or process, in a way that integrated their identities and limited conflicting values (Ashforth et al., 2008; Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

For some, their ambition was not to advance the role of the discipline or simply advance knowledge, but to bring about social change (Winkle-Wagner et al., 2010). They identified with the faculty role in general (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), but they also found deep acceptance in their cultural social identity (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1985) and wanted to give back as a way to strengthen others within the cultural community. Antony and Taylor (2001) noted

that African American graduate students in education convey a generalized desire to improve the education of their community; and Constantine et al. (2006) found that African American undergraduate college students connect their career paths with life purpose, including family, community, religion, and spirituality. These associations sit in some opposition to prevailing assumptions about careers that reflect White male, Western European worldviews, which include a separation of work and family, value of individualism, centrality of work in one's life, and a linear and progressive career path (Cook et al., 2002); these latter values and beliefs were not consistent with any of our interviewees. Instead, the participants viewed themselves in the process of attaining a doctorate and a high status position in academe, government, or industry as a way to model successful careers for other young people (primarily people of color). By seeking to include others similar to themselves in the professional ranks, as faculty or as researchers, they are attempting to create a more inclusive group while still maintaining group distinctiveness (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1985).

In seeking to address our second research question—How do students of color view the intersection of a faculty identity and their social cultural identity?—we relied upon social identity theory as an analytical framework for our interview data. In using this framework along with a critical race theory as our theoretical perspective, we assumed that race and racial identity matter in the development of career aspirations for students of color and found that students did in fact identify very specific cultural influences on their decision-making processes. According to social identity theory individuals may identify with the social category of faculty, yet they may not internalize and incorporate all the values or beliefs associated with that

role (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) as socialization theory suggests. Ashforth and Mael indicate that an individual may define herself or himself as a faculty member (faculty identity), yet disagree with prevailing values, strategies, and systems of authority associated with that role. Therefore, social identity theory offers an explanation for how students can take on a faculty identity through identification and yet not completely internalize the identity: they believe they can do it differently than their own graduate school faculty. For example, students who valued teaching more than research as a primary activity of a faculty member and therefore more consistent with their life goals, considered careers in nonresearch universities and colleges unlike what their own faculty did or encouraged them to do. Or they chose a different spin on the faculty role in order to focus on teaching and mentoring at a research university.

Our participants identified challenges prior to and beyond their experience of graduate school: pursuing research that supported their racial or ethnic community; finding a position that allowed them to remain connected to their family, which often included others within their cultural community; and being one of a few faculty role models for students of color. No doubt the participants whose career aspirations were not aligned with the broader twin responsibilities of the professoriate—teaching and research, which includes significant publication and grant writing—chose to follow a nonfaculty career that was more congruent with the lived experience of their cultural social identities. Such a view is consistent with the research of Mason, Goulden, and Frasch (2009) and suggests that problems of recruitment of faculty of color may not be entirely a pipeline issue (Cole & Barber, 2003). Our findings suggest that it is more than just a life balance issue: students of color have prior experiences that

may preclude an academic career and have integrated life goals that are perceived to be inconsistent with an academic career at a research university.

If students of color strive to achieve a positive cultural social identity, they may reject the social identity of a faculty member or a faculty career because of the incongruence of that role with their current cultural social identity. On the other hand, an individual may need to leave or reject their current cultural social group if there is a high degree of dissonance with their chosen career goals (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). While this conflict between social identities was a part of the conversation by graduate students, they looked for ways to maintain their cultural social identity, either by choosing a career outside academe or interpreting a faculty career to integrate their identities, rather than rejecting their cultural identity. The work of Craft, Foubert, and Lane (2011) has shown similar challenges of integrating religious identity with academic identity; participants reported resorting to a kind of covert integration “to appease personal conviction and to fulfill their calling” (p. 104). It appears that individuals seek ways to address the differences between the demands of the faculty role and their personal convictions. While there is flexibility in how one enacts a faculty identity, there is little support for the integration of a cultural or religious identity with a faculty identity.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Two potential streams of action flow from this research. First, in responding to the need for increased numbers of graduate students, particularly those who are US citizens and residents, and the human capital development of the US workforce (Wendler et al., 2010), universities must make alternate decisions and take actions that are consistent with the

social identity of their students, particularly students of color. Understanding that students of color may enter graduate programs with career goals different from what the dominant White, male faculty member may exhibit. For example, our study shows that while these students seek opportunities to do their own research, they desire to conduct research that is vital to their cultural community but may be devalued in their academic field. Students of color seek a faculty role to do more than research: they seek to be exemplary teachers and role models in the classroom for other diverse students. Furthermore, in order to attract more graduate students to academic careers—whether at research universities, comprehensive state universities, or community colleges—universities must consider the differing social identities of their students and determine how best to align their approaches to guidance and advising for these students so that a faculty career is a viable career option (Gardner, 2010). Graduate schools often offer professional development sessions that may include topics such as seeking a grant, developing a research agenda, or preparing for a job search. These typical programs could be supplemented to include information that would address the interests of our participants. For example, the grant-seeking workshop could address funding opportunities that target researchers or research populations with various ethnic backgrounds. The job search session could explore the differences in teaching and general faculty workload at community colleges compared to liberal arts colleges compared to research universities. Professional development programs that are designed to support teaching assistants or teaching in general could address how graduate students can create engaging learning communities for underrepresented students. The extra responsibility of being a good role model while meeting the extensive

demands of a tenure-track faculty position could be the focus of an entire series of professional development conversations.

The second stream of action applies to the creation of more inclusive professional workplaces and graduate education environments, so that students of color do not feel that they have to detach themselves from their cultural communities in order to survive and thrive in an academic career. Separating service and research from the individual's community will not attract students of color; nor will the behaviors of faculty whose family life—which is more than a responsibility to children but also a responsibility to their community as well—is presented as secondary to their career (as supported by the work of Kasworm & Bowles, 2010). Furthermore, the emphasis upon competition among graduate students and faculty in research universities, particularly in the area of obtaining grants, will not inspire many of the graduate students of color to join academia.

Inclusive environments begin with faculty in the classroom, supervisors in the lab, and programs that value the diversity within our student bodies. Professional development programming offered by graduate schools should not only focus on the needs of students, but should also connect to faculty. Graduate schools could partner with faculty development offices to address common issues, such as developing effective advising relationships for graduate students. Faculty who advise students, like those in our study, need to be aware of and support the varying aspirations and interests of these students. Appropriate advising methods and strategies are rarely, if ever, covered in faculty development workshops or are infrequently discussed in the preparation of new faculty. The participants in this study received messages that their specific research interests were not acceptable or that their desire to teach at nonresearch universities

was not appropriate. The typical faculty approach is to encourage the path that they took, that is to suggest a career at a research university. These messages must change, starting with offices of faculty development, graduate schools, and conversations within departments and colleges.

Building a campus environment that embraces the needs and desires of graduate students of color and suggests to these students that their cultural social identity can be consistent with a career in academe is important to diversifying our future faculty. Both streams of action demand that graduate education be altered and, along with this, university norms changed as well. Universities must consider what is at stake both for the faculty profession and for the nation's prosperity; universities must acknowledge that they serve not just a core of White and international students but students of color as well. In fact, the suggested changes would benefit all students in their decision-making process and their preparation for faculty careers at all types of higher education institutions.

FUTURE RESEARCH

We report here on one component of a larger investigation. Within the context of this larger investigation, we have considered the disciplinary differences of graduate students that affect career choices. These differences, combined with students' cultural social identities, are potentially significant influences and help to explain the reasons for specific career choices of these students of color. Future reporting on this research will aim to show that there is a major division in the academy for students generally and students of color in particular by their disciplinary affiliation as to whether or not they aspire to a faculty career. By using social identity theory as a foundation, future research can ascertain the extent to

which particular disciplines are attractive to students of color. Furthermore, future research can identify those characteristics of specific disciplines that promote an academic career for students of color and enable those students to secure a position at a university or college. We intentionally chose a diverse institution of higher education to conduct our study. Choosing a less diverse institution may identify additional obstacles for students of color and either confirm or challenge what we have discovered about the importance of cultural social identity.

Future research should also consider the perspectives of other institutional members, such as faculty and administrators. Listening to student voices is a critical first step that now needs to be incorporated with other institutional agents if change is possible. Exploring how administrators and faculty contribute to the current culture of an institution, as it relates to how graduate students are guided and supported in their career pursuits, is an important next step. Using critical race theory as a lens for assessing the institutional environment and addressing system issues that hinder academic careers of students of color would build on the current research and provide deeper recommendations for administrative practice.

CONCLUSIONS

The path to a faculty career is not a straightforward one, and for graduate students of color there are additional complexities, which we have identified through the use of social identity theory. While the prevailing view in scholarship is that choosing an academic identity—and thus a career aspiration to be a member of academe—is an act of finding a passionate pursuit (Austin & McDaniels, 2006), one's social (and cultural) identity influences the level of internalization of

academic values while in graduate school. This makes the “to be or not to be a faculty member” question more problematical.

The concerns over low levels of graduate students of color in our universities, excepting international students who in some fields comprise close to the majority of students, are not without justification. Furthermore, the concerns raised about graduate students rejecting faculty careers, particularly those at research universities (Mason & Goulden, 2006), are validated by our research investi-

gation. The relatively low numbers of faculty of color at our universities and colleges are not simply a problem of the student pool or the pipeline (Cole & Barber, 2003) but may also be attributed to a perceived misalignment between the cultural social identity of graduate students of color and the faculty career.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Karen J. Haley, Postsecondary, Adult, and Continuing Education, Portland State University, Portland, OR 97201; khaley@pdx.edu

REFERENCES

- Abes, E. S., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Meaning-making capacity and the dynamics of lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*, 612-632.
- Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the model of multiple dimensions of identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 1-22.
- Antony, J. S., & Taylor, E. (2001). Graduate student socialization and its implications for the recruitment of African American education faculty. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Faculty work in schools of education: Rethinking roles and rewards for the twenty-first century* (pp. 189-210). Albany, NY: Student University of New York Press.
- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management, 34*, 325-372.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 20-39.
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *Journal of Higher Education, 73*, 94-122.
- Austin, A. E. (2009). Cognitive apprenticeship theory and its implications for doctoral education. *International Journal for Academic Development, 14*, 173-183.
- Austin, A. E., & McDaniels, M. (2006). Using doctoral education to prepare faculty to work within Boyer's four domains of scholarship. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 129*, 51-65.
- Baird, L. L. (1992). *The stages of the doctoral career: Socialization and its consequences*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Bess, J. L. (1978). Anticipatory socialization of graduate students. *Research in Higher Education, 8*, 289-317.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research in education* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bowen, W., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2005). Grounded theory in the 21st century: Applications for advancing social justice study. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 507-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Cole, S., & Barber, E. (2003). *Increasing faculty diversity: The occupational choices of high-achieving minority students*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Constantine, M. G., Miville, M. L., Warren, A. K., Gainor, K. A., & Lewis-Coles, M. E. L. (2006). Religion, spirituality, and career development in African American college students. *Career Development Quarterly, 54*, 227-241.
- Cook, E. P., Heppner, M. J., & O'Brien, K. M. (2002). Career development of women of color and White women: Assumptions, conceptualization, and interventions from an ecological perspective. *Career Development Quarterly, 50*, 291-305.
- Corcoran, M., & Clark, S. M. (1984). Professional socialization and contemporary career attitudes of three faculty generations. *Research in Higher Education, 20*, 131-153.
- Craft, C. M., Foubert, J. D., & Lane, J. J. (2011). Integrating religious and professional identities: Christian faculty at public institutions of higher education. *Religion & Education, 38*(2), 92-110.
- Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2006). Multiple social categorization: Context, process, and social consequences. In R. J. Crisp & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Multiple social categorization: Processes, models, and applications* (pp. 3-22). Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Denecke, D. D., Frasier, H. S., & Redd, K. E. (2009). The Council of Graduate Schools' PhD completion project. In R. G. Ehrenberg & C. V. Kuh (Eds.), *Doctoral education and the faculty of the future* (pp. 35-52). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Denson, N., & Chang, M. J. (2009). Racial diversity matters: The impact of diversity-related student engagement and institutional context. *American Education Research Journal, 46*, 332-353.

- Ellis, E. M. (2001). The impact of race and gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with doctoral study, and commitment to degree completion. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 25, 30-45.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gardner, S. K. (2010). Doctoral student development. In S. K. Gardner & P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar* (pp. 203-222). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Gardner, S. K., & Mendoza, P. (2010). Introduction. In S. K. Gardner and P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar* (pp. 3-10). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Gasman, M., Perna, L. W., Yoon, S., Drezner, N. D., Lundy-Wagner, V. L., Bose, E., & Gary, S. (2009). The path to graduate school in science and engineering for underrepresented students of color. In M. F. Howard-Hamilton, C. L. Morelon-Quainoo, S. D. Johnson, R. Windle-Wagner, & L. Santiago (Eds.), *Standing on the outside looking in* (pp. 63-81). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Girves, J. E., & Wemmerus, V. (1988). Developing models of graduate student degree progress. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 163-189.
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia, PA: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Gunn, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, 330-367.
- Haley, K. J. (2006). *Graduate education experience and career paths of women faculty in higher education administration* [Doctoral dissertation]. Retrieved from <http://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/ir/bitstream/1840.16/3135/1/etd.pdf>
- Jaeger, A. J., & Haley, K. J. (2010, April). *Choosing a faculty career: Voice of students of color*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO.
- Johnson-Bailey, J., Valentine, T., Cervero, R. M., & Bowles, T. A. (2009). Rooted in the soil: The social experiences of Black graduate students at a Southern research university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 178-203.
- Johnsrud, L. K. (1993). Women and minority faculty experiences: Defining and responding to diverse realities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 53, 3-16.
- Jones, S. R. (2009). Constructing identities at the intersections: An autoethnographic exploration of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50, 287-304.
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41, 405-413.
- Jones, S. R., Torres, V. & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kasworm, C., & Bowles, T. (2010). Doctoral students as adult learners. In S. K. Gardner & P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar* (pp. 223-241). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Kerchoff, S. (1976). The status attain process: Socialization or allocation. *Social Forces*, 55, 368-481.
- Kreiner, G. E., & Ashforth, B. E. (2004). Evidence toward an expanded model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 1-27.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Lindholm, J. A. (2004). Pathways to the professoriate: The role of self, others, and environment in shaping academic career aspirations. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 603-635.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2006). *UC Doctoral Student Career Life Survey*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Mason, M. A., Goulden, M., & Frasch, K. (2009, January-February). Why graduate students reject the fast track. *Academe*, 11-16.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Nerad, M. (2009). Confronting common assumptions: Designing future-oriented doctoral education. In R. G. Ehrenberg & C. V. Kuh (Eds.), *Doctoral education and the faculty of the future* (pp. 80-89). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Postmes, T., Baray, G., Haslam, S. A., Morton, T. A., & Swaab, R. I. (2006). The dynamics of personal and social identity formation. In T. Postmes & J. Jetten (Eds.), *Individuality and the group: Advances in social identity* (pp. 215-236). London, England: SAGE.
- Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). *Heading new voices: Academic careers for a new generation* (Working Paper Series #7). Washington, DC: AAHE.
- Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Schein, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization. *Industrial Management Review*, 9(2), 1-16.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Singh, D. K., & Cooper, T. L. (2006). *Ivory tower of the brave new world*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.
- Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2011). *Digest of education statistics 2010* [NCES 2011-015]. Washington, DC: National

- Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education.
- Swail, W. S., Redd, K., & Perna, L. (2003). *Retaining minority students in higher education: A framework for success* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 30, No. (2). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.
- Sweitzer, V. B. (2009). Towards a theory of doctoral student professional identity development. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 1-33.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology intergroup relations* (pp. 77-98). London, England: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-20). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). *Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. (6). Washington, DC: George Washington University, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Trower, C. A. (2008). Young faculty and their impact on academe. In D. E. Heller & M. B. d'Ambrosio (Eds.), *Generational shockwaves and the implications for higher education* (pp. 41-58). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar in association with TIAA-CREF.
- Tuitt, F., Hanna, M., Martinez, L. M., & Salazar, M. d. C. (2009). Teaching in the line of fire: Faculty of color in the academy. *Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 16, 65-74.
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education : A perilous passage?* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 28, No. (3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wendler, C., Bridgeman, B., Cline, F., Millett, C., Rock, J., Bell, N., & McAllister, P. (2010). *The path forward: The future of graduate education in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Whiston, S. C., & Keller, B. K. (2004). The influences of the family of origin on career development: A review and analysis. *Counseling Psychologist*, 32, 493-568.
- Winkle-Wagner, R., Johnson, S. D., Morelon-Quainoo, C., & Santiago, L. (2010). A sense of belonging: Socialization factors that influence the transition of students of color into advanced-degree programs. In S. K. Gardner & P. Mendoza (Eds.), *On becoming a scholar* (pp. 179-199). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- U. S. Census Bureau. (2004). *Population projections of the United States: Current population reports*. Washington, DC: Author.